

ST HELENA GOVERNMENT HOME TO DUTY & PUBLIC TRANSPORT REVIEW



VALUE FOR MONEY REPORT

FINAL V1.0





DATE:	October 2007
AUDIT REFERENCE:	V32

CONTENTS

	Executive Summary & Overall Audit Opinion	3
1.	Introduction	5
2.	Resourcing & Scope	5
3.	Findings & Conclusions	5
4.	Recommendations & Management Action Plan.	11

Appendices

A:	Audit Opinion Definitions	15
B:	List of Personnel Consulted.	16

Lead Auditor Contact Details	
	<p>Tony Kilner</p> <p> Chief.auditor@sainthelena.gov.sh</p> <p> 2107</p> <p> Garden Hall Castle Gardens Jamestown</p>

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Home To Duty (HTD) Transport Review, undertaken February to September 2007 formed part of the Value For Money Plan for 2006/07 and was deferred into 2007/08. In light of our scheduled review, we were approached by the Chief Personnel Officer, Financial Secretary and Acting Chief Secretary to include the Public Transport System (PTS) in the scope of the review and to assess 'whether an effective, efficient and fair transport system that SHG staff and the public can better benefit from' be made.

In 2007/08 SHG has budgeted £42,000 for reimbursement of Home to Duty (HTD) bus fares, and £27,000 for subsidy to the PTS. The cost of providing Home to Duty transport in SHG and private hire vehicles is not known, but departments that use SHG and private hire vehicles for HTD transport budgeted a total of £469,000 for hire of vehicles.

We reviewed the expenditure and came to the following conclusions:

<i>Area</i>	<i>Value For Money Opinion</i>	
<i>HTD fare reimbursement</i>	Adequate	Management arrangements are generally conducive to achieving Value For Money – but further important enhancements could be made.
<i>Public Transport System</i>	Adequate	Management arrangements are generally conducive to achieving Value For Money – but further important enhancements could be made.
<i>HTD Transport in SHG and Private Hire Vehicles</i>	Inadequate	Management arrangements are not considered to be adequately conducive to achieving maximum Value For Money.

Departments are charged by the mile or by the daily rate, whatever is the higher, with the daily rate more often being the higher for. As a result they have little incentive to control the true costs of HTD transport arrangements or the use of these vehicles for private purposes by their staff. Records kept of HTD usage do not allow HTD costs to be monitored effectively.

At the request of the senior government officials named above, we also looked at policy options available to government in relation to public and staff transport. In doing so we went beyond the normal scope of Value for Money audits in scrutinising government expenditure.

On grounds of economic theory, we would suggest that a system whereby staff (except for teachers and shift workers) are responsible for their own transport arrangements would be the most efficient. For such a system to work efficiently, the distinction between un-established and established staff in respect of working hours and transport entitlements would have to be abolished – such a change should not however be made primarily on grounds of efficiency in transport. In the event of such a change a subsidised bus service should run between Jamestown and Half Tree Hollow in order to relieve pressure on parking in Jamestown, and staff, especially un-established staff, should receive a pay rise or transport allowances. We would however note that effects, both positive and negative, of such a change on individuals and on communities within St Helena would be large in relation to the overall gains in efficiency.

(Recommendation 10)

Management have considered a total of 11 recommendations (5 of which have been classified high priority) and have agreed 9. All recommendations are intended to improve the current practices, the most significant are:

- ☀ Departments and PWSD sections should be charged for use of SHG vehicles in a way that reflects the marginal cost of using them;
- ☀ Departments should improve cost control over SHG vehicles;
- ☀ Departments should discuss the feasibility of standardising their shift patterns to economise SHG vehicles in providing HTD transport;
- ☀ SHG should consider harmonising working hours and transport entitlements between un-established and established staff; and if SHG were to do so, they should
- ☀ Remove all transport entitlements (except for teachers and shift workers) and provide payment of transport allowances or pay increases to all staff, especially un-established staff.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Home To Duty (HTD) Transport Review formed part of the Value For Money Audit Plan for the year 2006/07 and was deferred into the plan for 2007/08. In light of our scheduled review, we were approached by the Chief Personnel Officer, Financial Secretary and Acting Chief Secretary to widen the scope of the review to include the Public Transport System (PTS) and to determine whether an effective, efficient and fair transport system that SHG staff and the public can better benefit from be made.

