

# Follow-up on past PAC recommendations 2022 - Report 3





To help the public  
service spend wisely

G

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

**Executive Summary.....1**

**Update since our February 2022 report ..... 1**

**About this report..... 4**

**High-level assessment of reports..... 5**

**Conclusion .....8**

**Appendix 1 - Workforce Planning and Management in the Cayman Islands Government (April 2018).10**

**Appendix 2 – Efficiency of Summary Courts (November 2019).....48**



# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

Section 77(7) of the Parliament Standing Orders (2018 Consolidation) requires the Cayman Islands Government to formally respond within three months of the Public Accounts Committee (PAC) laying an Auditor General report in the Parliament.

As part of the audit process, the Office of the Auditor General (OAG) routinely follows up on the implementation of the recommendations that we and the PAC have made as a result of performance audit reports and the PAC's hearings on these reports.

This report is one in a series of reports that the OAG is preparing to follow up on the recommendations made in PAC reports tabled since September 2018. The OAG published three reports in this series in August 2021, January 2022 and February 2022. This report is the fourth in the series.

## UPDATE SINCE OUR FEBRUARY 2022 REPORT

In February 2022, the OAG provided a status update on seven audit reports that the PAC had tabled in the Parliament between September 2018 and July 2021, for which the Government had not yet tabled Government Minutes. The Government Minutes for these seven PAC reports ranged between four and 38 months late; four responses were more than two years late. The report also provided a status update for two audit reports for which the Government Minutes were not yet due.

We provide an update on PAC reports tabled and the status of Government Minutes since our last report below.

---

## PAC REPORTS

In December 2021, the PAC tabled reports for *Follow-up on past PAC Recommendations 2021 – Report 1* (August 2021) and *Improving Financial Accountability and Transparency: Financial Management and Reporting* (May 2021). The Government Minutes for these two reports were due in March 2022.

In June 2022, the PAC tabled its report for *HSA Outpatient Pharmacy services* (November 2021). The Government Minute for this report is due in September 2022.

The OAG published its report *Follow-up on past PAC Recommendations 2022 – Report 2* in February 2022, which provided an update on three previous reports. The PAC considered this report in February and May and held a witness hearing in May. The PAC finalised its report in June 2022 and plans to table it at the next sitting of the Parliament.

The OAG published its report, *The Government's shift to online services*, in June 2022. The PAC plans to hold a hearing about in October 2022. The PAC will prepare its report after the hearing.

## GOVERNMENT MINUTES

The Government tabled the Government Minutes for the following three reports in June 2022:

- Report of the Office of the Auditor General on Follow-up on past PAC Recommendations 2021 – Report 1 (August 2021).
- Report of the Office of the Auditor General on Improving Financial Accountability and Transparency: Financial Management and Reporting (May 2021).
- Report of the Office of the Auditor General on Efficiency and Effectiveness of Summary Courts (November 2019).

The Government Minutes for the first two reports were three months late. However, we noted that the Cabinet approved the Government Minutes to be tabled in March 2022, but the Parliament did not sit between March and June 2022. Therefore, the Government Minutes were tabled at the first opportunity. The Government Minute for the PAC’s report on the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Summary Courts was due in October 2020. It was tabled 21 months late.

Exhibit 1 summarises all PAC reports tabled since September 2018 where the Government Minutes are late as of the end of August 2022 or not yet due. It shows that, at the end of August 2022, the Government was late in tabling its formal response for six PAC reports. The Government Minute for one PAC report was not yet due at the end of August 2022.

### Exhibit 1 – Public Accounts Committee reports tabled and status of the Government Minutes as of August 2022

Report of the Standing Public Accounts Committee on the:	Date tabled	Government Minute due	Government Minute tabled	Delay in tabling Government Minute
Report of the Office of the Auditor General on HSA Outpatient Pharmacy services (November 2021) (PA)	8 Jun 2022	8 Sep 2022	Not yet due	
Reports of the Office of the Auditor General on: (1) Owen Roberts International Airport (ORIA) Terminal Redevelopment Project – Progress update as at August 2018 (January 2019); (2) Financial Reporting of the Cayman Islands Government: General Report 2019 (December 2020); and (3) Improving Financial Accountability	15 Jul 2021	15 Oct 2021	Not yet tabled	11 months late

Report of the Standing Public Accounts Committee on the:	Date tabled	Government Minute due	Government Minute tabled	Delay in tabling Government Minute
<b>and Transparency: Budgeting (December 2020) (PA and GR)</b>				
<b>Report of the Office of the Auditor General on Efficiency and Effectiveness of the Utility Regulation and Competition Office (OfReg) (June 2020) (PA)</b>	12 Dec 2020	12 Mar 2021	Not yet tabled	18 months late
<b>Report of the Office of the Auditor General on Follow-up on past PAC recommendations (October 2018) (PA)</b>	10 Apr 2019	10 Jul 2019	Not yet tabled	38 months late
<b>Report of the Information and Communications Technology Authority 2015/16 Accounts (FA)</b>	22 Nov 2018	22 Feb 2019	Not yet tabled	42 months late
<b>Report on the Segregated Insurance Fund 2015/16 Accounts (FA)</b>	6 Sep 2018	6 Dec 2018	Not yet tabled	45 months late
<b>Report on the Cayman Islands Monetary Authority 2015/16 Accounts (FA)</b>	6 Sep 2018	6 Dec 2018	Not yet tabled	45 months late

The Cabinet approved the Government Minutes for four of these reports in June 2022, to be tabled at the next sitting of the Parliament:

- Reports of the Office of the Auditor General on: (1) Owen Roberts International Airport (ORIA) Terminal Redevelopment Project – Progress update as at August 2018 (January 2019); (2) Financial Reporting of the Cayman Islands Government: General Report 2019 (December 2020); and (3) Improving Financial Accountability and Transparency: Budgeting (December 2020).
- Report of the Office of the Auditor General on Follow-up on past PAC recommendations (October 2018).
- Report on the Segregated Insurance Fund 2015/16 Accounts.
- Report on the Cayman Islands Monetary Authority 2015/16 Accounts.

