

Submission by email, 4 August 2020

Firstly, some background information which will reflect why I am raising this issues. I fall into the vulnerable age range and was advised to isolate by my doctor due to health issues. I've been going out for the last couple of months for socially distanced walks but still have home deliveries. I'm happy for the borders to be open but feel that it was rushed.

This is the first time that I have submitted to a panel and apologise if it is written in the wrong format.

Whilst the majority of arriving passengers will be coming to visit family or friends, there will be a percentage of travellers who will be 'risk takers' as opposed to those who have taken a 'staycation' in the UK. By their very nature they will be the people who have attended larger gatherings, pubs etc at home. There are implications for our Covid numbers in this group. Can the panel confirm that if we move down to Level One that the current testing in place will remain at both the harbour and the airport.

I feel that we not only need contact tracers but data analysis staff. We need to understand the demographics of the travellers testing positive for Covid either symptomatic or asymptomatic. (age range, where they live etc) This will be invaluable if a second wave occurs. It may be that we may wish to ask a certain group to self isolate before they receive their negative result in the future if numbers continue to rise.

How is the island going to monitor clusters or outbreaks if we move to level one? I recently went to a local establishment for coffee. The tables were set apart, time slots shown and only one person was invited to an area to place their order. No details were taken. If a Covid case was later shown to have visited this establishment how would contract tracing have taken place?

Finally, are there any forms of checks being made on people who've been asked to self isolate? I feel that the government needs to be more transparent in the information that they are sharing. This would allow other residents such as myself to make informed decisions/assess risk and perhaps feel confident to venture into for example town.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to share my opinions.

Submission by email, 4 August 2020

Hi , I have just returned from New Zealand , transited through Dubai where everyone was masked up and gloves on. Then transit through LHR to Jersey. Completed the online PCR application prior to arrival. Had my PCR test at the airport, I must admit the swab at the back of my throat was a bit severe which gave me a sore throat for 12 hours due to the severity of the swab. My first result came back within 24hrs Negative. Isolated completely with not going outside until my 2nd test 5 days later at the airport facility, which I happily waited 35 minutes for. Once the PCR was completed I asked the nurse at the station about the continued Isolation rules and was told if my first result was Negative then I could re-enter the community and could finish my Isolation mask off etc. Of which I was very skeptical . As soon as I arrived back from the airport I phoned your help line and eventually got put though to Babs who made it very clear to me that in fact the information I had been given was definitely incorrect and that I should carry on isolating until my second results came through, which was 4 days later, which again came back negative.

I have 2 friends who came back nearly the same time as myself and live in Dubai who were told exactly the same information which is very disturbing.

I am happy to be contacted further and my information used if it helps protect the people of Jersey.

Submission by email, 26 July 2020

No isolation until a negative test result is outrageous. I have no problem with borders opening but it should be law to isolate until the result is received which is now taking an average of 48 hours. How many people can someone come into contact with during that time who the tracers wouldn't be able to contact if a positive result received. For example buses (with no masks until tomorrow) not able to trace all the people on there, pubs, restaurants, shops not able to trace. Contact few rows of people on same flight but on the bus from the airport no chance. This makes no sense. Advice is given to be sensible etc etc. People ignore advice but not the law!!!

This needs changing ASAP before we are all locked in again.

Submission by email, 25 July 2020

Dear Scrutiny.

I note that there was a request for continued public involvement re arrivals to the island. It important that this is not at this time seen as a request to stop travel, but a request that people who are tested on arrival, isolate, until their test result comes back negative. This is only 29 hours (it's increased) and will not cause economic damage to the island. We now have 5 cases in 3 weeks, not 1 in 7 weeks.

I was concerned that in an interview yesterday, the CM thought that 39 people writing to scrutiny was not a very big sample, as he didn't mention how many people wrote to him with data supporting his stance.

Note that the press have not been good at following up on questions re the possibility of people spreading the virus if they are asymptomatic and the term "Asymptomatic" seems to have become a magic wand that solves all problems. Symptomatic and Asymptomatic cases are even separated on the Jersey Gov web site. Why?

It should be made clear that asymptomatic corona virus cases can spread the virus. There is a lot of data on this and I have copied a couple of examples below. Our medical team should be asked for a straight "Yes/ no" answer and not waffle on about the unlikelihood of people who are asymptomatic spreading the virus. The fact is they can. They are too close to our politicians.

Our travel policy continues to be dictated by the transport operators and business. Yesterday, Iles Manche Express pulled out, I suspect due to French schools and the older tour groups sensibly deciding not to travel, (most need to catch coaches to get to Carteret and Granville pre boarding) rather than the islands travel policy, which seems a business excuse rather than a reason, as Jersey's travel policy didn't impact them, there isn't one. Flyby went bankrupt. BA stopped Gatwick operations and Easy Jst stopped flying here. Not much in the way of government proactivity.

Thank you for you work this.

Submission by email, 24 July 2020

Dear Mr Ward

I am writing to you in regard to the scrutiny you and other members are conducting regarding safer travel to Jersey during this pandemic.

I have no problem with the borders opening, however, I cannot believe that people are not ordered to self isolate until a negative test result has come through. These results are now taking an average of 48 hours to come back so within that time the arrivals could have mixed with many hundreds if not thousands of people. Without a negative result how can that possibly be acceptable. They mention track and trace when this is mentioned but only people they know they have come into contact with can be traced. They mention the aircraft in that so many seats are traced etc but they can't trace the people who were say next to them on the bus from the airport most without masks (until tomorrow) or the people in the bar or restaurants they mixed with. You know as well as I do that advice can and will be ignored. It needs to be law.

I suffer with multiple sclerosis so have had to be extra careful and when we had zero cases just before opening the border, I and no doubt many others had a bit of freedom as we felt safer. Something which has been missing for many months. Then anyone is allowed in without isolation. It beggars belief.

I have just driven past the Somerville Hotel and witnessed two medical personnel getting out of a car, donning the 'covid' PPE ie gown gloves mask and the plastic visor then enter into the hotel. I just rang to hotel to ask whether they had a Covid positive case there or a suspected case to which they tried to fob me off onto a manager who funny enough wasn't available. I have photos of the medics at the hotel in their PPE.

I said to her that she should know so that precautions could be taken, one would be to tell me to avoid there for starters. I can only assume that someone is in there who could have spread it to many people.

I have sent this to Gary Burgess of Channel News as I have made my views perfectly clear to him previously. So let's see what happens.

I thank you and the other ministers involved in this scrutiny for trying to instil into these ministers who decided to put the economy before the islanders health the importance of self isolation before the test result and the fact they voted against the amendment in this regard. I and many others will remember them when it comes to voting next time. Seems a long way off but not really.

Thank you.

Submission by email, 24 July 2020

I write with reference to the request for submissions to the new scrutiny panel. My submission is in a personal capacity.

Firstly, can I say that I welcome the setting up of this panel, this is critical for the island and strong scrutiny is essential.

I could not see the makeup of the panel but I assume that it has been chosen to give a fair balance between those politicians in favour of opening the borders and those who were not?

What does surprise me is that the panel has already asserted that the recent changes were not based on any form of medical reasons but purely economic.

How was that based?

Reality is, that it's impossible to completely divorce medical concerns from the economy for any extended period.

STAC will have always had to balance the long term medical impact of the various options in coming to any recommendation.

Jersey has followed that medically led advice throughout and personally I would rather continue to follow that advice (eg delaying level 2 to level 1) rather than non medically trained politicians/ civil servants or the views of a very small public survey.

As such I'm disappointed that the panel appears to have formed its views as detailed in the interim report going against the medical STAC view so early in the consultation.

There are some very valid challenges re the communication/ timing etc that do merit full scrutiny but it's a bit like the panel of judges have already found the defendant guilty at the pre trial hearing and that unfortunately means for me this is not an unbiased and forensic scrutiny process.

Submission by email, 24 July 2020

1. Surely it is totally unacceptable for a traveller to be able to roam free for 48 hours before finding out they are positive for Covid (timing given on official website 24/7 - Elizabeth harbour arrival) - no one can say with certainty yet whether asymptomatics can spread

2. Why are we spending money (surely these tests must come out in region of nearly £100 each taking labour as well into consideration) on numerous amounts of tests on day trippers when they have returned home to France before result known ? - do we then incur more monies for costs of letting them know ! You do not come for a day trip to sit alone in a park - you come to shop eat drink And move around

Submission by email, 14 July 2020

Thank you so much for being a part of the review team, it's good to know the voice of the concerned is in safe hands!

I have tried to summarise my thoughts and questions regarding the opening of the borders below, . I have split into categories as there may be different concerns based on the groups of people it will affect. I have tried my best to be constructive and not present personal views. But for transparency, my preferred route is to follow an elimination strategy.