1.2 During each annual budgeting process, SHG makes provision for HTD transport allowance, SHG 'call out' vehicle charges and PTS subsidy, as shown below:

Budget	2006/07	2007/08
HTD Transport	£40,800	£42,000
PTS Subsidy	£30,000	£27,000
Vehicle hire charges to departments using vehicles for HTD transport.	£450,500	£469,000
Total	£521,400	£538,000

1.3 At the Head of Departments Budget Away Day in January 2007, the HTD transport and PTS was discussed and possible options for improvement, which were considered during the review, were:

- 1) All staff should be entitled to HTD Transport (which could be achieved either through an improved HTD transport system or a comprehensive system);
- 2) A set payment given to all staff for HTD Transport;
- 3) Rationalise shift hours to allow staff to use either the improved HTD Transport or comprehensive PTS;
- 4) Flexi-time system could be used by all Departments with the existence of a comprehensive PTS;
- 5) Only SHG vehicles dedicated to 'on-call' are used out of SHG working hours; and
- 6) Increase benefits for the Island with a comprehensive PTS.

2. SCOPE AND RESOURCING

2.1 We firstly considered the current arrangements to assess whether they were operated with due regard to economy and efficiency.

2.2 We then looked at policy options available to government in relation to public and staff transport.

2.3 The review was undertaken by trainee VFM Audit Manager Helena Bennett and trainee auditors; Brenda Moors-Clingham, Sophie Young and Sheridan Richards, with support, guidance and report preparation of Chief Auditor Tony Kilner during the period of February to September 2007. The total cost of undertaking the audit was £8,000.

2.4 The assistance given by all staff and third parties involved is acknowledged with appreciation. A listing of those involved is included at Appendix B to this report.

2.5 Copies of this report were provided to the Chief Secretary, Financial Secretary and Chief Human Resources Officer. The final report, incorporating Government comments, will be made available publicly in the Jamestown library, at the Audit Service Offices and through publication at www.audit.gov.sh. The executive summary will be provided to the Public Accounts Committee and Audit Committee.

3. FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS

3.1 The main findings and conclusions are presented here and are based upon the agreed scope of the audit the actual work undertaken and evidence gathered.

3.2 Those findings which have resulted in recommendations being made are presented in Section 4 of this report together with management response and action plans.

Current Home To Duty Transport arrangements

3.3 There are currently 3 different forms of HTD transport undertaken by SHG staff. There are the Private Sector HTD buses, SHG and private hire vehicles, and private vehicles and arrangements.

Private Sector HTD Buses

3.4 Private Sector HTD buses are operated independently from each other and from SHG, with no contractual agreement for the public service provision.



3.5 The HTD buses are arranged on demand and by pre-booking, taking passengers to and from known destinations. The HTD bus times are set for majority of workers arriving at work by 08.30 and leaving work at 16.00.

3.6 In June 2003, SHG's policy was to provide a 100% refund to established staff using the private sector HTD buses, with hope that it would encourage an increase in demand - stimulating the bus service providers to provide additional transport provision.

3.7 Following fuel price increases in 2006, private HTD transport providers increased their fares. SHG does not reimburse this increase, so reimbursements now cover approximately 80% of bus fare.

3.8 The system of HTD buses, taking passengers to and from known destinations at known times is attractive to both passengers and transport providers and is an efficient way of meeting the current needs of established staff. A scheduled public transport service would not be as convenient to staff or as attractive to operators. The fact that increases in fares are born by passengers helps ensure that fares remain competitive.

3.9 The HTD reimbursement system helps to discourage the use of private vehicles reducing congestion and demand for parking spaces in Lower Jamestown, providing an indirect benefit to car users also. However many established staff do not use the system, some because of child care, work or other commitments means that they are not going directly home at 16.05, and some because they are willing to pay for the convenience that a car provides.

3.10 As stated in paragraph 3.4, the HTD buses operate independently of a contract with SHG and therefore provide the service on their own terms and conditions. During the audit it was found that SHG staff expressed concerns over the conditions of the HTD buses and the driving abilities of bus drivers. In 2001, amendments to the current Road Traffic Ordinance and proposed Public Service Vehicles (conditions of fitness, equipment and use) Regulations was drafted and issued for public consultation but were not enacted. Providing such regulations were not too burdensome, they could improve public confidence in the Public Service Vehicles without substantial additional costs and we recommend that such regulations be considered.

