STATES OF JERSEY

CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE RESILIENCE - TRANSPORT LINKS (R.129/2025): EXECUTIVE RESPONSE

Presented to the States on 16th October 2025
by the Public Accounts Committee

STATES GREFFE

FOREWORD

In accordance with paragraphs 69-71 of the Code of Practice for engagement between 'Scrutiny Panels and the Public Accounts Committee' and 'the Executive', the Public Accounts Committee (PAC) presents the Executive Response to the Comptroller and Auditor General's (C&AG) Report entitled: Critical Infrastructure Resilience - Transport Links (R.129/2025, presented to the States Assembly on 29th August 2025).

The PAC will review the response to this report and will consider publishing further comments in due course.

Deputy I. Gardiner
Chair, Public Accounts Committee

Chief Executive - Executive Response to C&AG Report: Critical Infrastructure Resilience – Transport Links

Summary of response

We are grateful to the Comptroller and Auditor General for this Review and its recommendations, all but one of which are agreed or partially agreed. The risk assessment and decision rationale, and action plan, set out below form our response. We are pleased that many of these actions are already underway.

Where recommendations have been 'Accepted but Deferred', it is acknowledged that proportionate activity is required to address the risk highlighted, however, the operating environment means that the current moment may not be the best time to plan the activity in the most appropriate manner. These deferrals will be monitored and reviewed periodically to ensure that decisions on future actions are made at the appropriate time, or deprioritised if the context has changed.

Risk assessment and decision rationale

Recommendations	Risk of non-implementation	Risk profile *(E, H, M, L)*	Other considerations in prioritisation	Is the recommendation agreed?	Improvement theme *(If applicable)*
R1 Agree a definition of Island critical infrastructure. This should include critical transport infrastructure for sea, air and on-Island transport and the routes which fall within this definition.	Failure to define Island critical infrastructure, particularly transport routes by sea, air, and land, may create a risk of inconsistent planning, preparedness and prioritisation across government and emergency services. Without a shared understanding, key assets may be overlooked in resilience strategies, leading to potential gaps in protection, misaligned investment, and reduced coordination and increased risk associated with resilience of infrastructure operators.	High	The complexity of inter-agency coordination increases the likelihood of this risk materialising, although can be managed through regular and collaborative engagement. The risk of failing to define Jersey's critical infrastructure is a foundational concern that affects nearly all aspects of resilience planning. It has a high score due to its potential to cause fragmented emergency preparedness, misaligned investment, and gaps in protection. Prioritising this risk is essential because it underpins risk management across government and emergency services.	Agreed.	Critical Island Infrastructure definition to support appropriate protection strategies
R2 Ensure that Ministers and (as relevant) other States Members are invited to participate in training and exercises for emergency response,	If there are less informed decisions during crises, there is a risk of poor coordination, reduced effective, there may be	Medium	The possible lack of opportunities for structured engagement from Ministers and States Members in emergency exercises poses a risk to leadership	Agreed. Emergencies Council will be	Leadership capability and awareness for emergency situations

Recommendations	**Risk of non-implementation**	**Risk profile** *(E, H, M, L)*	**Other considerations in prioritisation**	**Is the recommendation agreed?**	**Improvement theme** *(If applicable)*
covering both their decision-making roles but also, for example, as users of IT in relation to cyber security exercises. Log participation.	an impact on public trust, and missed opportunities to strengthen inter-agency collaboration and strategic oversight.		effectiveness during crises. Implementing this recommendation will be prioritised to reflect the need to embed emergency preparedness into political culture, supported by officers, and ensure that senior decision-makers are equipped to act decisively.	included in emergency planning 10- year training exercising plan. Inclusion will be based on their involvement as key stakeholders in an emergency.	
R3 Update the Jersey Emergency Risk Register (JERR) to ensure it is: • relevant to Jersey's capability and capacity to respond locally • complete, by carrying out an exercise requiring all JERR risk owners to confirm completeness of all entries in the JERR by the end of 2025; and • informed by and continuous with the management of 'chronic' risks, including through an understanding and ownership by the Executive Leadership Team of links to departmental Business Continuity Plans and Emergency Preparedness Plans.	An outdated or incomplete Jersey Emergency Risk Register could weaken Jersey's ability to identify, assess, mitigate, plan, train and exercise to ensure we have proportionate capability to respond effectively to major incidents or emergencies. Whilst not all risks cannot be foreseen, planned response activity to risks identified on the JERR may become assumed and aspirational, and unachievable. This can lead to delays in responsiveness at the point of crisis, misallocation of resources, and reduced resilience across departments, which could ultimately impact public confidence in government preparedness.	Medium	Whilst Jersey already has appropriate emergency response preparations in place, there is always room for improvement.	Agreed.	Jersey Emergency Risk Register
R4 Agree a timeline and publication process for developing a public facing Jersey Emergency Risk Register, so that	If not implemented, the JERR may not be accessible to the community, which could limit	Low	Without public awareness of local risks, individuals and communities may be less prepared, and the warning	Agreed.	Jersey Emergency Risk Register