Obviously there has been a lot of noise surrounding the need to open borders to help the financial impacts on the hospitality and tourism industry. In principle I understand the need to move forward and find a way to allow safe travel on and off the Island however, I like many others have concerns that the Safer Travel Policy does not put the health and safety of Islanders and Visitors first. As a side note (thank you Kevin for addressing), the communication has been consistently poor throughout and this is no exception. There are many concerned islanders that do not think the modelling is correct, and do not understand

the basis of the numbers given the current positive ratio and the lack of proactive testing in the UK / other countries people may be originating their travel.

To be able to assess risk, you need to have the information required to make a proper assessment and to draw any form of sensible conclusion - currently for some this is to retreat inside.

TOURISM

1. Concerns around test turnaround times - 12-72 hours - we need the Gov to commit to testing turnaround times and investing in sufficient on island testing to ensure that these times do not slip during the common cold / flu season - particularly important where people are being asked to act on common sense when travelling, something which has proven not to be a robust prevention tool
2. Concerns surrounding a single test and not multiple testing following increased risk contact (particularly on an aircraft where social distancing is not possible)
3. Concerns regarding short visits and test results not being received before they leave again, potentially meaning there is infection both inbound and outbound - will passengers on both routes then be requested to isolate?
4. Concerns regarding UK infection rates and localised spikes / lockdowns - currently this is not being considered as part of the Safer Travel Policy, what is an acceptable R rate for travel? And how does this apply to the RAG countries?
5. If a passenger's result comes back positive, I assume that they will be denied any further travel until a negative result returns. How is this being monitored / enforced? Are the airlines assisting and moving flights or is this a passenger or Government cost?
6. Pre-departure screening - why has this been rejected? In terms of reducing risk, would it not be prudent to request a predeparture test (max 72 hours prior to travel) in conjunction with a follow up test X no of days after arrival allow for incubation of the virus? The first test would prove safety to travel, the second would ensure that asymptomatic cases do not create an on-island spike
7. Travel Insurance - historic policies may cover COVID, but of course and single use or new annual travel will exclude COVID related issues - if Dr or hospital treatment is required will reciprocal agreements pick this up? What happens if there are no such agreements?
8. Are air / boat crew tested regularly and subjected to same contract tracing & isolation rules?

ISLANDERS LEAVING & RETURNING

This has been a major factor in allowing people to leave the island, due to many islanders having family from all over the world. As borders open, naturally people will want to visit their loved ones. The lower skilled / construction workforce traditionally comes from Poland / Portugal (mainland) / Madeira and the UK

1. For Islanders going on holiday and returning - the post arrival return to work requirements state that they should work from home where possible, this does not seem like a sensible move especially where companies provide a small amount of holiday (<20 days) or do not provide sick pay. With rumours suggesting an imminent return to level one, this could potentially put people's lives at risk
2. Track and Trace - Will employers be contacted as part of the track and trace programme for people living on island? Again, I have concerns around the low skilled / low paid workforce having to put financial struggles over moral obligations to attend work (where employees cannot work from home - e.g. construction workers / restaurant workers etc)
3. If an employer deems it appropriate, can they implement policy for employees to take extra holiday to cover the testing period?
4. Can the employer ask to see test results from an employee?

VULNERABLE & SHIELDING

1. What protection has been put in place following the opening of the borders, return to work for the shielding and the combination of the both?

PLANNING FOR SEASONAL FLU / COMMON COLDS

1. How will the safer travel guidance account for normal flu seasons where colds and therefore COVID symptoms are common?
2. Who will finance self-isolation during this period, for low skilled / low paid jobs, sick pay is often not included therefore forcing people to make the decision to go to work and putting people at risk

Once again, thank you so much for bringing this to review. As I am sure you have witnessed across multiple social media channels islanders are feeling very anxious regarding the sudden changes to the rules from the pilot to where we are at now with regards to overseas and foreign travel.

Please do let me know if you would like me to expand on any of the above points.

Submission by email, 13 July 2020

Dear Scrutiny Panel,

I saw in the JEP that you are asking for opinions on the current travel policy.

My concerns are:

- **Current testing regime not rigorous enough** - It will miss those that become infected during travel or in the few days running up to travel, as no second or third test being done. Recommend second PCR swab test at (?) 5-7 days, or on departure if trip shorter than 5 days.

- **Travellers should isolate pending first swab result.**

- **Standard of swab taking for PCR test inadequate in some cases/ ? some swab takers.** Swab taking technique needs to be regularly assessed to ensure reliable results - my cousin who is a doctor in England and has regular PCR swabs taken for work said that her one done in Jersey went nowhere near far enough up/back the nose. I am concerned this may mean that will get more false negatives than we should

- **With borders open the population need to again take greater measures to limit community spread** - suggest making masks compulsory in shops and having a large media campaign advising exactly what measures required and advising those with even mild symptoms to come forward for testing. The current social media advice is not specific enough, nor widely enough disseminated. Many people won't look at Facebook.

- **Under 11s need to all be tested on entry and children age 5 and over need to wear masks while travelling.** Under 11s currently not tested on entry and I understand that they don't have to wear masks either. While I appreciate that they are not super spreaders, they can acquire the infection and therefore have the potential to spread it. As a parent of a child under 11, I would recommend wearing of masks for all children age 5 and over, and swab testing people of all ages on entry, including infants. Parents have the choice not to travel if they don't want their children swabbed. Symptomatic nursery age children are being swabbed in the UK, so it can be done.

- **Incoming travellers should pay for their own testing (even if only partially).** Travel is a luxury and I do not feel that the Jersey taxpayer should be paying for permitting this luxury. Charging for it would also mean that an appropriately rigorous testing regime can be applied). If you feel that this will discourage tourists then you could implement a rebate of this charge for people confirmed as staying in hotels.

- **Strict measures required to test and isolate primary age children who have travelled before they return to school, in non-socially distanced classrooms, in September to prevent school outbreaks (these have occurred in England - Public Health England recorded 40 school outbreaks in the first week of July).** Travel (a luxury) should not jeopardise access to education (a necessity). Please don't allow the travel of a few risk to a whole class being quarantined for 2 weeks. Primary school children should be tested on arrival and not allowed to return to school for at least a week after travelling back to Jersey, with a 2nd test done after 7 days before restarting school.

I would be very grateful if you would consider my concerns, as listed above. Please would you acknowledge receipt of this e mail.

Thank you very much for conducting a much needed review into the travel policy.

Submission by email, 13 July 2020

Dear Scrutiny.

I sent the attached email to the states members, but understand that I should write directly to you. In summary.

My concern is the government policy on arrivals into Jersey with a request that ALL arrivals are isolated until a corona virus test result is confirmed as negative. In bullets.

As of today, we have had 4 cases confirmed from UK arrivals, not 1 in 7 weeks, but 1 in 8 days. We probably won't have had Saturday 11th or Sunday 12th July results back yet.

We were told that we are following, the "science" however, Dr Sandra Turnbull noted we could expect 1 in 15,000 of arrivals to test positive on ITV news, that's 1 in 7 weeks.. She also noted previously, that our own anti-body tests in Jersey showed that actual positive numbers were up to 10 times above those recorded, so this would bring the arrival statistics down from 1 in 15000 to 1 in 1500 which is about what we are getting now.

I have requested and been given from a states department some subjective assumptions on the country traffic light chart that allow the UK to be marked as a GREEN country, when there is not one statistic that could possibly take it out of AMBER (isolate until a result comes back negative). We are actually using the UK safe country list!!!! At time of writing, I believe that we are not part of the UK. By it's very nature, this list will not include the UK. The UK is one of the worst performing countries in the world, with 45,000 deaths and 300,000 plus cases. A number of countries will not accept UK arrivals and parts of the UK are now back in lockdown.

Day trip visitors from France will start arriving next week and not be tested,

The virus is here and we will always be at risk, however, we should have some control over our own destiny and a 26 hour isolation will not impact greatly on our economy. As per the "science" on why we should open the borders, there is no science to show that 26 hour isolation will impact on the economy.

I assume that we are now spending money contact tracing all the people who might have been in contact with the 4 arrivals. Will the government please publish shops, bars, restaurants and care homes (other) that these people visited from point of arrival.

Do we honestly believe that all people who arrive but to not opt to have a test will isolate for 14 days? This is a risk.

One final point, there should be no difference in approach after entry between symptomatic and asymptomatic cases. All can transmit the virus. I understand that someone might not show symptoms on departure of the UK, but they can still speed the virus.

My request is all arrivals be tested and isolate until the test results are received and don't open up to day trips until we have this under control. All arrivals will need an address on the island where they will isolate.

Thank you for your time.

Addition:

Dear Scrutiny.

As a follow up from my email yesterday, I am forwarding an email from Andrew Heaven, Head of Policy (on behalf of the CM who I wrote to) following my request for the **actual scientific data** that is driving our travel policy. There is no such data, as we are following the UK Safer Travel Corridor rules. As we are an island and not part of the UK, I feel that our policy should be more specific to Jersey.