(Recommendation 1)

3.11 In conclusion, the system of reimbursement of fares is reasonably efficient. It is not perfectly efficient as there will be costs of transport that would be avoided if they had to be paid for by the employee. For example some may take the bus, because of the reimbursement, but would share a ride in a car if there were no reimbursement. Or some staff might find jobs closer to home if they had to pay their own transport costs. The system is also not equitable to those not wishing, or not able, to go directly from home to work at the required time.

SHG Vehicles

3.12 SHG vehicles are taken home for either HTD transport or call-out by special permission of the Chief Secretary. Un-established staff use these vehicles free of charge for HTD transport.

3.13 We were unable to establish the cost of using SHG vehicles for HTD transport, but the costs would appear to be large in comparison with the cost of HTD bus fare reimbursement.

3.14 Departments are charged either a daily fixed rate or 'per mile' rate for each vehicle used, depending on which is the higher of the two calculations for the month or the period for which the vehicle is taken out of the pool. This results in Departments normally being charged on the daily fixed rate. As a result Departments and PWSD Sections have little incentive to control the additional costs of using these vehicles for HTD transport; nor do they have an incentive to control the costs of private usage of these vehicles.

(Recommendation 2)

3.15 Departments (or PWSD Sections) using government vehicles for HTD transport should be responsible for monitoring and controlling the costs. At a minimum, Departments and Sections should:

- ✿ Record mileage on HTD runs separately;
- ✿ Assess whether such mileage is reasonable;
- ✿ Calculate the cost of HTD provision; and
- ✿ Record mileage of call out vehicles in the possession of individual staff members.

(Recommendation 3)

3.16 Some staff are provided with vehicles so that they can be on call. They travel with their SHG vehicles for private purposes, so that they have transport in the event that they are called out. Such staff should pay for such use at an agreed mileage rate.



(Recommendation 4)

making their own arrangements do so at their own cost.

3.18 By special permission from the Chief Secretary, there are a few established staff that use SHG vehicles for HTD transport, only because there are no HTD buses travelling to and from their residential area to work, have no personal transportation and because the SHG vehicle is travelling from their residential area to work.

3.19 Shift work is required for Public Health and Social Services (PHSSD), Public Works and Services (PWSD), Police and Finance Department. Each section operates their shift patterns individually and use SHG vehicles for HTD transport. The Police Service have revised their shift patterns for Police and Prison staff to make best use of the dedicated Police vehicles for HTD purposes. PHSSD currently provide HTD transport for their nurses on shift but have found the SHG vehicles to be unreliable and therefore contracted a private sector bus provider to provide the night shift HTD runs.

Current Public Transport arrangements

3.20 In 2003 the 'St Helena Public Transport System' was set up to carry out the business of conveying the public to and from communities on St Helena. The PTS contract was awarded to 3 private sector bus providers who maintain different routes around the island through government subsidy. The PTS currently starts 09.00 and finishes 15.30, due to other personal or contractual commitments of the bus providers. Thus the primary uses of the PTS are the non-working population and majority being the elderly, as stated by the Government Economist during his 2006 review of the service.

3.21 During 2006, the Government Economist determined that the current subsidy level to support the PTS is still required to operate the current timetable and there being no scope for reduction. Some routes showed little demand even with the subsidy and so were withdrawn. Improvements to the PTS would generally require an increase in subsidy.

Private Vehicles & Arrangements and Special Cases

3.17 The remainder of SHG staff, use their personal vehicles or make private arrangements such as taxi hire for HTD transport. This is due to many having family commitments such as needing to get children to carers before and after work, other personal engagements, or work commitments. As stipulated by June 2003 HTD policy, staff

3.22 St Helena has high levels of car ownership and use of existing PTS routes has been less than predicted. A truly comprehensive PTS would require a service allowing users to make, for example, home-to-school-to-work-to-childcare-to-home journeys. Such a service, serving the whole island would require a prohibitively large subsidy and the benefits would be general rather than targeted on specific groups.

3.23 Instead the provision of public transport should be left mainly to private operators operating without subsidy. The current service benefits chiefly those not in employments and the public transport subsidy should continue to be used for the benefit of this group.

3.24 The system of out of rush hour transport could be extended without an increase if operators could generate additional funds from post distribution and courier services and these options should be further explored by the Post Office.