Recommendations	Risk of non-implementation	Risk profile *(E, H, M, L)*	Other considerations in prioritisation	Is the recommendation agreed?	Improvement theme *(If applicable)*
all Islanders are informed about emergency risk preparedness and management and also understand how they can act to improve individual and community resilience.	individual and community resilience, reduce public engagement, and may hinder confidence in emergency preparedness and effective communication during major incidents or emergencies.		and informing preparedness strategy may be less effective. Given that publication is already planned alongside the Household Emergency Plan, public engagement strategies will be put in place to maximise impact.		
R5 Make a clear decision about progressing work to draft a Resilience Law, including a timetable and action plan. As part of this, take steps, through for example a proper stakeholder consultation exercise, to understand what might make the Resilience Standards a better fit for Jersey.	The current Law will continue to be in effect and provides an effective framework in the interim. If not implemented there may be an opportunity missed to clarify roles and responsibilities and delays in formalising resilience standards, which may have governance or reputational impact on Government.	High	This legal framework is necessary to formalise resilience standards and clarify roles and responsibilities. Whilst it is anticipated that the drafting of a Resilience Law will be prioritised in 2026, reflecting its strategic importance to Jersey's future preparedness, the prioritisation of the legislative programme is a matter for the Council of Ministers.	Agreed but Deferred.	No action at this time.
R6 In line with the introduction of a new Resilience Law and further development of Resilience Standards, ensure there is a mechanism to integrate the Resilience Standards into contracts with owners and operators of critical infrastructure, including for transport links.	If not implemented in a timely way, there may be a missed opportunity to strengthen infrastructure resilience and enforceable standards, the impact of which may be the ability to potentially delay the consistent inclusion of resilience in infrastructure delivery, the development of guidance materials, and encourage consistent practice across departments.	Medium	This recommendation is supported, and there is a clear recognition of the value in embedding Resilience Standards within infrastructure contracts. However, the ability to mandate these standards is currently limited by the absence of a formal legal framework. As such, full integration will be carefully timed to align with the development of the Resilience Law. Once the legal framework is in place, this area can be revisited with greater clarity and confidence to ensure resilience is embedded effectively in infrastructure delivery.	Agreed but Deferred.	No action at this time.

Recommendations	**Risk of non-implementation**	**Risk profile** *(E, H, M, L)*	**Other considerations in prioritisation**	**Is the recommendation agreed?**	**Improvement theme** *(If applicable)*
R7 Develop a formal process for post-implementation review of new air route trials involving Government, Ports of Jersey and Visit Jersey. To commence with a detailed review of the impact of the new Paris route served by Blue Islands.	If a formal post-implementation review process for new air route trials is not implemented, then Government, Ports of Jersey, and Visit Jersey may lack the necessary insights to assess the strategic, economic, and tourism-related impacts of new routes, resulting in missed opportunities for route optimisation, reduced stakeholder alignment, and diminished ability to respond effectively to market changes or future connectivity needs, but will have no impact on Jersey's critical infrastructure resilience as these routes are not critical.	Low	New air route trials, such as the cited example of Paris / Blue Islands, are discretionary and accretive: they are not critical infrastructure, and we consider such arrangements outside the scope of this work. In any event, existing processes include mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating transport connectivity and tourism impact with our ALBs. These are considered sufficient for the current scope and scale of new route introductions. Formalising a separate review process would duplicate effort and risk misalignment with broader strategic objectives at a time of capacity constraints.	Not agreed	No action at this time.
R8 Introduce a structured process for reporting the identified Key Performance Indicators in respect of the Blue Islands loan so that achievement of the desired outcome can be evidenced or corrective action taken.	If a structured process for reporting the identified KPIs is not implemented, achievement of the desired outcomes cannot be evidenced, and corrective action may not be taken. It is important to remember that the loan was made at a time of crisis and that the outcomes themselves were not a specific objective at that time. The specific objective was to safeguard a critical travel corridor during the pandemic. The loan has been made therefore adding a structured	Low	Whilst the business case for the loan identified a range of KPIs that would support the GoJ in assessing the success and impact of the loan, outside of a crisis situation, the KPIs were not the rationale for the loan which was to secure the Island's critical connectivity, particularly for medical flights, during the Covid pandemic and when BA and easyJet had grounded their fleet.	Agreed and ongoing. A periodic, structured reporting arrangement is in place to ensure that the Minister for Treasury and Resource remains up to date.	No additional action at this time.