The email states that this is only one of the indicators, however, as throughout the pandemic, no science has been given to show how we have arrived at a decision. The following bullets are completely subjective. At the very least, we should have a high level points system based on some numbers (cases per 1ml, deaths per 1000 etc. and now numbers recorded at entry following tests)

My request remains that all incoming passengers test and are isolated until a negative test is returned.

The estimates re numbers of arrivals testing positive are already incorrect. 4 in 3000 arrivals (now I'm estimating. We don't have the Saturday and Sunday numbers yet) against 1 in 15,000 (Dr Turnbull ITV News) Or 4 in one week against the estimate of 1 in seven weeks.

Submission by email, 10 July 2020

I am against the proposed change and am comfortable with the current rules.

I am happy to follow the advice of our Medical Advisers, who do not believe enforced isolation is necessary at this time.

I believe that this proposal is based on appeasing the ignorant, the irrationally scared, and the people who would rather see Jersey locked up for a long period of time for their own needs.

This proposal states that we think our own Medical Advisers are incompetent and sends out the message that people have the right to be fearful - visitors are dangerous - we must avoid them.

Jersey already has some of the harshest entry requirements in Europe - don't make them even more stringent

Thanks

Submission by email, 9 July 2020

Like many, I was pleased but a little surprised when the announcement was made on 30th May that borders would definitely reopen to all travelers the following week on Friday 3rd July.

As I am considered at high risk of severe impact from Covid-19 due to medication and a health condition, I was particularly interested to see which options were taken and safeguards for everyone including folk such as myself. Deputy Macon, via Twitter linked to the Safer Travel Policy document on 27th June, prior to the vote and so I read it with interest to see what was being proposed in the document.

After reading the proposition, I had a number of questions directly relating to content of the document as I was confused by some of statements made. I put my points to both Deputy Macon

and Deputy Pamplin online via Twitter. I received no reply from Deputy Macon but had considerable contact back from Deputy Pamplin, who even went to the trouble of obtaining some answers while in a meeting with Dr. Muscat.

My first very important point to make here is while attempting to refer back to some of the documents content to give you feedback, I discovered the proposition policy document p84-2020.pdf (as lodged 26th June and available online for some time after that date) contained some different policies, some vague ideas and no clear indication of the ongoing now adopted border opening procedures, yet the currently available version online reflects the current system. How did the original version in its original vague form get passed by States vote – how is that possible?

How did States members know exactly what they were voting for? I'm under the impression they may read the original draft version, a mish-mash of ideas and data about the border trial testing period.

I read the original version of the 43 page proposition document on 27th June. In full. I formulated some questions about it via social media (Twitter) Deputy Pamplin responded and also put some of the points to Dr. Muscat.

How can an initial draft proposition document not clearly reflecting the intended ongoing policy and procedures it is lodged to represent get voted through?

Note – The following points were in the original document but have been since removed following quite substantial policy document revision.

An entry in the document under the heading of exemptions (now removed) stated visitors able to produce a certificate showing the presence of igG antibodies could be exempted from the testing programme. This would infer some belief in not entirely proven immunity.

Where did this idea come from?

Why was this included?

The concept of immunity/lasting immunity is still under question.

This point was addressed by Deputy Pamplin following his conversation with Dr. Muscat.

The original document also went to great pains to explain that the PCR testing turnaround was expected to be 12 hours or 24 hours, this detail has been completely removed from the current version.

My question here is how could it allude to there being a 12 hour turnaround if there is currently nothing in place to provide this in time for the border opening, only a proposed date we hope it to be able to offer 12 hr (or less) turnaround (potentially now August?).

My main reason for including the above removed points is that anyone reading the Safer Travel Policy document as originally lodged on 26th June, (or those reading the document around that date) would have been given the impression some particular resources or procedures were going to be in place that have simply not been implemented and have now been removed from the policy following revision.

This begs the question from any lay person not party to States procedures, is it correct and acceptable that a draft proposition lodged on a specific date (in this case 26th June) be amended either before being voted into legislation or after with such significant changes? (with no recording of the proposition text changes).

Points of interest to me currently in the existing proposition document p84-2020.pdf (version as at 08/07/20)

Within the 'Review of the Border Testing Trial' p29 onwards section, mention is made of the testing regime; day 0 – PCR test, Day 4 – PCR & antibody test, Day7 – PCR test.

The three day testing regime was abandoned for the opening on 3rd July.

As the carrying out of only one initial test on arrival was not made clear in the policy document, one wonders how many who voted knew exactly what the policy for testing involved?

The trial review noted that 34 people failed to return to follow up tests. Was this the reason why three day tests were abandoned? No update as to why these people did not go back for further tests was given.

Has there been any further information as to why people did not continue the testing programme? This was referred to in the policy document, "Information from follow up calls is being analysed to further understand the reasons"

No reassurance was given in the document that people would be chased either to come back for a follow-up test or to find they had sufficient excuse not to, no process for this was written in.

On page 39 of the document, 'Annex –Information For Participants'

The fine for failing to self-isolate is still given as 'up to £10,000'.

Following the passing of this travel policy, public information on the gov.je website began to change the sum to 'up to £1,000'

I found two active pages regarding travel on the gov.je website, one saying 'up to £10,000', the other page, 'up to £1,000'.

Senator Farnham Tweeted a poster image with the 'up to £10,000' fine on the Friday 3rd July when the policy was passed in the States.

Was the initial £10,000 to £1,000 a change of mind? A typo? Just for the trial period then a change of mind??

Or a deliberate impression of a hardline fine used as a deterrent - initially (up to £10,000) then amended inconsistently (quietly?) to the slightly less severe 'up to £1,000'?

Page 42 "If you're staying for a short amount of time - You should not enter the testing programme if your stay in Jersey is less than 72 hours."

It is unclear why this statement appears in the document at all. Was this actually applied in practice to the trial testing period? So any short-term visitors during the trial period were not tested? See my comments further down regarding business travelers as this is applicable to the above statement.

Also on Page 42 - "The tests you'll have to take

There are three stages to the testing programme over the first seven days after you arrive. You will be given guidance on what to do at each stage.

The results of your tests will decide how many of the stages you must complete."

Anyone reading this policy document (or skim reading it) could well have thought the above 'Information For Participants' was being applied to the ongoing Safer Travel Policy as standard.

The above items it would seem were applicable to the trial travel period only.

Note: The original draft proposition policy document as made available online did not contain the detailed information that explained the routine of only one PCR test adopted on 3rd July, the current revised document now does seem to.

The BIG ONE!

Ok, the biggest point from the entire policy is the reluctance to get new Island arrivals to properly isolate following initial PCR test on arrival and to 'avoid people and crowded areas'.

It is noted there is a current proposition for a change to this measure. Which I fully support.

Despite visitors being instructed to maintain distancing or avoid crowded areas, one wonders how many will stick to a guideline of keeping away from areas or people. It would appear our medical advice is treating asymptomatic covid-19 sufferers as no risk, which I'm not sure is entirely the safest policy. Given the unknowns about covid-19 and the many new facts, it would be nice for those who are interested like myself to have some background as to the basis of the STAC advice and how the States made these decision arising from the advice.

Granted that the medical advice has been sought regarding the technical aspects of the virus, has there at any point been appropriate consultation with a psychologist, to aid policy with insight into that other more random element into the picture, the human potential virus carrier?

Just a short browse on social media will give a flavour of the variety of reactions people have to covid-19, some very worried, some accept it, some just try to get on with things but are mindful of others, some do not follow safety rules, distancing, masks etc., some are completely opposed to the safety rules, couldn't care less and think the virus is a hoax.

We potentially will get this spectrum of mindset in each of our visitors.

Will someone back from the airport or harbour who doesn't believe in the safety measures just dump their luggage and go to the restaurant or into town for food and shopping? – it is a possibility. What about a local person on returning to the Island, finds they need food supplies and just goes food shopping? – on evidence of my wife's food shopping trips, some shops are removing distancing markings and on evidence of just taking a walk out and about, many folk are not distancing anyway, setting a bad example to visitors.

In an interview shortly after the border opening press conference, Dr Turnbull stated it was decided that one test would be given to those arriving on the Island, as "people don't want more than one test".

It was also noted in another interview just last week on television Dr. Turnbull also said it was 'obstructive' to give more than one test to someone arriving.

This of course goes against the three day testing regime successfully trialed and specified in the Safer Travel policy proposition document that was voted on, yet notice of this change to testing seemed only indicated verbally via Lyndon Farnham at the press conference to announce the 3rd July border opening.

What was going on with the actual policy documents available to the public? Were all States members fully aware of the policy document differences at the time of vote?

Why was no change affected to the proposition document available to the public and press to reflect this quite significant change to testing regime at that time? – and why was no medical advice/evidence written in to state the one PCR test would be sufficient for our needs on Island?

