STATES OF JERSEY

CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE RESILIENCE – TRANSPORT LINKS (R.129/2025): EXECUTIVE RESPONSE (R.129/2025 RES.) – COMMENTS

Presented to the States on 20th November 2025
by the Public Accounts Committee

STATES GREFFE

2025 R.129
Res.Com.

COMMENTS

The Public Accounts Committee (PAC) presented the Executive Response to the Comptroller and Auditor General's (C&AG) report 'Critical Infrastructure Resilience – Transport Links' (the Report) on 16th October 2025. The PAC has given further consideration to the Executive Response since presenting it, and has agreed to present the following Comments:

Recommendation One

Recommendation	**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.
Risk of Non-Implementation	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.
Risk Profile	High
Other Considerations in prioritisation	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.
Is the recommendation agreed?	Agreed
Improvement theme	Critical Island Infrastructure definition to support appropriate protection strategies

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

PAC Comment:

The PAC welcomes the acceptance of recommendation one noting that a definition of Island critical infrastructure will aid in planning, preparedness and prioritisation across government and emergency services.

The Panel recognises that this action will take some consultation and work with the Jersey Resilience Forum however questions why it would take until June 2026 the identification of critical infrastructure. The Committee suggests that elements of critical infrastructure should be readily identifiable, for example critical transport infrastructure, especially noting the executive's comments concerning critical routes in response to recommendation seven.

The PAC recommends that the Government of Jersey should publish its current understanding of critical transport infrastructure, for example critical routes, particularly in the light of recent events concerning the cessation of operations of Blue Island. This should take place no later than 31st December 2025.

<u>Recommendations Three and Four</u>

Recommendation	**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.
Risk of Non-Implementation	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.
Risk Profile	Medium
Other Considerations in prioritisation	Whilst Jersey already has appropriate emergency response preparations in place, there is always room for improvement.
Is the recommendation agreed?	Agreed
Improvement theme	Jersey Emergency Risk Register

Recommendation	**R4** Agree a timeline and publication process for developing a public facing Jersey Emergency Risk Register, so that all Islanders are informed about emergency risk preparedness and management and also understand how they can act to improve individual and community resilience.
Risk of Non-Implementation	If not implemented, the JERR may not be accessible to the community, which could limit individual and community resilience, reduce public engagement, and may hinder confidence in emergency preparedness and effective communication during major incidents or emergencies.
Risk Profile	Low
Other Considerations in prioritisation	Without public awareness of local risks, individuals and communities may be less prepared, and the warning 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.
Is the recommendation agreed?	Agreed
Improvement theme	Jersey Emergency Risk Register

Action theme	Actions	Linked Recs	Target date	Responsible Officer
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

PAC Comment:

The PAC welcomes the agreement of the Government of the Jersey (the Government) with recommendations three and four of the C&AG report noting that these will improve Jersey's ability to identify, assess, mitigate, plan, train and exercise to ensure there is proportionate capability to respond effectively to major incidents or emergencies, and make the JERR accessible to the community. However, upon consideration of the actions identified in the Executive Response to implement these recommendations, the PAC notes some areas of concern:

Firstly, the PAC would highlight that the actions may not fully meet recommendation three, with primary issue relating to the undertaking a thorough review of JERR involving risk owners, to confirm completeness of all entries in the JERR. This also risks not meeting the recommendation of ensuring the JERR is relevant to Jersey's capability and capacity to respond locally. The Committee recognises that it can be implied that the development of a chronic risk strategy may enable this.

The Committee secondly notes that there is some misalignment of timeframes, with the actions for recommendation three needing to be undertaken prior to the publishing of the JERR, in line with recommendation four. Although it is admirable that a public facing JERR is made available in a timely fashion, publishing an incomplete version in December 2025 may cause confusion or misunderstanding when an update is provided following the relevant review and development of strategy in March 2026.