Recommendations	**Risk of non-implementation**	**Risk profile** *(E, H, M, L)*	**Other considerations in prioritisation**	**Is the recommendation agreed?**	**Improvement theme** *(If applicable)*
	reporting mechanism does not impact the inherent existing risk.				
R9 For patients whose travel to overseas appointments is organised by Health and Care Jersey, capture, analyse and report data about delayed and missed appointments. This should include the consequences in terms of patient health and wellbeing and cost and be used to assess risk and potential mitigations.	If not implemented, then senior managers will have limited visibility of the impact of travel disruptions on patient appointments off-island. This may lead to missed opportunities to further improve resilience.	Low	Data on missed appointments is already collected by the Travel Office. This includes appointments that are cancelled by the hospital and by the patient, as well as those impacted by travel disruptions. The Travel Office have well-embedded processes for mitigating the risks of appointments being missed due to travel disruptions. An escalation process is already in place, for cancellations which have not been re-booked; most patients are offered a viable alternative.	Agreed and ongoing.	No additional action at this time.
R10 Urgently review oversight arrangements for the Jersey Emergency Transfer Service's current and proposed future contract, including to make sure processes are in place to: • fully understand and address the impact of current weaknesses in the service, including by: • taking a patient outcome perspective; and • actively addressing the risks already logged and those that should be logged	If not implemented, then the service may be sub-optimal, leading to instances of non-availability where alternative transport arrangements need to be made. In addition, if not implemented, additional resources may continue to be utilised (people and financial) in dynamically risk managing any availability issues.	Low	The work to address this recommendation is already being progressed; the elements identified are already included in the procurement strategy, which was agreed in June 2025.	Agreed and ongoing.	Governance – Jersey Emergency Transport Service

Recommendations	**Risk of non-implementation**	**Risk profile** *(E, H, M, L)*	**Other considerations in prioritisation**	**Is the recommendation agreed?**	**Improvement theme** *(If applicable)*
• align Key Performance Indicators to monitor all weaknesses identified, even if these are not yet contractual • develop routine reporting and escalation arrangements; and • establish joined up Business Continuity Plans.					
R11 Implement a robust procurement strategy to support a November 2025 decision on the award of the JETS contract, informed by views on how well the current service provision meets the States of Jersey's desired outcomes, and how well risks can be managed within the States' risk appetite for this service.	If a robust procurement strategy is not implemented, other providers are available and have been engaged through the procurement process, therefore the likelihood of there being no emergency transport service is minimised.	Medium	The procurement strategy, which was agreed in June 2025, is robust and is being delivered. The current service contract expires in May 2026; the procurement strategy timescales align with this.	Agreed in part – the current service expires in May 2026; the timeline for decision-making has been agreed accordingly, and is expected to be in Q1 2026, as current service expires May 2026..	Governance – Jersey Emergency Transport Service
R12 In procurement processes where changes to stated criteria or terms of contracts are proposed, and in post-contractual variations, document a comprehensive impact assessment, to include evaluation of value for money, the contribution to the States' strategic and operational priorities, an evaluation of whether the funding sources continue to be used appropriately, and the updated risk profile against risk appetite.	If not implemented then there may be poor return on investment, poor value for money or non-alignment with States strategic priorities. However, in general we would not change criteria during a procurement process or where we have issued standard terms once they have been published.	Low	In some cases, Terms and Conditions may be updated during the final negotiation and these should be documented, impact assessed and be included in a recommendation to award report. In terms of post-award variations, a contract variation should be prepared documenting the change, including impact, in line with the Best Practice Toolkit. This is not currently a requirement of the PFM unless the value of the contract is varied by 10% or 100,000. Under these	Agreed in principle. The requirement for an impact assessment will be considered as part of the regular review cycle of the PFM and Best Practice Toolkit, which is currently under way. This review cycle is undertaken as part of business as usual	No additional action at this time, as will be implemented as part of business as usual cycle of review.