According to the travel policy, private travelers to the Island by air and sea are to arrange their own border PCR test. Is this being checked by anyone that they are actually arranging tests?

They are instructed to isolate until the test can be taken (within 24 hours of arrival) what mechanism is in place to make sure they are isolating? Or even arranging testing??

Why is there no explicit detail covering this procedure as many boat owners I've spoken to are

unaware.

The Safer Exit Strategy - Given the Travel Policy as it stands in the real world one wonders how this directly relates to the Safer Exit Strategy document I recall being published in May.

Clear reference was made to us having elements of an 'elimination' strategy. References were also made to the New Zealand procedures for such a strategy.

The Safer Travel Policy document refers to us having a "suppress, contain and shield" strategy.

Which direction are we headed in? Why was 'elimination' mentioned previously but doesn't seem to be the name of the game now?

I suspect because the opening of the borders as we have done does not allow for an elimination feature in our strategy remotely similar to that of New Zealand or Guernsey. As Dr. Muscat has said today (09/07/20), "we are fighting fires".

Opening the borders with some holes in policy will not allow for 'elimination' it will prolong the continued possibility of spread.

Conclusion – The implications of safe travel do not only affect me as a 'high risk' person. The implications affect my wife and children.

A slightly overlooked aspect of shielding is the pressure placed upon those who do not have to shield but have a partner, child or elderly relative at home who has to be kept 'safe'.

These 'shielders' (for want of a better word) need to take extra precautions in their interactions or have to take the time to weigh up the various risks of carrying out their usual activities in the 'slightly amended for now' normal (I'm not a fan of 'new normal').

There is no detailed legislation and very little guidance for 'shielders' who are expected to go about their normal day to day activities, return to work, School plus other activities, the guidance issued is insufficient.

My wife has been approached as part of her job to meet clients visiting the Island (including one on the day of arrival). She struggled to find guidance as to the risk that this may pose to myself and how to mitigate this (or indeed whether to decline the meetings).

The uncertainty mentioned above as to whether short term visitors are indeed tested just adds to this.

Why can't we put in place some detailed high risk carers/shielders guidelines?

Guidelines that would safeguard against pressures of corporate business demands to comply or be left behind or sacked.

Another aspect of the spectrum of human reactions to the virus is the varying spectrum of health self-assessment.

For example, that smoker with a regular cough, 'it's not an unusual cough to me so why should I think of myself as having covid-19 or take special measures just because of my smokers' cough'?

Some friends of ours (family of 4) had sore throats for a short period. By chance they had antibody tests and lo and behold, they had covid-19 igG antibodies present. They themselves thought nothing of the slight dry throats they had.

This is also a factor to consider where self-assessment of health in an untested person may well lead to unintentional viral transmission if left waiting for test results and 'free to roam'.

Travel policy and other people's adherence to safety measures such as distancing etc. all impact on viral transmission and can make a difference to the 'shielder' not bringing home the virus to their protected 'high risker'.

I think Deputy Jess Perchard made a particularly eloquent set of statements during the travel policy debate about the concerns many who are shielding have. Deputy Pamplin also highlighted the need to some for 'Reassurance'.

Being told that medical advice has been followed and to trust it is not all that reassuring I know it should be. evaluating my risks is not easy.

The unknowns of this virus mean we have new data regularly, how can we be assured that policy will change to reflect these things?

Some members of the public are not cowering in their homes 'living in fear' as Senator Gorst may be lead to believe. Some are.. yes, worried, concerned and also some like myself are doing as much as they feel comfortable to do and are interested in how the virus develops, our progress in relation to other areas in the world and what methods and logic are being applied to the measures here to help keep everyone safe. We want to hear what is being done to keep us as safe as possible.

A key member of the States team who was overseeing testing and tracing recently responded to questions on social media with a dismissive "why are you questioning the science now?" - because we have a right to question those who we voted for into their position in government, to explain what they are doing and why – also because the reasons and facts behind decisions give us some reassurance - it's as simple as that.

Leaving aside the puzzling adherence to the U.K.'s initial covid-19 response of the Herd Immunity strategy, I've not had all that much to complain about with the Government's response to the covid-19 pandemic. I've not been one to moan and groan on Facebook about it.

Until now.

The opening up of the Island to 'outsiders' is a big thing. Given the severity of the pandemic, it is a huge task for any jurisdiction.

I have relative's off-Island who I haven't seen for some considerable time, a new niece I haven't even met etc. My brother (living in London) who only recently recovered from covid-19, I've not seen for a great deal of time.

I was hoping we (Jersey) would be nimble enough to come up with a world class (overused words I know!), solid, watertight approach to opening borders, one that would set a benchmark model through its carefully considered procedures and appropriate resources, good enough for other jurisdictions to emulate. One that would give confidence to travelers, get the business world excited and buoyant enough to gain some recovery and also allow for all Islanders to feel as safe as possible. I've not really seen too much of that so far, and I want to know why we don't have it.

Submission by email, 9 July 2020

Hello,

My opinion is that until the average test result turnaround is below 24 hours, a quarantine should be required and enforced if possible. I can only assume it would be impossible to check up on all arrivals in the 48 hour period they are waiting for results, but a random selection to ensure there is some kind of deterrent?

This would mean it is only a temporary measure until the government moves towards meeting its 12 hour turnaround target, at which point I believe the low risk of transmission from arrivals to the general public would be much more reassuring for islanders.

Submission by email, 9 July 2020

Dears Sir / Madam

Please could scrutiny find out why they decided to change from the procedure in the pilot program of doing 3 PCR tests over an extended period, to doing just 1? How many more additional cases are being missed (particularly those who are incubating the virus, which Dr Brink says we would miss with just a single test) because of that change? Is it all just about money???

Submission by email, 8 July 2020

Compulsory Isolation Debate

Today's news that there may be a debate to make isolation compulsory on arrival whilst travellers wait for their test results is a big concern.

Taking into account the need to prepare tourist accommodation for new guests after previous guests departures, combined with the guidelines make it impossible for guest to go directly to the accommodation if they arrive early in the day; this is particularly poignant for self-catering which takes longer to prepare for guests than hotel rooms. Government would need to provide workable isolation guidelines to holidaymakers and accommodation owners so what is required is clear.

Although borders are open, we are receiving cancellations in numbers due to the testing regime alone. The necessity to isolate on arrival will lead to even higher cancellation rates and dissuade potential new bookings from committing.

Positive Test Results

Press reports yesterday have left me feeling concerned; I had made a presumption that there was a fixed process in place in respect of holidaymakers that test positive for Covid-19. It appears my trust may be mis-placed and as a result I would like to raise the following questions:

If a holiday guest tests positive, leading to the need to isolate, are they able to utilise the paid for self-catering for the period it is booked or are they obliged to proceed, with their travelling companions, to the government quarantine facility immediately.

If they are not able to use the self-catering then who pays for the reserved holiday accommodation? Doubtless, clients will be expecting a refund on unused accommodation under such circumstances.

Where a short break or 1 week booking has been made, who funds the remaining accommodation to cover the remainder of the 2 week isolation period.

If an owner is not willing to allow for a guest to isolate, presumably, the government provides accommodation.

Payroll Scheme

I have not seen any information extending the funded payroll scheme beyond August. Responsible businesses need to make plans and decisions based on this information and I would ask that a case

for clarification be put forward. Staff members need to know how long they can be employed for as it is likely many business will see the need to reduce staff numbers if the funding is not extended.

Feel free to pass this document to the appropriate departments or individuals as a reply is required at the earliest opportunity. The questions affect many businesses who will need the knowledge.

Submission by email, 8 July 2020

Dear Mr Ward,

In reference to the above subject and the article in the JEP today (6/07/20).

I am writing to you directly rather than the panel, because I believe that Jersey Government advice to arriving visitors needs to be refined urgently to get the message across correctly.

Last week I telephoned and then emailed Tim Nicolle on this very matter after reading the paragraph below on the States (Coronavirus) website.

This is the paragraph;

'Be swab-tested at the airport or harbour, then while waiting for the results **you should** limit the time spent away from your accommodation, limit social contact and, **where possible**, avoid public transport and indoor gatherings'

I commented that in my opinion it was too vague, because by its use of words it was relying on visitors to do the right thing ,(not something to do in a Pandemic) not authoritative enough, open to interpretation and would put the Island and residents at risk of another outbreak of Covid-19.

I suggested that the paragraph be re written and I supplied a substitute paragraph as a suggestion,(based on the fact that I have over 25 years experience as a journalist writing for UK National and regional newspapers).

This is the paragraph;

•All persons arriving at Jersey Airport or Harbour without a negative test certificate will be swab tested. **These persons must** remain at their chosen accommodation (address of accommodation will be required) **until the test results have been confirmed.**

Those with negative test results will be allowed free access to the Island and its services

Anyone with a positive result will be required by Jersey Law to remain isolated for 14 days. Isolation will be monitored and large fines incurred for those breaking the law. These policies are in place to protect the health of the residents and visitors to Jersey .

