
STATES OF JERSEY



FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE (R.36/2026): EXECUTIVE RESPONSE

Presented to the States on 19th October 2026
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: Fire and Rescue Service (R.36/2026, presented to the States Assembly on 6th March 2026).

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

Deputy K. Wilson

Chair, Public Accounts Committee

Chief Executive response to the Fire and Rescue Service Report

Summary of response:

Justice and Home Affairs welcomes the C&AG's review of the States of Jersey Fire and Rescue Service (SJFRS) and thanks the C&AG for this thorough and constructive assessment. The report provides valuable independent assurance on governance, performance and resilience within a critical public safety service.

The recommendations are broadly accepted and align closely with improvement activity already underway. The Executive Response reflects a proportionate approach, recognising the maturity of existing arrangements while prioritising further improvements that strengthen assurance, transparency and protection of public and firefighter safety.

Priority action focuses on the oversight of extreme and high risks, continued progress on National Operational Guidance (NOG), strengthened performance and benefit management aligned to the Community Risk Management Plan (CRMP), and sustained visibility of workforce capability and critical digital enablers. Where recommendations cannot be implemented immediately, the associated risks are acknowledged and will continue to be actively managed through established risk registers and governance arrangements.

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 Review the risk registers and risk appetite in the light of the number of extreme risks, to ensure that: - there is clarity over risk tolerance and proposed treatment and mitigations; and - a clear picture is presented of the	If not implemented, extreme risks may lack clear tolerance levels, agreed mitigations, and transparent timelines, which may reduce the quality and consistency of information for senior governance groups and may weaken their ability to prioritise actions.	Medium	R1 is prioritised as a proportionate, evidence-based refinement of existing governance. Extreme risks are already well managed through SJFRS Risk Review Group scrutiny, quarterly deep dives, and regular reporting to the Strategic Leadership Board (SLB) and Performance & Delivery Board (PDB), supported by the GoJ Central Risk Team's maturity review in 2025 confirming effective controls. Implementation therefore focuses on sharpening risk appetite, treatment choices, timelines, and	Agreed – underway or complete Work is ongoing, improvements already underway, using existing governance and assurance tools, such as the Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) risk management system, supported by oversight from the SLB and PDB. It is considered that this arrangement provides strong	Risk Management, Governance and Assurance

timeframes needed to implement the mitigations and any dependencies.			interdependencies without adding unnecessary process burden or duplicating planned gap analysis work. Using the Government of Jersey risk matrix, R1's residual risk is 'Medium' reflecting limited oversight related impacts rather than operational or statutory failure. Risk appetite is set at ministerial level, with treatment plans and delivery owned operationally.	visibility and assessment of risks. However, as highlighted by the C&AG, further work is needed to strengthen the consistency and effectiveness of mitigation, particularly where risks are complex or long term in nature. SJFRS is therefore already focused on refining and improving existing work, especially around risk appetite, treatment choices, timeframes and interdependencies.	
R2 Develop and implement a four-year Strategic Business Plan that takes account of the ambition and vision for the future with clarity over staffing and roles. Ensure that the Strategic Business Plan includes key objectives, with clear measurable targets.	If not implemented, there is a risk that SJFRS would continue using a four-year plan that works operationally but does not fully reflect corporate objectives, workforce needs or measurable outcomes, limiting its ability to show alignment, progress and effective resource use to governance bodies and the public. This may also increase the risk of misalignment between the plan and wider organisational expectations, which may leave some uncertainty around workforce planning, succession and resilience. As a related corporate risk already exists, R2 should be treated as a refinement, updating the register to reflect the need to align the Strategic Business Plan with	Medium	R2 is prioritised as a proportionate refinement of SJFRS's long established multiyear planning approach. While past plans, including the former Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP), met sector expectations, national practice has since shifted to the CRMP model, which provides a clearer basis, through a Fire Standard, for setting strategic direction. The current and upcoming CRMP cycles offer a strong foundation for updating the four-year Strategic Business Plan by integrating corporate objectives, workforce needs and measurable outcomes without creating duplicate processes. This targeted	Agreed – deferred for later action dependent on resource and tied to CRMP timelines into 2027 The recommendation aligns with the existing CRMP planning cycle and provides a proportionate opportunity to strengthen long-term strategic direction, workforce planning and measurable objective setting. The work can be integrated into activity already underway, particularly the development of the 2027–2030 CRMP and does not require creating new	Strategic Planning, Performance and Benefits Management