The PAC accordingly suggests that the Government of Jersey revisit the actions relating to recommendation 3 and introduce items to specifically carry out an exercise requiring all JERR risk owners to confirm completeness of all entries in the JERR by the end of 2025. The Committee further suggests that the publication of the JERR is then held until that document has been updated following any findings of the review, with an aim to publish no later than March 2026.

<u>**Recommendations Five and Six**</u>

Recommendation	**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.
Risk of Non-Implementation	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.
Risk Profile	High
Other Considerations in prioritisation	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.
Is the recommendation agreed?	Agreed but Deferred.
Improvement theme	No action at this time.

Recommendation	**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.
Risk of Non-Implementation	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.
Risk Profile	Medium
Other Considerations in prioritisation	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.
Is the recommendation agreed?	Agreed but Deferred.
Improvement theme	No action at this time.

PAC Comment:
The PAC welcomes the agreement by the Government of recommendations five and six, noting that these will help to clarify roles and responsibilities and formalise resilience standards. However, the Committee is concerned that any actions to meet these recommendations have been deferred awaiting legislation finalisation.

The Committee acknowledges that the progression and adoption of any new Resilience Law is ultimately a decision for the Council of Ministers and States Assembly. However, the PAC understands that some form of the Resilience Law has been on the legislative programme for a number of years,[1] and as identified in the Executive Response it is anticipated that drafting of a Resilience Law will be prioritised in 2026.

The PAC would therefore identify that concurrent activity should be possible to meet recommendations five and six. For example, whilst not legally mandated, progress could be made on embedding standards as good practice in advance of the Resilience Law. Further progress could also be made through a planned programme of wider engagement in advance of the legislative development. This was outlined by the C&AG's report:[2]

> *77. The Government is responsible for awarding contracts and concessions to provide critical transport links for Islanders in three key areas: some ferry*

[1] Ministerial Plans 2023, page 36
[2] Critical Infrastructure Resilience - Transport Links (R.129/2025)

> *services, the air ambulance service and the bus service. None of these contracts specifically note the need for the owners or operators of transport infrastructure to be compliant with the JRF's Resilience Standards or the duty to provide supporting information."*

The PAC accordingly recommends that the deferred status of recommendations five and six is reconsidered and concurrent actions identified to engage on and embed the Resilience Standards, whilst relevant legislation being progressed.

Recommendation Seven

Recommendation	**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.
Risk of Non-Implementation	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.
Risk Profile	Low
Other Considerations in prioritisation	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.
Is the recommendation agreed?	Not Agreed
Improvement theme	No action at this time.

The PAC is disappointed that the Executive Response is not accepting of recommendation seven. Whilst the Executive Response contends that the recommendation may be out of scope of 'critical', new routes, such as the Paris offering, may have impacted upon existing routes that could be classed as critical. As such a post-implementation review of a new initiative has merit and would be particularly useful to allow for future planning.

During the drafting of the comments Blue Islands has made the announcement of cessation of operations. The PAC will consider the matter separately but at this point would suggest that this highlights the need for a formal review process for such trials in the future, including ascertaining impact upon critical routes. Although contingency has been implemented in this instance, additional review of lessons learned may prove useful and further consideration of recommendation seven by the Government of Jersey should be given.

<u>Recommendation Eight</u>

Recommendation	**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.
Risk of Non-Implementation	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 reporting mechanism does not impact the inherent existing risk.
Risk Profile	Low
Other Considerations in prioritisation	Whilst the business case for the loan identified a range of KPIs that would support the GoJ in assessing the success and <u>impact</u> 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.
Is the recommendation agreed?	Agreed and ongoing. A periodic, structured reporting arrangement is in place to ensure that the Minister for Treasury and Resource remains up to date.
Improvement theme	No additional action at this time.

PAC comments

The PAC notes the agreement of recommendation eight, however is somewhat concerned that the Executive Response had not identify any actions to be undertaken in regard to introducing a structured process for reporting the identified Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) in respect of the Blue Islands loan. The PAC would highlight that although structured reporting was in place, there may have been a lack of the necessary structured monitoring against the initial objective criteria.