In my opinion, this instructs persons arriving in a direct way so that they are under no illusion as to what is required from them as visitors to the island during the Covid-19 Pandemic.

Tim Nicolle responded by saying he would pass my comments on both from the email and our telephone discussion.

Earlier today I went to a store. A customer asked me how to find the exit. She had a mask on and ironically it transpired during a social distance conversation that she arrived on Friday by ferry.

I enquired if she had been tested on arrival, she confirmed that she had.

I queried if she had been asked to limit her contact with others or told to stay at her accommodation until the test results were known. She had not been given any instructions at all other than to say " We will be in touch when the results come through".

She commented that the whole arrival process off the ferry was a shambles and it appeared that the people in charge really didn't appear to know what they were doing and it was a long, tiring process.

This scenario, although true, could never be confirmed.

However, it is as I have stated, based on my conversation with the visitor.

I firmly believe it warrants enquiries from your panel as to how visitors are going to be instructed on arrival.

Have leaflets been printed with instructions so that visitors know how to comply?

Is it good enough that the Chief medical Officer said on TV this evening that having two positive cases arrive in Jersey shows that the system is working ? Two more positive cases is not a success!

What about the travellers sitting next to the positive cases on the ferry and on aircraft?

Where have these travellers been in the meantime and how many people have they been in contact with?

In my opinion, it really could result in a massive escalation of Covid-19 if action is not taken quickly to stop visitors mixing until they have test results.

This is easily avoidable for all visitors- all they have to do is bring a negative test certificate, issued the day before their flight.They are then free to do whatever they want on arrival. Also by insisting that all visitors do this would mean that everyone on the ferry or plane is safe also.

That means hundreds of visitors per week free to boost the economy in Jersey and free to mix and travel around the island without restriction because they do not have Covid-19

Action should, in my opinion, be taken immediately to protect Jersey and its people by insisting on negative test certification from visitors. Persons arriving untested should be isolated at their accommodation directly (and monitored) or at the Nightingale Wing until test results come through.

It would be far better to see people waiting in the Nightingale for results, rather than ignoring what is happening and see the Wing full of patients fighting for their lives.

It really is common sense and I do hope that you and your newly formed panel are able to improve the matter considerably and quickly.

I send this with the best intentions for the safety of all.

Submission by email, 8 July 2020

The track and trace system is working very well as it has identified cases quickly and advised other affected travellers immediately. The online registration system works efficiently. Keep going with the procedure and streamline as we gain experience. Well done to everyone involved!

Submission by email, 7 July 2020

The hole in this seems to be what happens while waiting for results. We could incorporate mandatory self isolation for 2 days while waiting or insist on a -ve result to be presented at the arriving port. The latter would deal with day trippers.

There are blogs where people consider the rules for day trippers are different and they can go round to restaurants etc putting everyone at risk. Any changes need to be implemented right away or it will be pointless.

Addition:

Hi

This one from post 77 and then posts 85 onwards...

<https://www.flyertalk.com/forum/british-airways-executive-club/2019877-jer-lhr-launching-6.html>

I tried to point out that general day tripping/restaurants/tourist sites wasn't really in the spirit of the law but some disagreed...

Addition:

Also I did ring the helpline and asked - as I had a guest planning on coming from the UK for work and would it be OK to go to restaurants etc, and was told they can technically do anything but "we are hoping people will be sensible"

Submission by email, 7 July 2020

How can you all allow this ridiculous situation to be going on
Are you all happy to be putting our lives at risk
Until the island can return to normal our borders should remain closed
Look at Guernsey

Submission by email, 7 July 2020

My response to the safer travel review is:

1. Why were people not asked to stay at home or at their hotel until receiving their results?
2. Why is the passenger information on a friendly pastel shaded leaflet which does not reflect the importance of the safety information and the part visitors can play in keeping the island safe.

Kind regards

Submission by email, 7 July 2020

The hole in this seems to be what happens while waiting for results. We could incorporate mandatory self isolation for 2 days while waiting or insist on a -ve result to be presented at the arriving port. The latter would deal with day trippers.

There are blogs where people consider the rules for day trippers are different and they can go round to restaurants etc putting everyone at risk. Any changes need to be implemented right away or it will be pointless.

Submission by email, 7 July 2020

To whom it may concern,

As you requested to hear peoples opinions surrounding the “Safer Travel Guidelines”, here is what my family and many others think.

- Allowing travellers to wonder Jersey for up to 72 hours before being informed of their results is not “Safe” therefore cannot be included in a “Safer Travel Guideline” and puts all “at risk” islanders who have now been told to come out of shielding at SERIOUS risk.
 - Recommendation – Follow GSY’s approach of Isolate for 14 days and test on the 7th day.
- Assuming that you will be able to test everyone that arrives at time of arrival, which has already been proven unsuccessful does not work.
 - Recommendation – Follow GSY’s approach of Isolate 14 days and test on the 7th day.
- Using the “economy boost” phrase is absolutely ridiculous, we currently make most of our money from air traffic, finance industry and our fibre back bone. Tourism will not flourish during 2020 or till late 2021 at least.
- Create a travel bubble in the channel islands, people will travel to Jersey from Guernsey as they have already expressed.
- Let ALL Islanders feel safe again by:
 - Recommendation – Follow GSY’s approach of Isolate and test on the 7th day.
- “Support local” – This has been spoken about for years, right now is our opportunity. Take it. Think of the local businesses that would flourish.
- Admit when you get it wrong, like this “Safer Travel Guideline” for example. This will bring trust back.
- Stop looking at this as Us against them, we are all in this and the decisions you make directly affect our safety and the health of our family’s and friends. Expect to be challenged.
- Slow down - Take your time when making decisions, this is not a race. This is peoples lives.
- Stop trying to beat Guernsey to it, learn from them and work with them. Their population trust their government because of the way they have dealt with this and continue to. Where as many Jersey residents have lost faith in ours.

- We are an Island of 100,000, not 65 million, our strategy must be different.
 - Admit that 1 in 7000 was completely wrong.
 - Recommendation – Follow GSY’s approach of Isolate and test on the 7th day.
 - Employ a Health Minister with a medical background and is who is capable of saying no.
-

Submission by email, 7 July 2020

I would be really interested to know how the government think they can safeguard the island when people were allowed to pass through and out of the port without being tested because there was nobody there to test them.
And there seems to be time lag between testing and any initial isolation while the results come back. Surely that doesn’t make sense.

Submission by email, 7 July 2020

I agree with opening borders to a point but we must have people isolating until they have tested negative, I work at the hospital and see new staff lining up in the hospital for I D badges when they have just got off the plane, it should be about health not wealth!

Submission by email, 7 July 2020

I understand borders need to open in some shape or form but - and especially as with 3/4 of my family in moderate risk bracket and an 88 year old mother - I was horrified when the States voted AGAINST incoming travellers having to Self isolate UNTIL results of tests were known - it is still not definitely proven as to whether or not asymptomatic carriers are able to pass on the virus - and this isolation period would be such an easy ask ! - any local family welcoming returning members would surely not object to all staying in the family home until results are known - and I would question whether any tourist that is here for such a short period of time that they object to this isolation is not going to add that much to the hospitality coffers anyway !!! In contrast a lot of our friends and colleagues in similar age and wealth brackets are understandably feeling more nervous now about going back out into the various Island establishments and you have to wonder just how much money is being lost that way - many thanks for your time

Additional:

As an addendum to previous comments :

... and if this is true - with regards to Clipper travel and incoming passengers :-

“those on the Clipper as they are reportedly advised in advance of travel that they need to self-isolate and arrange a test the following day at the airport. “

How can that possibly be advisable - more delay for testing - more mixing time allowed in getting to testing site !

Surely we need to get all these things we were never fully informed about ironed out - especially in light of rising levels of virus in many places again - and before we start receiving larger volumes of passengers - thank you all again

Submission by email, 7 July 2020

Dear Scrutiny Panel

Just wonder please if you can ask the Health Minister, Chief Minister and Chief Medical Officer of Health and other health officials the following questions:

Is it their aim to have Herd Immunity among the population in Jersey re Covid 19 ?

Are they content that Covid 19 is brought into the Island via Air and Sea travel passengers in order for it to spread through the community or are they content to prevent it spreading through the community?

Covid 19 is a dangerous and serious virus, therefore is this their aim or is their aim to protect the population of Jersey from Covid 19 via testing , track and trace, face masks, hand sanitisers, social distancing, potential future lockdowns?

The population of Jersey need clarification on this.

Submission by email, 7 July 2020

I write to you as the Officer to the Scrutiny Panel seeking the views of Islanders on guidelines for travel in and out of Jersey.

I understand that Jersey needs to open its borders and that connectivity is important. I do, however, have real concerns about the current border testing regime. I sincerely hope to be proved wrong.