(Recommendation 5)

3.25 The wider public gains from public transport services are to the extent that it reduces traffic and parking congestion. A service between Half Tree Hollow, which has plentiful parking, and Lower Jamestown, which does not, would help reduce parking problems in Jamestown. If such a service could be arranged to coincide with drop off and pick up from the crèche, it would also support working parents with young children. For these reasons we would recommend that this route be added.

(Recommendation 6)

3.26 Generally, the provision of public service buses should be left to the private sector. The government should support private sector buses through the provision of common infrastructure (i.e. maintenance of bus shelters) and the provision of common information and publicity for all private providers committing to a regular scheduled service.

(Recommendation 7)

Future Policy Options

3.27 The practice of SHG arranging for staff transport or partly reimbursing the cost of

transport to work is unusual. Most employers in most countries leave transport arrangements to staff. There are sound reasons why. Employers generally do not care where their employees come from or how they get to work and so can most efficiently pay staff in a way that does not depend on their employees' place of residence or transport choice. Employees do care, and are better placed to make decisions about their transport choices and about where to live and work, than their employers. Whether they bear all the costs and gain all the benefits of their choices, these choices can be expected to be efficient. We are therefore inclined to recommend that staff bear the cost of transport to work.

3.28 However, if all transport provision or reimbursement to SHG stopped immediately:

- ✿ More staff would use private cars, making traffic and parking in Jamestown worse;
- ✿ Government vehicles that could efficiently be used to transport staff would be idle;
- ✿ In the short term, providers of HTD buses might not have the capacity to provide spaces to all who wanted them;
- ✿ There might be insufficient demand for bus providers to operate a service for un-established staff in the mornings, leaving them entirely reliant on private transport; and
- ✿ Shift workers would be entirely reliant on private transport.

3.29 With un-established staff working 07.30 – 16.00 with an hour for lunch and established staff working 08.30 to 16.00 with half an hour for lunch, the afternoon rush hour is very concentrated but the morning rush hour spread out. A pre-requisite for the introduction of an efficient system relying on private transport (including privately provided public service vehicles) would therefore be scrapping the distinction, at least in terms of working hours and transport entitlements between established and un-established staff, or otherwise changing work patterns to ensure that both morning and afternoon rush hours are evenly spread.



3.30 The decision to alter schemes of service and working hours should not however be made on grounds of transport costs alone. Given that un-established staff are currently often unsupervised for the first hour of the day, they would seem at least in some cases to be operational reasons favouring this change.

3.31 From the transport point of view the optimal pattern for example; would be some departments in Jamestown working say 07.30 – 15.15, others with equal numbers of staff working say 08.30 – 16.15, and others working a flexitime system. This would allow providers to offer two runs each morning with the same bus and two in the afternoon, while also serving those commuting in the opposite direction on their way back from the first run.
(*Recommendation 8*)

3.32 Current arrangements for teacher travelling on school buses would seem to make sense operationally and so should continue. Shift workers without their own cars would be in a difficult position under such a system and SHG vehicles might have to be used for the transport of shift workers. The reduction in demand on the car pool for the transport of (other) un-established staff should ensure that private hire is not required for the transport of shift workers.

3.33 As more staff could be expected to use private vehicles if current incentives were taken away, a service should be provided, subsidised if necessary, between Half Tree Hollow and Lower Jamestown. This would reduce the numbers of SHG staff and others needing private vehicles to get to work in Jamestown and allow some of those who do, to park in Half Tree Hollow.

Compensating Staff

3.34 If staff had to assume responsibility for their own transport arrangements, they would need to be compensated. Whatever method is used to this there would be winners and losers.



3.35 Staff could be compensated in two ways, by a general pay increase or by a transport allowance based on distance of home to work.

3.36 A transport allowance, based on current HTD fares, would cost about £180,000 (See figure 1 for calculation). Winners would be those staff (about 300) who currently use private vehicles plus those who would prefer to take the money and make their own arrangements. Losers would be un-established staff not as well served by HTD buses as by current arrangements, mainly those working outside of Jamestown and far from where they live. Staff currently using HTD buses would be broadly unaffected.

Transport Allowance Calculation

684 staff (excluding teachers) working more than walking distance from their homes
x 12 months
x £22 allowance
= **£180,000**

Figure 1

3.37 The effect of such a system to the government's finances of this arrangement is difficult to work out as the cost of providing transport to non shift working un-established staff is not known. If the cost of this provision were £140,000 for example, which is not an unreasonable estimate; the effect would be cost neutral. Additional funding applied to a rise in un-established staff salaries would make the change more equitable and acceptable, as might a cut in un-established staff hours from 37.5 hours to 35 hours per week.