	Community Risk Management Plan (CRMP) cycles and departmental risks.		effort aligns operational and organisational strategy.	processes or structures beyond those already established.	
R3 Implement a new suite of Key Performance Indicators and, in doing so, ensure that the indicators reflect the totality of the service requirements.	If not implemented, SJFRS will be unable to demonstrate how well its strategies and plans are working in terms of effectiveness, efficiency and economy, creating a risk of failing statutory duties and increasing the likelihood of avoidable harm to the Island. Delivering an effective fire and rescue service depends not only on prevention, protection, response and resilience, but on the overall corporate health and performance of a complex organisation with significant people costs, regulatory and enforcement responsibilities, and demanding sector standards. SJFRS can only be effective as an integrated system, not a simple delivery unit.	Extreme	This recommendation must be read alongside R2, as new or amended Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) need to be considered in the context of corporate objectives that are set through the updated medium term planning approach-. Using the GoJ matrix, the residual risk is Extreme, because incomplete KPIs prevent full performance assurance, and gaps in core service activity could go unnoticed, leading to statutory failure and long-term harm-. This recommendation reinforces the work that has already started to strengthen performance measurement usings KPIs across SJFRS.	Agreed – deferred for later action dependent on the enabling strategy as part of the CRMP work in 2027. Phase 1 KPIs already released; a further suite of KPIs specific to the enabling strategy, will follow. The Extreme rating reflects reduced assurance and visibility over performance and risk rather than evidence of service failure; implementing a full KPI suite is therefore necessary but must be sequenced with R2 to ensure alignment with revised medium-term planning objectives.	Strategic Planning, Performance and Benefits Management
R4 Track the use of the growth funding approved in the Government Plan 2026-2029 to demonstrate the benefits achieved through the additional investment. In doing so, ensure there is clarity as to what the additional	If not implemented, SJFRS may be unable to demonstrate how growth funding in the Government Plan 2026–2029 has been used, leaving unclear what benefits the investment has delivered or what risks remain, reducing transparency and value for money assurance. This risk persists despite existing financial oversight. R4 will ensure funded activity is clearly tracked and its impact evidenced,	Medium	A proportionate response has been developed by aligning R4 with existing work on portfolio, programme and benefits tracking, keeping resource demands low and avoiding duplication. Current processes already capture growth funding use and incorporating clearer objectives and benefits fits naturally within available capacity and the new Service Delivery Plan. Using the GoJ matrix, the residual risk is	Agreed – deferred for later action as comprehensive benefits tracking is dependent on additional resource. The recommendation is accepted, as it aligns with existing work to improve portfolio, programme and benefits tracking. SJFRS already monitors growth funding use	Strategic Planning, Performance and Benefits Management

