

Appendix 1 -Methodology

Contents

Purpose	1
Main survey – Analysis of Responses	1
Digitising hard copy submissions	1
Creation of master dataset	2
Consideration of respondents’ IP addresses / Country	2
Data cleansing.....	4
Approach to data analysis	5
Written Submissions – Analysis of Responses	5

Purpose

Appendix 1 of the Consultation Report sets out the methodology followed to analyse responses to the main survey and the written submissions received as part of the public consultation regarding the proposed 2030 Phase-Out of Petrol and Diesel Vehicles.

Main survey – Analysis of Responses

The main consultation survey was fully completed¹ a total of 2,030 times:

- A. 2,022 online completions
- B. Four received as hard copies during week commencing 2 February 2026
- C. Four received as hard copies on 9 March 2026.²

Digitising hard copy submissions

Four hard copy submissions received by the consultation team prior to the commencement of data cleansing and analysis (B above) were digitised by hand keying

¹ Partially completed online survey responses were not included in the analysis, as these had not been actively submitted for consideration using the ‘Finish Survey’ button on the last page.

² Four hard copy surveys were received by the Environment and Climate team on 9 March 2026 having been posted on dates in late January in sufficient time to reach the consultation team before the deadline. It is not clear why it took five weeks for these submissions to be delivered. Due to the completion of the data cleansing and significant progress in analysing all responses, it was not possible to include these completed surveys within the findings of the consultation report. Four completed survey responses would constitute 0.2% of all responses received.

them into a copy of the online survey instrument³, so these could be merged with the main dataset of 2,022 online responses. The publicly available version having been closed on the last day of the consultation period. Each of these hard copy responses was numbered so it could be easily identified in the final dataset.

Creation of master dataset

The datasets for the online survey and the digitised hard copy submissions were downloaded and saved to a secure Teams channel. These files were then merged to create a single master dataset of 2,026 responses. The master dataset was then reviewed to identify any submissions that were not eligible for analysis.

Consideration of respondents' IP addresses / Country

By default, the online survey tool used by the Government of Jersey collects respondents' Internet Protocol (IP) addresses and Country. Although IP addresses and associated Country can provide an indication that a respondent is physically located in Jersey, this is not conclusive. As part of the data cleansing process, consideration was given to the IP address and Country collected for each respondent in conjunction with other information in their submission, before identifying any ineligible responses. The IP Address / Country for the four digitised responses (B above) were all recorded as Jersey at the point of data entry by a Government of Jersey officer.

It was agreed that a response with a non-Jersey IP address / country was not a sufficient reason for this to be discounted, give the likelihood that Islanders might complete the survey whilst travelling for work or leisure, or choosing to use a Virtual Private Network (VPN) capable of assigning them a non-Jersey IP Address.

From the total of 2,026 responses in the pre-cleansed master dataset, 1,745 had a Jersey IP address / Country (see Table 1 below for a full breakdown)

- Of 1,955 respondents that had responded in an individual capacity, 1,685 had a Jersey IP address / Country
- From 71 submissions received on behalf of a business or organisation, 60 respondents had a Jersey IP address / Country.

Duplicate IP addresses were identified using a conditional formatting function in Excel. 322 of 2,026 responses shared one of 138 IP addresses with between one and seven other responses (See Table 2 below for a breakdown by Country).

³ The consultation was publicised as ending on Friday 30 January. Close to the end of the consultation period, a major vehicle retailer contacted all its customers informing them of the consultation and advising them that this was due to close on Saturday 31 January. It was therefore decided that the survey should be closed in the early hours of Sunday 1 February so that any submissions from Islanders in receipt of that email could be collected.

2030 Phase-Out of Petrol and Diesel Vehicles – Consultation Report
Appendix 1 – Methodology

Examination of this group of responses did not identify any significant levels of duplication or suggest that they had been submitted to increase the count of specific views.

Identified Country of Response	Total
AUSTRALIA	8
AUSTRIA	1
BAHRAIN	1
BARBADOS	1
BELGIUM	1
BERMUDA	2
BULGARIA	2
CABO VERDE	4
CANADA	1
CAYMAN ISLANDS	1
FRANCE	32
GERMANY	4
GUERNSEY	6
ICELAND	2
IRELAND	1
JAPAN	3
JERSEY	1,745
KENYA	1
MALAYSIA	2
MALDIVES	1
MAURITIUS	1
MEXICO	1
NEPAL	1
NETHERLANDS	2
NEW ZEALAND	6
NORWAY	1
PORTUGAL	3
QATAR	1
SINGAPORE	2
SINT MAARTEN (DUTCH PART)	1
SOUTH AFRICA	6
SPAIN	8
SWEDEN	2
SWITZERLAND	6
THAILAND	2
UNITED ARAB EMIRATES	1
UNITED KINGDOM	149
UNITED STATES	14
Grand Total	2,026