Again, the PAC will consider this matter separately following the cessation of Blue Island's operations, but notes that no action on this matter was raised by the Government of Jersey in the Executive Response a month prior to the airline's liquidation.

The Committee recommends that specific action in monitoring success factors are considered to observe any future financial support and to confirm operations of those receiving support remain viable whilst ensuring value and return on investment for Islanders remain reasonable. For example, active monitoring of success against certain KPIs such as those identified in the original business plan for the Blue Islands Loan, amongst others, as highlighted below:

Key objectives	**KPIs**
Increase number of visitors to Jersey	Number of air passengers (Blue Islands)
Restore, and strengthen, regional connectivity to the UK	Number of critical routes served by Blue Islands Resilience of those routes
Long term increase in economic value of leisure and tourism sector	Spend per head of Blue Islands' air passengers (tourism and leisure visitors) and associated Gross Value Added impact
Secure a long-term base carrier deal	Signed base carrier deal Blue Islands job creation in Jersey Payment of associated fees/charges
Financially stable Blue Islands	Repayment of Government loan and interest Resilient and stable route network

Key Performance Indicators linked to objectives of loan to Blue Islands[3]

Recommendation Nine

Recommendation	**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.
Risk of Non-Implementation	If not implemented, then senior managers will have limited visibility of the impact of travel disruptions on patient appointments off-island. This may lead

[3] Critical Infrastructure Resilience - Transport Links (R.129/2025)

	to missed opportunities to further improve resilience.
Risk Profile	Low
Other Considerations in prioritisation	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.
Is the recommendation agreed?	Agreed and ongoing.
Improvement theme	No additional action at this time.

PAC comments
The PAC welcomes that recommendation nine has been accepted, however notes that it has been allocated a risk profile of 'Low'. Although the impact of missing opportunities to improve resilience against delayed and missed overseas health appointments may be a low risk for the Government of Jersey, the potential consequences for Islanders is high.

The Committee also notes that no actions have been identified in regard to recommendation nine. This is despite the C&AG Report identifying that the travel office was unable to provide information in some instances, for example to Freedom of Information requests, with the report going as far as stating:[4]

> *167. It is clear that the Government does not routinely monitor performance or have a sound basis for understanding and managing the risks to patient outcomes when overseas health appointments are missed. It is important that the Government has a mechanism to ensure adequate reporting on patients' experiences, including the impact of missed appointments on health and wellbeing, to inform decisions.*

The PAC therefore suggests that the Government of Jersey revisits its risk profile for recommendation nine, particularly given the recent events concerning Southampton flights and that actions are considered to enable accurate reporting of the data of delayed and missed overseas health appointments, their consequences and any mitigations.

Recommendations Ten and Eleven

[4] Critical Infrastructure Resilience - Transport Links (R.129/2025)

Recommendation	**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 • 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.
Risk of Non-Implementation	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.
Risk Profile	Low
Other Considerations in prioritisation	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.
Is the recommendation agreed?	Agreed and ongoing.
Improvement theme	Governance – Jersey Emergency Transport Service

Recommendation	**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.
Risk of Non-Implementation	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.
Risk Profile	Medium
Other Considerations in prioritisation	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.

Is the recommendation agreed?	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.
Improvement theme	Governance – Jersey Emergency Transport Service

Action theme	Actions	Linked Recs	Target date	Responsible Officer
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

PAC comments
The PAC is concerned that recommendation ten, although accepted, has been allocated a risk profile of 'Low' given that the successful provision of Jersey Emergency Transport Service ultimately impacts Islanders' lives.

Although recommendation eleven, relating to the procurement strategy for the upcoming updated JETS contract, has been allocated a medium risk profile; the PAC would suggest the anticipated timings are potentially tight. The Committee understands that the JETS contract terminates in May 2026, with the Executive Response identifying that the decision making around this contract will be made in Q1 2026. This is as little as two months prior to the expiration of an important service.

The PAC would also highlight that there is a requirement to make any changes to the value of a contract with an existing supplier 6 months ahead of the contract renewal, and strictly not to appoint a new supplier 6 months ahead of that change.