My concerns are as follows:

1) The accuracy of the swab testing at the airport and harbour? I had heard that this was only 70% accurate. If so, 30% or 3 out of 10 arriving passengers will be free to roam Jersey, and they could, potentially, have covid19.

2) I very strongly believe that all arriving passengers should self-isolate before receiving their result (as was suggested in the States Assembly, but sadly not adopted.) Everyone should be tested and there should be no exemptions (even if they had a negative result 72 hours previously, this does not mean that they are negative now.)

3) How are they planning to monitor all arrivals? How are they planning to test those arriving on private planes. boats and the Manches Iles Express? How will this be monitored?

- At present I understand there is a problem with those people with UK mobiles, which makes them uncontactable. Deputy Rob Ward's amendment was accepted, but, once again we have not been given the detail. Islanders need to be reassured about how all of this is being conducted,

4) Should we be considering a programme of self -isolation for 7 days? (as is currently being proposed in Guernsey as a 'pilot'?)

N.B Arrivals into New Zealand, Madeira, Australia are ALL expected to self-isolate in a Government facility (Hotel) for 14 days with the Military guarding them.

I have copied below the advice from Dr Brink in Guernsey. I understand that they are to run a pilot study there for arriving passengers (up to a certain number). There they are encouraging 'passive surveillance' between days 8 and 14. Should we be doing the same?

Information from the Guernsey Website:

Between days 8 and 14, those leaving self-isolation will be subject to 'passive surveillance' meaning they will be asked to report any symptoms, no matter how mild. Anyone experiencing any symptoms will be asked to be tested again. All in this group will also be asked to limit their contact with other people as much as possible, for example avoid going to restaurants during this time. This approach balances the health protection risk of infection with the wider health and wellbeing needs of the population.

While the incubation period for the coronavirus is understood to be between 2 and 14 days, data shows more than 80% of cases would be identified after 7 days. Coupled with passive surveillance and the Bailiwick's track and trace system, the risk of this approach is felt to be very low. However, before introducing 7-day testing as the norm, this pilot is being carried out first to help ensure its effectiveness and to gather the requisite evidence to support any such decision.

When the Proposition was presented to the States Assembly at the end there is a report by STAC, written by Mr Patrick Armstrong (an Orthopaedic surgeon)

I am concerned about the following paragraph, where it states:

'it is likely that as the visitor numbers increase there will come a point where the capacity of our testing capacity will be exceeded and we will need to consider further how testing can be targeted on higher risk groups or considering sampling of arrivals to provide assurance around the number of travellers entering Jersey who may be carrying the virus.'

I personally feel that this is unacceptable. If the borders are opened up, then robust testing and contact tracing is required. We owe it to Islanders to keep numbers as close to zero as possible. Otherwise we shall be back in lockdown and this will have a huge detrimental effect on the economy, business as usual (as we are currently experiencing it) and routine medical treatment. The Hospital is just opening up to treat the backlog. If Covid 19 cases surge, and more cases end up in Hospital, 'business as usual' will cease again - no-one will want to attend. All we have done over the last three months will have been in vain.

I very much worry that numbers of people in Jersey with Covid 19 are bound to increase (contra to the Government 'suppression' strategy.) This is extremely hard on those who are 'very vulnerable' and not great for all Islanders. Until Friday 3rd July 2020 Jersey was in a good position (mostly by 'luck' because Islanders wished to lock down earlier than the Government really wanted to, and almost everyone has adhered to advice.) We shall only remain so with good isolation, really robust testing plus contact tracing. We need to be absolutely certain to protect our borders. I fear it may already be too late.

I am not against people being able to leave and enter Jersey, but I do not think that what the Government currently has in place is not good enough. Too many people are being allowed in too quickly. With the cases already imported, how many cases will there be in the next 14 days? This does not seem like a 'safer travel period' rather the reverse and an, 'unsafest travel period.' I urge the Government to re-consider their policy and to bring in more stringent measures for the good of the people of Jersey.

Submission by email, 7 July 2020

My view is that the travel guidelines are poorly conceived and ill-judged. To my mind, rather than on arrival in Jersey, a COVID-19 test should be administered to all passengers booked to travel to Jersey prior to departure (whether that is 24 hours prior or another time period would, of course, be based on medical advice). Then, if a passenger is found to be positive, they are not permitted to travel. That way a positive case will be prevented from reaching the Island and potentially causing a new outbreak and there is no risk to the other passengers on the plane, either of becoming infected or of

having to self isolate for 14 days. Both of which would put a huge dampener on someone's holiday plans! This would also ensure that all staff at the airport and harbour, taxi drivers, bus drivers, waitresses, waiters, hotel staff, etc and the wider public would not be able to come into contact with someone who had tested positive.

The current testing regime is flawed. Permitting passengers to continue as normal for up to 72 hours whilst awaiting test results is a recipe for disaster. When you are on holiday, you go to restaurants, bars, on buses - you do not stay in your hotel room. A person could have infected many people in the space of 72 hours, 48 hours, or even 24 hours. This risk could simply be avoided entirely by testing prior to departure.

I am sure one of the arguments for mitigation of the risks mentioned above will be that there is contact tracing. This is a bit of a red herring and in my view of very limited effect. Take for example a person who travelled on a bus prior to receiving a positive result. Do you collect the names and contact details of everybody who travelled on the affected bus journey? There is also the matter of GDPR and the possibility that people will not provide correct contact information. Even if you are able to trace every single contact an infected person has had since their arrival how do you police self-isolation? Again, this risk could simply be avoided by testing prior to departure.

Submission by email, 7 July 2020

Well done?

This is the exact reason I didn't want the borders open yet.

This debacle proves that the procedures put in place aren't fit for purpose?

Someone needs to be held accountable, too many "cockups" are being made and no one is being held responsible?

Once again Jersey's Government rushed through a vote to open up our borders and now have put us in danger?

This whole entry testing hasn't been implemented in a thorough way. As I said above, this has been rushed as far as I can see all because of the Hospitality Industry putting pressure on certain representatives on the Government.

One person on a flight and one on a boat with Covid-19 out of 600, we were told that the Government expected 1 in 7000. Tick, another failure?

As someone who is isolating/shielding due to medical reasons I can see this has put my freedom back many months, when I just thought it may be possible to start safely venturing out the Government does this.

Submission by email, 7 July 2020

Good morning,

You have asked for public comment on this subject. As any debate on safe travel is likely to take a while, please bear in mind that many islanders just want to leave Jersey, this would not affect any concerns about importing Covid-19.

I have been trying to get to St Malo with my car since France reopened its borders last month, the last thing I need now is for Jersey to close its borders again. Condor have problems with the stevedores at St Malo but they hope to have this resolved for the coming weekend, my booking with them has had to be put back three times now.

All I want to do is get OFF the island, I'm not interested in coming back at the present time. So please let us leave, even if incoming travel is put on hold.

Submission by email, 6 July 2020

With reference to the States Assembly voting on the opening of borders I know that we need to do this to get the economy and hospitality working again. The problem is that we should have had the 48hours isolation in place in order to protect the islanders. If you really wanted to come on holiday or come back to your home then I am sure this would not have been a hardship.

They are saying that once the results are back if positive then have to get people to isolate (15 people max) from plane. What about the rest of the flight that have been breathing the same air, the transport from airport/port and contact for the 48 hours. A lot of these travellers would have been out and about the island enjoying meals etc so are all these people being traced.

One more point that might not be of interest to you but I think it is disgusting that a Minister (Judy Martin) had the audacity to stand up in the Assembly and say she is sick of hearing from people that they wished that they were in Guernsey the way they have handled the virus and that they should go and live their she should look at how they have handled Media reports daily and been truthful in what they have told the public she should be reminded that it is the public's Income Tax that pays her £1,000 a week salary and should show a bit more respect to the public.

My last comment on this is that the public have little or no confidence In this Government . (Unfortunately we were told by Reform Candidates that JLF was a good candidate to vote for that was the biggest waste of a vote that we have ever done)

Would just like to say that The Scrutiny Panel needs to be given the relevant information in a timely manner.

Submission by email, 6 July 2020

As part of the travel guidelines review should the scrutiny panel not suggest that people are only allowed to travel once they have provided proof of a negative covid test which is relatively easy to obtain in the UK certainly. Or at the very least, should it not be law that people arriving in the island have to isolate until their results have come through. It is ridiculous that people on flights or ferries have to consider whether their fellow passengers might be carrying the virus unknowingly.