3.38 Alternatively all staff (other than teachers) could receive a pay increase of £19 per month for example (tax free or higher if taxable). This would be more efficient from the administrative point of view and in the long term, efficiencies would arise as people moved jobs or home closer together. Those living close to work (mainly in Jamestown) would gain substantially, those in Ladder Hill and Half Tree Hollow be broadly unaffected and those living in other areas would lose out under this arrangement, as compared to the transport allowance method outlines in the previous paragraph.

3.39 Under such a system staff provided with transport because they have to be on call and do not have their own vehicle, should be expected to be charged for their home to duty mileage. See paragraph 3.16.

3.40 Jobs requiring shift work is not an attractive job opportunity to most people and therefore to provide an incentive to the current workers and potential workers SHG should continue to provide free HTD transport. However to economise the use of transport, Departments should consider standardising their shift patterns and SHG provide specific HTD buses to commute all shift workers home to duty. This would save the requirement of 3 vehicles

for example travelling the same route to pick up different departmental workers.
(Recommendation 9)

3.41 We also considered whether, if working hours were harmonised, the current arrangements of HTD bus reimbursement could be extended to un-established staff. This would be a reasonable system, but not as efficient as possible, for the reasons given in 3.11.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS AND MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN

Recommendations in *gray* are recommendations not agreed by management..

Recommendation 1	<p>The draft Bill for revision of the Road Traffic Ordinance and introduction of Public Service Vehicles (conditions of fitness, equipment and use) should be considered for enforcement to ensure public transport service is carried out on a safe and reliable basis.</p> <p><i>(For Audit Finding on which this is based, refer to Main Report, Section 3.10)</i></p>
Priority: (H/M/L)	
MEDIUM	
Management Response	General Comments:
	<i>Legislation had previously been prepared, but was not pursued due to the unfavourable comments during public consultation process. The draft legislation should be resurrected.</i>
	Officer responsible for Implementation:
	<i>Chief of Police /Attorney General's Chambers</i>
	Implementation expected complete by: (Month & Year)
	<i>Chief of Police to resurrect draft legislation and provide comments to the AG's chambers by end January 2008, with a view to the legislation being processed for enforcement during 2008.</i>

Recommendation 2	<p>Departments and PWSD sections should be charged for use of SHG vehicles in a way that reflects the marginal cost of using them i.e. charge by mileage plus a flat rate.</p> <p><i>(For Audit Finding on which this is based, refer to Main Report, Section 3.14)</i></p>
Priority: (H/M/L)	
HIGH	
Management Response	General Comments:
	<i>It was agreed that the Transport Division should come up with suitable charges to reflect the true cost of using the vehicles.</i>
	Officer responsible for Implementation:
	<i>Senior Transport Manager</i>
	Implementation expected complete by: (Month & Year)
	<i>End January 2008.</i>

recommendation 3	<p>Departments and Sections should monitor and control costs of HTD transport in SHG and private vehicle usage. At a minimum, should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☀ Record mileage on HTD runs separately; ☀ Assess whether such mileage is reasonable; ☀ Calculate the cost of HTD provision; and ☀ Record mileage of call out vehicles in the possession of individual staff members. <p><i>(For Audit Finding on which this is based, refer to Main Report, Section 3.15)</i></p>
Priority: (H/M/L)	
HIGH	

Management Response	General Comments:
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Heads of Department to ensure that the log sheets for each vehicle reflect the mileage used for HTD, etc to prevent abuse. This should be monitored by department and a return sent to Financial Secretary on a monthly basis.</i> 2. <i>It was also noted that the log book need to be reviewed so that all the required information can be recorded.</i>
	Officer responsible for Implementation:
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Heads of Department</i> 2. <i>Senior Transport Manager</i>
	Implementation expected complete by: (Month & Year)
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Heads of Department to submit returns to the Financial Secretary by the second week in each month, relevant to the previous month.</i> 2. <i>Senior Transport Manager issued revised log sheet to HoDs on 28 November 2007.</i>