funding has enabled the service to do and what level of risk remains to be managed.	strengthening accountability and clarity on residual risk.		Medium, because non-implementation could leave the benefits of growth funding unclear, and could weaken value from money assurance and clarity on residual risk without affecting service delivery.	and expanding this to include clearer objectives and benefits integrates naturally with the Service Delivery Plan and wider alignment of activity, avoiding duplication while strengthening accountability and visibility of funded improvements.	
R5 Enhance the processes used to track decisions and actions from all governance groups and meetings relating to SJFRS.	If not implemented, improvements in governance recordkeeping may not be sustained, reducing assurance, weakening follow-through on actions, and increasing the risk of delayed, duplicated or unimplemented decisions. Although consistency has improved, failure to embed controls could undermine confidence in decision making and progress tracking. At a corporate level, this poses a governance and assurance risk by weakening reliable decision/action tracking. At departmental level, it reduces oversight across workstreams performance, capability, risk mitigation, training and operational learning, where accurate logs are essential for confirming delivery and escalating slippage.	Medium	R5 is prioritised as a proportionate refinement of existing governance arrangements, consistent with the C&AG's findings. Decision and action recording has been strengthened across the Strategic Leadership Board and Performance and Delivery Board, with ongoing focus on ensuring decisions are translated into clear, tracked actions, including links to benefits realisation under R4. Implementation is therefore focused on embedding and sustaining these improvements rather than introducing new processes. Given the potential for gaps in decision and action tracking to reduce assurance and obscure issues that could affect operational capability or compliance, the residual risk is assessed as Medium, supporting a proportionate focus within existing capacity.	Agreed in principle – underway or complete Based on the rationale already outlined, the recommendation is accepted and is already being implemented as part of business as usual.	No additional action as being delivered as business as usual.
R6 Develop and implement an action plan to address the points raised in the 2025	If not implemented, then SJFRS may miss an organisational development opportunity presented by the review, and so may fail to manage the risk of poor practice or performance to the extent	Medium	R6 is prioritised as a proportionate refinement of existing governance. The internal review is largely complete. Implementation therefore focuses on completing and embedding the	Partially Agreed – underway SJFRS will complete and embed the governance review action plan within	Risk Management, Governance and Assurance

internal review of SJFRS governance.	possible, leading to weakened service delivery, and loss or harm.		review's conclusions within current capacity. R6's residual risk is Medium as non-implementation could weaken assurance but not directly affect service delivery.	existing capacity, recognising constraints on pace and completeness within existing resource, integrating its outputs into the CRMP cycle to strengthen decision-making, accountability and governance effectiveness.	
R7 Progress and track the implementation of compliance with National Operational Guidance to agreed timescales	If not implemented, then SJFRS may not be able to assure itself, governance, or islanders, that work and progress to manage 'extreme' risks in the operational context is sufficient and resulting in the potential for loss and harm.	Extreme	SJFRS already has an 'extreme' rated risk in the ERM relating to an inability to demonstrate National Operational Guidance (NOG) adoption or adaption. As the CAG's report highlights, there is an issue with the lack of capacity to properly track and monitor progress, which is being made, through NOG areas. This could lead to a lack of assurance. Adopting or adapting NOG has, for a number of years, been an absolute core operational priority of SJFRS and it will remain so for many years and so the need to track and understand progress, as well as assure it, at the strategic level, with confidence and ease, is vital.	Agreed – deferred for later action as comprehensive tracking is dependent on identifying additional resource. The recommendation is accepted, as it aligns with existing work.	Operational Capability, Competence and Safety
R8 Undertake a review of training needs and associated budget provision. In doing so:	If not implemented, then SJFRS may not be able to assure itself, governance, or islanders, that the right amount of training is provided to adequately manage the risk to the public and to firefighters, or that the	Extreme	R8 is tightly coupled with the implementation of NOG, indeed it is a delivery arm of NOG. On that basis, the prioritisation of NOG adoption or adaption is accompanied by the	Partially Agreed but dependent on approach to implementation of NOG on a risk-based approach. The review of training needs and	Operational Capability, Competence and Safety

• prioritise training approvals to match the available budget; and • review all ongoing training contracts to determine what contracts should be subject to future market testing.	training budget is consistently securing the best value and resulting in the potential for loss and harm both due to the direct cost of not providing training or the missed opportunity to secure training, due to limited resources being used inefficiently.		prioritisation of training capacity and capability including the ongoing strengthening of the risk-based prioritisation of budget and the value for money derived from it. The residual risk is assessed as Extreme, reflecting that inadequate or poorly targeted training could lead to significant operational, safety or statutory consequences.	budget provision is accepted in principle and will be undertaken based on resources available. Implementation of R8 represents a useful continuation of current work to strengthen training and so operational safety and effectiveness in the medium to longer-term.	
R9 Ensure robust performance management is in place for the implementation of all recommendations from the 2025 Subject Matter Expert review.	This relates to the Emergency Services Control Centre (ESCC) Subject Matter Expert (SME) review - if not implemented, then SJFRS may not be able to assure itself, governance, or islanders, that work and progress to deliver improvements set out in the report is effective and is having the necessary effect on public and firefighter safety and effectiveness, potentially resulting in operational performance that falls below what is required and so resulting in avoidable loss and harm.	Extreme	As with recommendations relating to NOG, including training, and the assurance that must underpin them, R9 is foundational to delivering the improvements planned and under way. Many of the recommendations cannot be considered or managed in isolation and the theme of NOG adoption or adaption is fundamental and runs through all of the recommendations associated with it. On this basis, this work is and must continue to be prioritised and includes its own governance arrangements. Given the critical operational implications of potentially failing to deliver SME driven improvements, the residual exposure remains Extreme, reflecting the potential for significant safety, competence and statutory compliance risks if this work is not robustly monitored and delivered.	Agreed in Principle – underway or complete Work is underway with ESCC as part of joint governance arrangements.	Operational Capability, Competence & Safety