Submission by email, 6 July 2020

I believe the inward travel arrangements need review. Islanders have worked hard over the past few months to limit the affects of CV19 on the elderly, venerable and sick in the Island, protect our health service, those in care homes etc. Just as it becomes a little bit safer to come out and enjoy our Island, both natural and businesses, we find that mixing with people from the UK again exposes us to further risk. Whilst emergency flights have been running successfully, there had been a dash towards fully opening our boarders. I believe we do need further travel opportunities, these should be done with the greatest of care and consideration. I believe that all should be tested, unless there is a medical reason not to do so, the Tenerife flight showed people can't be trusted to self Isolate. We could go down the Hong Kong route, where if isolated at home, you have an electronic tag that works with your smartphone, that reports in if you leave home. All tested people must isolate at home, or hotel, and should be contacted with results as soon as possible, but not be allowed out or to mix until shown to be clear, and that includes family contact. All should be tested, regardless of age, if we are to protect the health and prosperity of our Island. A lot of elderly are afraid of the virus, and will remain so, unless they are confident with the travel arrangements. Without proper isolation and testing, it will force many into a period of further isolation, so potentially damaging their physical and mental health.

Submission by email, 6 July 2020

1. Please can the panel discuss and consider creating a video of the process for traveling to and from the Island, as an assurance to the public?
 2. In addressing any significant rise in cases, how would the Government rectify the travel process, and how quickly could a new process be implemented, if any is felt to be required?
 3. Can it be confirmed for passengers when duty free services will resume, and will it be a gradual increase in capacity of staff, or collectively operational with the resumption of services all at once?
 4. Will the panel kindly confirm how often and when airport staff are tested?
 5. Would the panel please clarify if the Government advise on territories not to travel too?
 6. Can the panel confirm if it would have capacity to confirm how many travelers enter or leave the Island on a weekly basis?
 7. When positive checks are found and persons are forced to isolate, what checks are done to assure the persons are not leaving their residence (despite enforced isolation)
 8. Please could the panel make use of duty free staff, it has been some time where the staff have been furloughed. Is there capacity for their use in some form to support the safeguard of travel?
 9. Please can it be identified if more flights resume, has there been preparedness for flight resumption's to already confirmed but not publicly announced locations.
 10. I thought it would also be worth mentioning the use of private planes. Have private planes been traveling into the island since April 1st, and what guidelines have been imposed on such parties?
-

Submission by email, 6 July 2020

Whilst I am not against the opening of the border, I was dismayed that the Government voted to open up with no requirement for incoming individuals to isolate until their Covid swab results are returned. How impatient and inconsiderate those who voted 'for' must be. For the sake of one more week, this issue could have had a positive outcome with people being required to isolate. So now we have two positive cases in two days. How many people now have to isolate compared to far fewer had people been required to isolate whilst seating their test result? You only have to see the number of comments on social media to realise how the govt has not listened to the public. We shall avoid visitors now. We won't go out and spend locally. After all, who is standing next to us? A visitor with Covid?

Submission by email, 6 July 2020

The borders have been open since Friday and there have been new cases entering Jersey. no matter how careful you might be with the testing, mistakes will always be made the way forward should be the Guernsey route making sure the elderly are safe and any vulnerable islanders safe, my son included. Keep the borders close until we have a vaccine. I am keeping all my staff in employment as I was told we did not qualify for government assistance, if we need to go back into lockdown we will have no choice but to make everyone redundant and close down

Submission by email, 6 July 2020

Hi Scrutiny

I think it is awful that passengers arriving in Jersey are tested for corona virus then they don't have to isolate before their results, they could be spreading the corona virus in the population in Jersey in the meantime. They should all be wearing masks until they get their results. I think Jersey locals should be wearing masks again too. Scientists are advising people to wear masks to stop the spread of the virus and to stop oneself catching it from someone's cough or sneeze that might carry the virus and spread it.

Oh dear, Jersey doesn't feel safe again and this is worrying.

Lots of people are very scared to go out and they are worried for good reason. The argument for releasing restrictions to help mental health only applies to some and there are also many people in Jersey who suffer from anxiety from the fear generated by restrictions being lifted.

Also they are scared because of Jersey's approach to allow the corona virus to spread in comparison to Guernsey's dedication to eradicate the virus.

Many many people are still staying in and are scared to go out, even more so now seeing how quickly the restrictions have been lifted. These people include the most vulnerable and those with existing health conditions who really need protecting.

In fact we all need protecting and the Island has a responsibility to protect us by making good and wise decisions in the first place.

A hard lesson to be learnt here, please help stop the spread of this virus via the incorrect guidelines that have so far proved the virus came here via sea and air passengers very quickly.

So many people thought this would happen, and it has.

Submission by email, 6 July 2020

Hi there

I completely agree that our borders should be open but the current testing/self isolation process is wholly inadequate and in my view creates a significant risk of having to close our borders again.

I do not understand why all arrivals that agree to be tested are allowed to roam the island unrestricted until they receive their test results. If positive, they can have passed the virus on to a significant number of people before they are put into self isolation. This seems to defeat the point of testing in the first place.

There is a balance to be had but this should be achievable. Passengers arriving should only be allowed free access around the island after they have been confirmed as negative, and in the meantime should self isolate.

Anyone that doesn't have a test should self-isolate as currently required.

The exemption for those who have an approved negative test 72 hours prior to coming to Jersey also risk significant re-infection as they could have caught the virus in that 72 hours. Everyone arriving should be subject to testing as above or 14 day self-isolation.

This seems to be a reasonable approach and for the sake of self-isolating for 24 hours in order to reduce the risk of more infections, I don't think travellers will be put off coming. We need to open the island but we need to do it whilst minimising the risk of further infection and possible deaths and a second lock down.

Submission by email, 6 July 2020

I feel that the correct level of testing is being done for people visiting and returning to the island.

We need to live with this virus until a vaccine is found and cannot lock ourselves away from the world, however we still need to protect our elderly and vulnerable by carrying on with the current levels of protection.

The expensive nightingale hospital and some levels of communication apart, I and other in my family feel that the states ministers have worked well and not overreacted to the pandemic.

Submission by email, 6 July 2020

Dear Scrutiny Panel

Please can you ask if all passengers travelling to Jersey either by sea or air be tested for Covid 19, then asked to stay in isolation wearing a mask (apart from eating and sleeping) until they have their results.

It is not fair on the people who live in Jersey to be put at such risk of having those new arrivals being free to roam the island and mingle with the population while they have not received their results.

Covid 19 can lead to death, it is a very serious virus.

Testing on day 1 is not good as the symptoms present on day 3 up to day 7 for a positive result. (I know this as I have had 4 Covid 19 tests having been in hospital twice in the last 6 weeks for a different illness not related to Covid 19.)

Therefore potentially other passengers may develop symptoms after they have been tested at the airport and harbour , ie in the days after their test.

Also I believe the people of Jersey should certainly be encouraged to wear masks when out in public and in shops. I noticed just yesterday that standards are slipping at a supermarket, the staff member on duty said it didn't matter if customers did not use the hand sanitizer.

It matters now more than ever as Covid 19 is now on the rise again, with 6 active cases, plus other test results still pending,

This is totally unsatisfactory.

My family believe we had Covid 19 in February to March, it was the 'Flu from Hell' that is the only way I can describe it, horrific sore throat, earache temperature, continuous cough, loss of taste and smell, feeling of permanent jet lag, etc. Unfortunately the Infection control hadn't been set up yet to test the general public, our family had to isolate and fight the virus the best we could. It took me a month to get over it as I developed bronchitis, I would not wish Covid 19 on anyone, it is horrible.

Incidentally Antibody tests are giving out false negative results, so people who have tested positive for Covid 19 are later testing negative for antibodies. Scientists have not yet found all the antibodies or T Cells carrying the virus. This test is unreliable.

Some people carry the virus asymptotically, this can still be passed on to others. It is recognised by scientists that droplets from a sneeze can travel a great distance and remain in the air for a long time.

Surely all passengers on an aircraft that has landed in Jersey should isolate if even one passenger is tested positive for Covid 19? They will have all been put at risk, plus the staff on the aircraft, airport staff etc. The same applies at the harbour.

Nobody wants this virus to spread, the Island must do everything to prevent this.

Submission by email, 6 July 2020

Dear Scrutiny Panel members

Like other islanders I have heard that one passenger tested +ve for Covid 19 on Friday. I have the following comments:

1. Both the government statement around this and the information on the gov website implies that the test procedure carried out at the airport is processed in a very short time i.e.:

Easy Jet Gatwick Friday Test Processing 35 mins. This suggests that the process **and results** are virtually immediate when in fact the test results are taking up to 72 hours to complete. The statement goes on to say that the passenger and others who were also contacted are isolating at home which indeed they no doubt are. There is no indication as to how long there was between test and results during which each of these people was free to move around the island.

2. In spite of clear guidance that establishments should make efforts to gather the contact details of people dining at them there is little evidence that this is happening. We have been seated at tables in 7 island establishments and only asked once for a contact detail. Social distancing is hardly ever adhered to. So if people come to the island, or indeed islanders themselves, and visit island pubs, cafes and restaurants how is contact tracing going to succeed?

We must be the only country in the world that has got to the position of having no active cases, only to open our borders and not to have at the very least a requirement to self isolate until a -ve test result is returned. This also leaves aside the absolute fact that 100% of cases picked up whilst in transit to Jersey (using often public transport and travelling through airports etc) will be missed through test on arrival.