Recommendation 4	<p>Staff provided with vehicles so that they can be on call should pay for private usage at an agreed mileage rate.</p> <p><i>(For Audit Finding on which this is based, refer to Main Report, Section 3.16)</i></p>
Priority: (H/M/L)	
MEDIUM	

Management Response	General Comments:
	<p><i>OCS Circular No.1/2004 stated that SHG vehicles must not be used for private purposes. This policy will prevail and the Circular will be re-issued by 11 January 2008.</i></p> <p><i>Recommendation therefore not accepted.</i></p>
	Officer responsible for Implementation:
	N/A
	Implementation expected complete by: (Month & Year)
	N/A

Recommendation 5	The Post Office should consider whether Public Transport Buses could be used for post and courier services.
Priority: (H/M/L)	
MEDIUM	<i>(For Audit Finding on which this is based, refer to Main Report, Section 3.24)</i>
Management Response	General Comments: <i>Not agreed.</i>
	Officer responsible for Implementation: <i>N/A</i>
	Implementation expected complete by: (Month & Year) <i>N/A</i>

Recommendation 6	A PTS service between Half Tree Hollow and Lower Jamestown coinciding with drop of and pick up times from the crèche, should be arranged.
Priority: (H/M/L)	
MEDIUM	<i>(For Audit Finding on which this is based, refer to Main Report, Section 3.25)</i>
Management Response	General Comments: <i>SHG departments were asked to ascertain interest from employees using this service. Questions were asked about reimbursing cost of tickets which the existing budget cannot accommodate. Based on limited interest shown thus far and, subject to availability of funding, a PTS service between HTH and Lower Jamestown should be trialled for 1.5 months before the end of March 2008.</i>
	Officer responsible for Implementation: <i>Deputy Chief Secretary</i>
	Implementation expected complete by: (Month & Year) <i>End March 2008</i>

Recommendation 7	Government should support private sector buses through the provision common information and publicity for all private providers committing to a regular scheduled service.
Priority: (H/M/L)	
MEDIUM	<i>(For Audit Finding on which this is based, refer to Main Report, Section 3.26)</i>
Management Response	General Comments: <i>PTS bus schedules and any changes thereto, are already being published by the OCS. This should continue and should be done on a more regular basis, i.e quarterly starting with January 2008, in the two local newspapers.</i>
	Officer responsible for Implementation: <i>Office of Chief Secretary</i>
	Implementation expected complete by: (Month & Year) <i>End January 2008</i>

Recommendation 8	Government should consider the harmonising of working hours and transport entitlements between un-established and established staff.
Priority: (H/M/L)	
HIGH	<i>(For Audit Finding on which this is based, refer to Main Report, Section 3.31)</i>
Management Response	<p>General Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Human Resources Department, to look at the possibility of harmonising the working hours using ANRD as a starting point to see how it will work.</i> <i>Human Resources Department, in consultation with Financial Secretary, to prepare a briefing note outlining the impact of unifying the public service.</i> <p>Officer responsible for Implementation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Human Resources & Agricultural & Natural Resources Departments</i> <i>Human Resources Department and Financial Secretary</i> <p>Implementation expected complete by: (Month & Year)</p> <p><i>End March 2008.</i></p>

Recommendation 9	Departments should discuss the feasibility of standardising their shift patterns to economise SHG vehicles in providing HTD transport.
Priority: (H/M/L)	
HIGH	<i>(For Audit Finding on which this is based, refer to Main Report, Section 3.40)</i>
Management Response	<p>General Comments:</p> <p><i>Those departments operating under shift work to prepare a matrix showing the impact of changing the shift pattern to minimise the use of HTD transport.</i></p> <p>Officer responsible for Implementation:</p> <p><i>Heads of Department - PHSSD, PWSD, Police, OCS for Plantation House</i></p> <p>Implementation expected complete by: (Month & Year)</p> <p><i>End March 2008</i></p>

Recommendation 10	<p>If Government decide in principle to harmonise working hours and transport entitlements of un-established and established staff, then this should be done in conjunction with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☀ The removal of all transport entitlements, except in exceptional circumstances, ☀ A bus service from HTH to Lower Jamestown; and ☀ The payment of transport allowances or pay increases to all staff, but mainly to un-established staff. <p><i>(For Audit Finding on which this is based, refer to Executive Summary)</i></p>
Priority: (H/M/L)	
HIGH	
Management Response	General Comments:
	<i>Once work is completed on recommendations 6 and 8, this matter will be considered.</i>
	Officer responsible for Implementation:
	<i>Office of Chief Secretary</i>
	Implementation expected complete by: (Month & Year)
	<i>End May 2008.</i>