R10 The Chief Officer of Justice and Home Affairs and the Chief Fire Officer should reassess the urgency and timescales being applied to key digital projects aimed at mitigating extreme risks.	A Digital, Data and Technology (DDaT) strategy and pipeline of deliverable advancements is, in the modern, professional context, a critical underpin for any competent fire and rescue service and so, if not implemented, SJFRS may not be able to assure itself, governance, or islanders, that work and progress to manage ‘extreme’ risks, through the use of digital technology in the operational context is sufficient, and resulting in the potential for loss and harm.	Extreme	As above, NOG adoption or adaption is underpinned by DDaT, with mobile data, learning, training recording, fire safety, resource management and alerting as well as control centre functions and platforms being notable examples. As highlighted in the report, digital is a point of critical dependency and so a failure to prioritise execution of this recommendation would have the same effect. While the Chief Officer, Justice and Home Affairs, and the Chief Fire Officer can and will reassess the urgency and timescales associated with digital projects, neither will have ultimate control. The residual exposure remains Extreme, with reflecting that delays or gaps in critical digital projects could materially affect SJFRS’s ability to manage operational risk and maintain safe systems of work.	Agreed in Principle – underway or complete Work is ongoing to ensure that a risk-based approach is used to prioritise activity on key digital SJFRS projects.	Digital Enablement of Operational Risk Management
R11 Implement enhanced performance management arrangements that include: • setting realistic action plans linked to CRMP priorities	If not implemented, then SJFRS may not be able to assure itself, governance, or islanders, that work and progress to manage ‘extreme’ operational risks and wider corporate risks is effective, which could result in the potential for loss and harm due to unseen weaknesses.	High	A proportionate response to R11 has been reached by aligning it with work already underway under R4, R5 and R6 to improve planning, benefits tracking and governance oversight. SJFRS are considering how enhanced performance and project-management arrangements can be delivered within the scope of last year’s business case,	Partially Agreed – as SJFRS will enhance performance and project-management arrangements using the limited capacity available to ensure clear action plans, timely reporting and effective oversight of	Strategic Planning, Performance and Benefits Management

• reporting of relevant performance data on a timely basis • enhanced project management arrangements • benchmarking of performance against relevant peers; and • challenge and oversight from governance structures including the Minister.			recognising limited capacity and the need for flexible rather than dedicated project-management roles. Because strengthening performance and project-management capability is essential to delivering CRMP priorities, non-implementation would limit progress and assurance, so the residual risk is High, reflecting the potential for significant operational or corporate consequences if performance weaknesses remain undetected.	progress against CRMP priorities. The breadth and depth of the work will broaden if further resources become available.	
R12 Review the work that SJFRS is undertaking outside of the normal fire service categories to determine whether SJFRS is the most efficient and effective service response option. In doing so, consider whether a formal Service Level Agreement with HCJ would be beneficial to manage expectations,	If not implemented, SJFRS may continue to undertake noncore activity without clear agreement on scope, standards or prioritisation, leading to ongoing abstraction of operational resources from core fire and rescue duties. This creates opportunity cost risk, reduces capacity for training, prevention, enforcement and readiness, and may weaken assurance that resources are being deployed in the most effective and sustainable way. Over time, failure to clarify responsibilities and demand may increase operational risk and obscure value for money considerations across the wider system.	High	Some non-core activity can be economical and beneficial in isolation, and in certain circumstances efficient for partner services; however, it may be operationally inefficient for a Fire and Rescue Service when it displaces core capability or increases exposure to risk elsewhere. The review therefore focuses on clarifying the balance between supporting wider system needs and protecting operational capacity. A structured scope review, including consideration of formal agreements with partner departments, will help ensure transparency, manage demand, and support sustainable use of specialist fire and rescue resources.	Agreed – deferred for later action Delivery is dependent on SJFRS reviewing non-core activity and working with HCJ to clarify responsibilities, standards and value for money, including consideration of a Service Level Agreement to ensure activity aligns with operational priorities and statutory duties. This work will be prioritised based on existing resource constraints.	Digital, Data & Technology Enablement