Table 1: Identified Countries for pre-cleansed master dataset of 2,026 responses

Location of duplicated IP Addresses	Count per Country
FRANCE	6
GUERNSEY	2
JERSEY	295
NEW ZEALAND	2
UNITED KINGDOM	17
TOTAL	322

Table 2: Country location and count of duplicated IP addresses

In Question 3 of the main survey, individual respondents were asked to indicate their Parish of residence:

- 1,930 individual respondents selected a Parish of residence.⁴
- 17 individual respondents recorded that they preferred not to disclose where they lived:
 - 10 of these respondents had a Jersey IP address
 - 5 had a UK IP address
 - 1 had a French IP address
 - 1 had a Swiss IP address.
- 8 individual respondents recorded that they did not live in Jersey. The IP Address / Country for these responses were recorded as being located in: the UK (3); Guernsey (1); Portugal (1); Spain (1); Belgium (1); and Australia (1).

Data cleansing

Submissions were removed from the initial master dataset of 2,026 where:

- There was no public record for a named business/organisation for which an organisational response had been submitted
- Submissions were wholly duplicated or included significant elements of identical free text as one or more other responses
- Multiple submissions had been made on behalf of the same organisation: only one response was retained in these instances
- Submissions made on behalf of organisations not located in Jersey, with no evidence of any links to the Island
- Submissions made by individuals who recorded that they do not live in Jersey.

A total of 15 responses were removed from the final dataset following the identification of duplicate and invalid responses. 2,011 responses were therefore formally analysed: 1,944 from individuals and 67 from businesses / organisations.

⁴ For consideration of respondents stated Parish of residence see pp. 30-31 of the Consultation Report.

Approach to data analysis

Due to the number of responses received and the significant total length of all free-text responses submitted, it was agreed that the analysis of the consultation needed to be divided between officials to progress the consultation report. Analysis was approached as follows:

- The master dataset was split into two documents, one for individual responses and another for organisational responses
- Individual and organisational responses to survey questions were the batched to allow allocation to a small team of officers involved with consultation analysis
- Charts and tables were created to present quantitative responses to multiple-choice questions
- Tasks and processes were created to standardise the approach taken when analysing free-text qualitative responses, including:
 - Manual redaction of all free-text responses before any use of Microsoft Copilot. Where information was redacted, it was replaced with '[TEXT REDACTED]'
 - Thematic analysis of written responses using Copilot, with initial manual analysis of these, where time permitted
 - Creation of charts and tables to summarise key themes from free-text responses.

The relevant sections of the consultation report were then created using these elements. The main narrative was drafted to present the findings from each question, pulling in the charts, tables and summaries that had been produced.

Redacted free-text responses were filtered to remove those where consent had not been given to reproduce these, so that these could be published as Appendices to the Consultation Report.

Written Submissions – Analysis of Responses

All responses were digitised, given a unique reference number and saved in a secure Teams channel. Where the response was a scan or PDF these were converted to Word in order for the redaction to be completed, a uniform font type and size was applied to all submissions. It should be noted that the conversion process is not perfect with some individual letters, characters and formatting anomalies occurring. Wherever possible these were manually rectified.

An excel spreadsheet was created with each submission added as an independent entry. An initial read through of all responses was completed to ascertain whether the response was from an individual or on behalf of an organisation, business or club. Where a

2030 Phase-Out of Petrol and Diesel Vehicles – Consultation Report Appendix 1 – Methodology

submission did not provide an opinion or feedback on the consultation or on the wider climate emergency / Carbon Neutral Roadmap workstream no further analysis was completed.

Respondents were contacted by email to obtain consent to reproduce their submission in the consultation report.

For individuals it was clarified that their responses would be redacted to ensure anonymity. Where the submission was made on behalf of a business, organisation or club, permission was sought to reproduce the response and attribute it to the organisation. The business also had the option of choosing for their submission to be reproduced by anonymously. All respondents were given the option of not providing permission to reproduce their submission, with the guarantee that their thoughts would still be analysed.

Where no email response to the consent request was obtained it was assumed consent was not given.

A redacted version of each submission was saved within the respondent folder. Personal contact information (names, email addresses, home addresses or any other identifying information) was redacted from the response. Where a business or organisation had provided consent for their submission to be attributed to their business or organisation, the name and organisation address or email address was included, with any individual name, personal signature or personal email address or commercially sensitive information removed.

Where information was redacted, it was replaced with '[TEXT REDACTED]'.

All submissions were read and the key themes identified in the spreadsheet, allowing a count of the key themes to be established. Key additional points from each submission were noted and direct quotes from the submissions recorded.

The redacted submissions were collated into one document. The Word function 'personal information removal' was enabled.

Co-pilot was used on the redacted submissions to cross-check the themes identified in the manual analysis and to pull out additional themes for the responses to be analysed against.

Where permission was obtained to reproduce the redacted submission, these are provided in Appendix 14.