APPENDIX A**AUDIT OPINION DEFINITIONS**

Every VFM audit concludes with an overall opinion based upon individual opinions that are applied to each of the review areas identified as part of the scope of the audit. The range of opinions, together with an explanation of their meanings, is as follows;

<i>Value For Money Opinions</i>	
GOOD	Management arrangements are conducive to achieving Value For Money and only minor enhancements, if any, can be identified.
ADEQUATE	Management arrangements are generally conducive to achieving Value For Money – but further important enhancements could be made.
INADEQUATE	Management arrangements are not considered to be adequately conducive to achieving maximum Value For Money.

AUDIT RECOMMENDATION PRIORITIES

<i>Priority</i>	
HIGH	Immediate risk to achieving the outputs of the operation at lowest cost, efficiently and effectively.
MEDIUM	Issues identified which would improve the quality of the operation, with regards to cost-effectiveness and/ or output.
LOW	Minor enhancements identified to improve the effectiveness of the operation.

APPENDIX B**LIST OF PERSONNEL CONSULTED DURING AUDIT**

The assistance given to the Audit Service by all those listed below during the course of the audit is acknowledged with appreciation.

NAME	JOB TITLE	SECTION / AREA
Christine Turpin	Accountant - Financial, Analysis and Planning	St Helena Government – Finance
Dax Richards	Senior Accountant	St Helena Government – Finance
Desmond Wade	Chief Finance Officer	St Helena Government – Finance
Lorrian Yon	Executive Officer	St Helena Government – Finance
Leeanne Henry	Senior Assistant Secretary	St Helena Government – OCS
Kirsty Yon	Executive Officer	St Helena Government – OCS
Pamela Young	Director of Tourism	St Helena Government – OCS
Sandra Sim	Assistant Secretary	St Helena Government – OCS
Cherry Walters	Executive Officer	St Helena Government – PWSD
John Cranfield	Senior Transport Manager	St Helena Government – PWSD
Simon Oliver	Head of Energy Division	St Helena Government – PWSD
Colin Anthony	Senior Engineer	St Helena Government – PWSD (Energy)
Herman Williams	Senior Engineer	St Helena Government – PWSD (Water)
Brenda Stevens	Executive Officer	St Helena Government – PWSD
Derek Thomas	Chief of Police	St Helena Government – Police
Jacqui Robinson	Executive Officer	St Helena Government – Police
Debra Knipe	Statistics Officer	St Helena Government – DEPD
Brenda Thomas	Executive Officer	St Helena Government – DEPD
Joey George	Human Resources Officer	St Helena Government – HR
Glenda Peters	Executive Officer	St Helena Government – HR
Sharina Williams	Senior Clerk	St Helena Government – HR
Karen Yon	Senior Executive Officer	St Helena Government – LL&PD

NAME	JOB TITLE	SECTION / AREA
Sherry Vanguard	Senior Clerk	St Helena Government – DESS
Beverly Francis	Post Mistress	St Helena Government – Post Office
Linda Cranfield	Assistant Post Mistress	St Helena Government – Post Office
Joanne Crowie	Executive Officer	St Helena Government – Education
Christine George	Clerk	St Helena Government – Education
Helen Lawrence	Assistant Secretary	St Helena Government – PHSSD
Lily Andrews	Senior Executive Officer	St Helena Government – PHSSD
Thelma Sim	Senior Executive Officer	St Helena Government – ANRD
Garth Armstrong	Government Economist (short term contract)	St Helena Government – OCS
Julie Thomas	Business Service Manager	St Helena Development Agency
Colin Williams	Owner	Private Sector – Colin's Bus Service
Jeffrey Stevens	Owner	Private Sector – Fox Motors
Mark Yon	General Manager – Production & Services	Private Sector – Solomon's & Company PLC
Maxwell Benjamin	Owner	Private Sector – Maxa Boys Transport
Cecil & Patsy Leo	Owner	Private Sector
Nicholas Thorpe	Owner	Private Sector – Thorpe & Sons
Tracey Corker	Owner	Private Sector
Hensil O'Bey	Chief Executive St Helena	Private Sector – Cable & Wireless PLC
A special thank you is given to all SHG Staff and public for completing the transport questionnaires		