Furthermore, the Committee notes that the actions identify that quarterly contract meetings will continue. The PAC would opine that this may not be sufficiently frequent, especially in the finalisation of the new contract.

Accordingly, the PAC recommends that the risk profile, actions and timeframe relating to recommendations ten and eleven are reconsidered by the Government of Jersey

Recommendation Twelve

Recommendation	**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.
Risk of Non-Implementation	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.
Risk Profile	Low
Other Considerations in prioritisation	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 circumstances, an exemption must be prepared for approval.
Is the recommendation agreed?	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 and will be informed by this recommendation.
Improvement theme	No additional action at this time, as will be implemented as part of business as usual cycle of review.

PAC Comment:

The PAC notes that recommendation twelve has been agreed in principle and that no additional action has been identified at this time. **The Committee, however, would request that the timeframe of the regular review cycle of the PFM and Best Practice Toolkit completion be confirmed.**

Recommendation Fourteen

Recommendation	**R14** Ensure that the Key Performance Indicators for the bus service fully align with, for example, use of resources from the Climate Emergency Fund.
Risk of Non-Implementation	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.
Risk Profile	Low
Other Considerations in prioritisation	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.
Is the recommendation agreed?	Agreed and ongoing
Improvement theme	No additional action at this time.

PAC Comment:

The PAC welcomes the agreement with recommendation fourteen. The Committee understands at this time there has been no Ministerial Decision, and therefore KPI criteria updates, in ensuring that the bus service fully aligns with use of resources from the Climate Emergency Fund. **The PAC would expect the Government of Jersey Officers will ensure that sufficient detail of the link between the expenditure from the Climate Emergency Fund and any KPIs of the bus service, is provided for ministerial consideration**.

Recommendation Fifteen

Recommendation	**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 • 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.
Risk of Non-Implementation	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 commitment for legacy purposes.
Risk Profile	Low
Other Considerations in prioritisation	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 introduce efficiency and reduce costs and impact to the public'.*
Is the recommendation agreed?	Agreed and complete. The ToRs were completed ahead of the September 2025 meeting.
Improvement theme	No additional action at this time.

PAC Comment:

The PAC notes and welcomes that recommendation fifteen has been agreed with and identified as complete. **The Committee would however comment that the Executive Response did not identify the value of the Terms of Reference for multi-party meetings about highway assets in allowing the Government of Jersey to ascertain and understand views and expectations of stakeholders, such as the utility companies. The Committee would expect the Government to consider this point in future development of relevant Terms of Reference.**

<u>Recommendation Sixteen</u>

Recommendation	**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.
Risk of Non-Implementation	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.
Risk Profile	Low

Other Considerations in prioritisation	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.
Is the recommendation agreed?	Agreed but Deferred.
Improvement theme	No action at this time.

PAC Comment:

The PAC notes that recommendation sixteen has been agreed but deferred with the Executive response identifying that documents have been developed for GoJ roads administered by I&E HIAM team but that resource restrictions mean that this initiative will not be prioritised at this time.

The Committee notes with concern that the Executive Response assigns a 'Low' risk profile to the non-implementation of this recommendation outlining that there is little impact to current operational procedures with GoJ HIAM already working to the principals and writing them into those operational procedures.

The PAC suggests that a specific action point to finalise the documents is required to ensure that it is not deferred further, and that the allocation of a low risk profile requires further evidence to show that the deferred actions will not negatively impact the coherent and comprehensive set of references for all those working with highways assets.

Conclusion

Overall, the PAC welcomes the Executive Response to the C&AG report Critical Infrastructure Resilience – Transport Links, noting the agreement with the majority of recommendations made. However, the Committee has highlighted concerns on the allocated risk profile and missing actions in some cases. The Committee would request that further consideration be given in these areas and the PAC will follow up the points raised in due course.

The Committee has noted that the airline Blue Islands has made the announcement of cessation of operations during the formation of these comments. The PAC will consider this matter separately but has made recommendations concerning the monitoring and review of any future financial support for airlines or routes.