service standards and value for money.					
--	--	--	--	--	--

Prioritised improvement plan:

Action theme	Actions	Linked Recs	Target date	Responsible Officer
Risk Management, Governance and Assurance	Strengthen clarity and oversight of extreme and high risks, including risk appetite, treatment and delivery timelines, supported by effective senior challenge and improved ministerial visibility.	R1	Q4 2026	Chief Fire Officer (CFO)
	Improve visibility of dependencies and assumptions for long-term mitigations, ensuring complex risks have clear ownership and delivery sequencing.	R1	Q4 2026	Deputy Chief Fire Officer (DCFO)
Strategic Planning, Performance and Benefits Management	Develop an updated version of the longstanding four-year Strategic Business Plan (CRMP 2027–2030), integrating objectives, workforce planning and KPIs aligned with the CRMP cycle. The extent to which this will be achieved will be dependent on resources.	R2	Q4 2026	DCFO
	Subject to business case and funding approval, implement portfolio/programme tracking framework (milestones, objectives, benefits from growth funding business). Introduce light touch project support function.	R4, R11	Q3 2027	Head of Headquarters, SJFRS
	Strengthen KPI suite, performance reporting cycles and benchmarking; ensure station commanders and portfolio leads undertake premeeting KPI review and bring action plans for underperformance.	R11, R3	Q3 2027	DCFO
Governance, Decision-Making & Oversight	Implement the governance review through a single action plan, as part of the Enabling Strategy within the CRMP 2027-2030, that strengthens decision and action logging across SLB/PDB, embeds improvements into the CRMP cycle with an annual review, and ensures clear escalation and closure of overdue or high-risk actions.	R6	Q4 2026	Head of Headquarters, SJFRS

Operational Capability, Competence & Safety	• Subject to business case and funding approval, progress and maintain a structured approach to tracking NOG adoption and adaptation, improving the consistency and clarity with which compliance and operational benefits are evidenced using existing systems and capability when possible.	R7	Q3 2027	Area Commander (Operations)
	• Undertake a risk based review of training needs against existing budget provision, prioritising and reprioritising training activity accordingly, and carrying out a proportionate review of training contracts to inform future decisions.	R8	Q3 2027	Area Commander (Operations)
	• Ensure Subject Matter Expert recommendation themes are reflected, monitored and reported through the CRMP and existing governance arrangements.	R9	Q4 2026	DCFO
	• Complete structured review of non-core activity; work with HCJ to explore SLAs to clarify responsibility, standards and value for money	R12	Q4 2026	DCFO
Digital, Data & Technology Enablement	• Actively engage with Digital Services to influence the prioritisation and sequencing of digital activity affecting SJFRS, ensuring tier one operational risks, critical dependencies and service requirements are clearly articulated and appropriately considered within corporate DDaT planning, with agreed communication and escalation route	R10	Q4 2026	Chief Officer, Justice and Home Affairs
	• Reflect agreed SJFRS digital and data enabling requirements within the DDaT elements of the CRMP, working with Digital Services to clarify roles, ownership and prioritisation assumptions, and to set out indicative sequencing that supports operational and enabling needs, recognising reliance on wider corporate prioritisation.	R10	Q4 2026	DCFO