Please challenge this failed policy by, at the very least insisting that people isolate until they receive a -ve result.

Jersey has had many months now to get a quicker testing and results process in place and has failed absolutely to do so. Why?

Many people who would be out spending in our local economy are so reluctant to do so as they do not trust this government to keep islanders safe. Let us hope that the few tourists who do visit the island compensate for the lack of spending in the local economy that islanders would be willing to engage in if it were not for this fear factor.

Thank you for the work that you do.

Addition

Further to my email below I see now that a Condor passenger has now tested positive. So with 24 hours of opening borders two positive cases. Are any of the 175 other passengers or staff on the ferry (which I guess was around a 4 hour crossing) having to isolate?

This is not a Safe Travel Policy. It is anything but.

Submission by email, 6 July 2020

I think that only those travellers that have a valid negative test result within the last 72 hours should be allowed into Jersey.

Allowing travellers to test on arrival with a delay in receiving the result leads to an increased risk that the local containment policy will simply fall apart. The instance of one on the very first inward flight is a clear warning that the current plan is flawed. If results can be provided while arriving passengers wait, before leaving the airport than the practice can be reviewed.

Submission by email, 6 July 2020

Dear Sirs

I am 58 years old, Jersey born and bred and lived on the island my entire life.

It is with much regret that for the first time ever I have to agree with others that the States of Guernsey appear to have made our own States look like amateurs during the Covid Crisis so far.

Last week, the latest States decision not only to open the borders, but to also ignore the scrutiny committee's proposals, left me totally dumbstruck.

On the very day the commercial flights begun, a case was identified on only the second flight – a flight with a mere 72 passengers on board.

In a statement, spokesperson for the government, said: 'A passenger arriving from Gatwick on Friday evening has tested positive for Covid-19. The passenger was asymptomatic and is isolating at a private residence.'

'Contact tracing has already taken place for the 15 passengers seated in the adjoining rows and they are self-isolating in private residences.'

To make matters worse, it was not identified until approx. 48 hours had elapsed due to the current inefficiencies in testing!

Indeed, it has already been rumoured that the individual concerned has been wandering around St Helier unaware of infecting goodness knows how many members of the public. This is probably true as they did not have any symptoms.

The States of Jersey are being naive in the extreme to think visitors will self-isolate until such time as they get their Covid test result.

What the States of Jersey should now do and do it very quickly indeed, is to be totally open and honest with the General Public of Jersey, something that does not appear to have been the case on the lead up to the vote to open the borders 'safely'.

The following information, together with any additional pertinent information should be made public at the earliest opportunity:-

1. Exactly, how long did it take for the result of this passenger's test to be available;

2. How many of the 15 passengers had self-isolated prior to being contacted and asked to self-isolate;
3. Did all those individual's asked to self-isolate, self-isolate;
4. Have all these passengers agreed to future tests during the period that they are now in self-isolation.

The States should also not allow themselves to be bullied by EasyJet or indeed any other travel operator into the islands, to the detriment of the local population.

I am sure that the majority of the General Public would agree that there was a lot to be desired as to the manner in which the opening of the borders was initially communicated, especially the fact that the island remains woefully behind in respect of testing arriving passengers within an effective time period.

I would also imagine that the majority of Jersey Residents would agree that the borders should remain closed to commercial passengers until tests can be carried out locally and the results known and communicated the same day as arrival.

Furthermore, far more consideration should be given as to the level of Covid that exists in the country of departure, such as the UK and those cases need to fall much further than they currently stand.

There are currently 36 towns & cities nearing a second lockdown, please see the link below:-

<https://www.goodtoknow.co.uk/wellbeing/health/36-cities-local-lockdown-548615>

Indeed, I cannot imagine that the number of cases in the UK are any less than when the island initially went into lockdown. Thus, what a shambolic decision to open the borders in the manner they were done so last week.

After all the hard work and patience by the public in managing to virtually stop the spread of Covid in the island entirely, where has this recent 'gung ho' approach by the States of Jersey come from?

I appreciate we need to get the economy moving, but do the States not realise that they are gambling (there is no other word appropriate) with setting the Island economy back once more. Many locals have been waiting patiently to go out and enjoy the restaurants and pubs as much as possible as matters have eased, however as soon as the numbers of infections start to tick up once more (which surely they are likely to do so), many of these people will once again think twice about going out once more.

Even when ignoring the health consequences and solely from an economic viewpoint, as far as I can see, the potential downside of this decision is far greater than the potential upside.

To conclude, the States of Jersey are in grave danger of losing all public trust at this moment in time, with the main contenders appearing to be Messrs, John Le Fondre, Lydon Farnham & Ian Gorst.

Submission by email, 6 July 2020

Good morning

I understand you are asking for islanders' views.

I agree we have to open the borders for the emotional and economic reasons, however I strongly feel that all people coming to the island should have to isolate until they receive their test results (unless they have opted for 14 days' self-isolation - which itself needs spot checks).

I am a vulnerable islander who has only just begun to resume elements of 'normal' life.

Submission by email, 6 July 2020

Afternoon Mr ward,

I felt compelled to write to you after the recent events this weekend, regarding the opening of the borders and SARS-CoV-2 (covid-19) and my disgust as to how this has been fudged by our illustrious leaders.

As an island we are very privileged to be able to control our borders in a pandemic. We have lost that control, all of the good work of the last 3 months will be for nothing in the coming weeks, as we are once again 'shown up' by our neighbouring island of Guernsey.

The borders of the island must be opened, I don't think anyone can disagree, but to open them with no requirement to isolate before gaining test results for the virus is criminal. We were in a position to either expect self-isolation until the results came through, or isolate in one of our wonderful hotels (something that worked well in Asia) until the result came through. Instead we allow anybody to walk off a plane or boat, wander off into our community, until the results of a test.

This criminal negligence the states has allowed, has now been proven to be based on 'business' not science. Two people in the first two days have brought the virus onto the island, something we were told, statistically should happen every 6 to 7 weeks.....1 in 7000. Maybe the advice that is given to our politicians needs to come from scientists rather than from the lobbying of business leaders more interested in pounds than lives. My own deputy is trying to get happy hour re-introduced.....great idea at this time, I thankfully didn't vote for the incompetent deputy who should stick to slogans not politics.

Its only a shame there is no election soon to off load the 'old school' who are mainly responsible for this. They should be held to account in court for their negligence.

I don't think that my email can do justice to how disgusted I am with the incompetent 'old school', but feel free to call me to discuss in greater detail.

Submission by email, 6 July 2020

Hi, you may have read my posts on facebook.

I saw the cryptic article on JEP website regards you wanting opinions on the testing program. The article won't yield results as no working links are provided.

If you haven't read my comments, the govt must backtrack.

Those who pushed these crazy 'test but roam' rules through must be held to account.

So we now have 2 new cases inside 3 days of arrivals. That isn't helping the island which clearly has hidden cases seen in workforce screening.

Our so called medical experts predicted 1 case per 7 weeks and declared Jersey covid free, just last week !

I am high risk, as is my wife. Many others are too and why should Islanders hide why visitors roam free until results are in.

It's madness and this latest attempt by govt to mitigate is simply, fantasy. Asymptomatic people, transmit virus.

It is well documented and, if indeed asymptomatic people can't, why indeed are they made to isolate at all?

As is seen in most sane countries, you don't simply reimport, or supplement local case loads by letting unknown people wander free.

It's simple.

Test, Isolate, Result, No Exceptions or don't come. Allowing this madness to continue will ultimately kill islanders which in law, is manslaughter by any other name.

I am angry.

Submission by email, 6 July 2020

Dear Deputy Ward

I understand that you are the Chairman of the above and I thought I would get in touch to give my view on the travel guidelines. Frankly, I think they are poorly conceived and ill-judged. To my mind, rather than on arrival in Jersey, a COVID-19 test should be administered to all passengers booked to travel to Jersey prior to departure (whether that is 24 hours prior or another time period would, of course, be based on medical advice). Then, if a passenger is found to be positive, they are not permitted to travel. That way a positive case will be prevented from reaching the Island and potentially causing a new outbreak and there is no risk to the other passengers on the plane, either of becoming infected or of having to self isolate for 14 days. Both of which would put a huge dampener on someone's holiday plans! This would also ensure that all staff at the airport and harbour, taxi drivers, bus drivers, waiters, waitresses, hotel staff, etc and the wider public would not be able to come into contact with someone who had tested positive.

The current testing regime is flawed. Permitting passengers to continue as normal for up to 72 hours whilst awaiting test results is a recipe for disaster. When you are on holiday, you go to restaurants, bars, on buses - you do not stay in your hotel room. A person could have infected many people in the space of 72 hours, or 48 hour, or even 24 hours. This risk could simply be avoided entirely by testing prior to departure.