Recommendations	**Risk of non-implementation**	**Risk profile** *(E, H, M, L)*	**Other considerations in prioritisation**	**Is the recommendation agreed?**	**Improvement theme** *(If applicable)*
			circumstances, an exemption must be prepared for approval.	and will be informed by this recommendation.	
R13 Ensure that the evaluation of the piloted East to West bus route includes an emphasis on value for money and contribution to the States' key priorities.	If not implemented, any decision to continue or pause this or similar schemes may not be informed by data that supports an effective cost-benefit decision, which could have a financial or reputational impact by not necessarily aligning with CSP outcomes.	Low	Evaluation activity is planned and can be delivered by the Transport Planning team using existing patronage, reliability and cost data. An appropriate evaluation that will include route performance, environmental and social considerations should precede any decision to extend/scale the pilot and before budget setting for 2027, subject to ministerial views on the continuation of service.	Agreed and already included in work plan.	Review of pilot schemes effectiveness (e.g. bus routes) before further commissioning
R14 Ensure that the Key Performance Indicators for the bus service fully align with, for example, use of resources from the Climate Emergency Fund.	If there is a misalignment between funding intent (decarbonisation/mode shift) and operator incentives, then there could be a reputational impact to government that its support does not necessarily match policy direction.	Low	The contract includes a requirement for the operator to submit an annual service plan for approval which will be used to set KPIs in accordance with GoJ policy.	Agreed and ongoing .	No additional action at this time.
R15 Develop Terms of Reference for multi-party meetings about highway assets, so that everyone has the opportunity to be clear on: • who should attend and whether there is a need to ensure deputies • who will Chair the meeting and how decisions will be made	If the terms of reference are not developed, utility company representatives may not understand the level of commitment and cooperation required. This has not affected the monthly meeting although is required to re-establish the structure and level of	Low	The utility co-ordination meeting has been a feature within I&E road network management monthly calendar since as early as and pre-2008 and there is a well-established understanding of the meeting purpose *to share information and look for opportunity to do dual works to*	Agreed and complete. The ToRs were completed ahead of the September 2025 meeting.	No additional action at this time,

Recommendations	**Risk of non-implementation**	**Risk profile** *(E, H, M, L)*	**Other considerations in prioritisation**	**Is the recommendation agreed?**	**Improvement theme** *(If applicable)*
• what the business is and how agenda items are submitted • how notes and actions will be managed; and • whether the output and outcome of the meetings will be reported to any other forum or group. Keep these up to date to reflect any changes to the Roads Law.	commitment for legacy purposes.		*introduce efficiency and reduce costs and impact to the public'.*		
R16 Complete the drafted documents: • Highway Infrastructure Asset Management (HIAM) Policy (draft, August 2021) • HIAM Strategy (draft, October 2023); and • HIAM Plan (draft, February 2022). Ensure that, together with the Highways Inspection Manual, these form a coherent and comprehensive set of references for all those working with highways assets.	If the documents are not updated from draft to approved, then there is little impact to current operational procedures. GoJ HIAM are already working to the principals and writing them into those operational procedures.	Low	These documents have been developed for GoJ roads administered by I&E HIAM team. Current resource restrictions mean that this initiative will not be prioritised at this time. HIAM budget and resources are currently being focused on project delivery and implementing the inspection manual.	Agreed but Deferred.	No action at this time.

Prioritised improvement plan

Action theme	Actions	Linked Recs	Target date	Responsible Officer
Critical Island Infrastructure definition to support appropriate protection strategies	• Emergency planning to work with the JRF to agree a definition of critical infrastructure which will include critical transport infrastructure.	R1	June 2026	Chief Officer, Justice and Home Affairs
Leadership capability and awareness for emergency situations	• Emergency Planning will ensure that the Emergencies Council are included as participants within the emergency planning 10- year training exercising plan.	R2	October 2025	Chief Officer, Justice and Home Affairs
Jersey Emergency Risk Register	• Build a mechanism to enable communication to Chief Officers within government so that they can align their risk management approach with the information provided on the JERR. • Develop a chronic risk strategy to enable visibility of chronic risks for ELT members to assist with understand the impact on their departmental business continuity plans. • Phase 6 of the development of the JERR by Emergency Planning will ensure completeness by the end of 2025 • Publish the public facing JERR in Autumn 2025 along with the Household Emergency Plan.	R3 R4	March 2026 December 2025	Chief Officer, Justice and Home Affairs Chief Officer, Justice and Home Affairs
Governance – Jersey Emergency Transport Service	• Continue to implement the procurement strategy, This includes reviewing KPIs, data and reporting. • Continue to hold quarterly contract meetings.	R10 and R11	December 2025	Chief Operating Officer, Acute Services
Review of pilot schemes effectiveness (e.g. bus routes) before further commissioning	• Conduct evaluation of the piloted East to West bus route.	R13	Q3 2026	Ass. Director Highways, Transport, and Infrastructure