The Parliament has not met since the Cabinet approved these Government Minutes for tabling.

## ABOUT THIS REPORT

This report provides an update on the Government’s progress in implementing the 29 recommendations made in the following two PAC reports:

<i>OAG report</i>	<i>PAC report tabled</i>	<i>Government Minute tabled</i>	<i>Total Recommendations</i>
<i>Workforce Planning and Management in the Cayman Islands Government (April 2018)</i>	10 April 2019	14 October 2020	16
<i>Efficiency of Summary Courts (November 2019)</i>	1 July 2020	8 June 2022	13
<b>Total recommendations</b>			<b>29</b>

This report provides:



- A high-level assessment of each report, including a Red-Amber-Green (RAG) progress rating (Exhibit 2).
- An overall conclusion on the Government’s progress in implementing the PAC recommendations (Exhibit 3).
- Detailed assessments of the Government’s progress for each report (Appendices 1 and 2). Each appendix includes a summary of the PAC recommendations and the original OAG recommendations, the Government’s response and planned implementation date to the original OAG recommendations, updated responses received between July 2020 and September 2022, and an OAG comment on the updates.



## HIGH-LEVEL ASSESSMENT OF REPORTS

Exhibit 2 below outlines our high-level assessments of the Government’s progress with implementing the recommendations of the two reports covered in this follow-up.

### Exhibit 2 – High-level assessment of progress in implementing PAC recommendations

Report	OAG comment	OAG assessment (January 2022)
<p><b>Workforce Planning and Management in the Cayman Islands Government (April 2018)</b></p>	<p>The OAG report included 13 recommendations. The PAC endorsed these and made three further recommendations in its report (April 2019). Fourteen of the recommendations were directed to the Portfolio of the Civil Service and the other two were directed to the Government.</p> <p>All 16 recommendations were accepted. Overall, we have assessed that three recommendations have been implemented, 11 have been partly implemented and there has been limited/ progress for two. Of the eleven recommendations that have been partly implemented, implementation is in progress for ten and action is planned but has not yet started for one. Because, three recommendations have been implemented and action is in progress for a further ten, we have assessed overall progress as <b>Amber</b> – some progress.</p> <p>See Appendix 1 for details.</p>	<p> Some progress</p>
<p><b>Efficiency of Summary Courts (November 2019)</b></p>	<p>The OAG report included nine recommendations. The PAC endorsed these and made four further recommendations in its report (July 2020). The majority (ten) of these recommendations were directed to Judicial Administration. The other three were directed to the Government.</p> <p>Of the 13 recommendations, one was not accepted. Of the remaining 12, we have assessed that three recommendations have been implemented, five have been partly implemented and there has been limited/ progress for four. Of the five recommendations that have been partly</p>	<p> Limited progress</p>

Report	OAG comment	OAG assessment (January 2022)
	<p>implemented, implementation is in progress for one and action is planned but has not yet started for four.</p> <p>Judicial Administration has not fully implemented any of its ten recommendations. It is unclear if Judicial Administration accepted one of the recommendations; therefore, we assessed it as Not accepted. Of the remaining nine, one is in progress, it plans to but has not started addressing four and has made limited or no progress for another four. We have consequently assessed Judicial Administration’s progress as <b>Red</b> – Limited or no progress.</p> <p>The Government addressed all the three recommendations directed to it. We have therefore assessed the Government’s progress as <b>Green</b> – Significant progress has been made in addressing the recommendations.</p> <p>See Appendix 2 for details.</p>	

*Note: **Red** – limited or no progress has been made; **Amber** – some progress has been or is being made; **Green** – significant progress has been made in addressing the recommendations.*

Our assessment of the 29 recommendations in these two reports shows that one (three per cent) of the recommendations was not accepted. Overall, six (21 per cent) of the recommendations have been implemented. A further 16 (55 per cent) are partly implemented or action is planned to implement them and there has been no progress with six (21 per cent) of the recommendations.

### Exhibit 3 – Summary of the implementation of recommendations

	Recommendation not accepted	Recommendation implemented	Recommendation partly implemented or action is planned	Limited or no progress with recommendation	Total recommendations
<i>Workforce Planning and Management in the Cayman Islands Government (April 2018)</i>	- (0%)	3 (19%)	11 (69%)	2 (12%)	16
<i>Efficiency of Summary Courts (November 2019)</i>	1 <sup>1</sup> (8%)	3 (23%)	5 (38%)	4 (31%)	13
<b>Total</b>	1 (3%)	6 (21%)	16 (55%)	6 (21%)	29

The OAG will continue to follow up on the 16 recommendations that we have assessed as **Amber** (Partly implemented or action is planned) and the six recommendations that we have assessed as **Red** (Limited or no progress).

---

<sup>1</sup> It is not clear if one of the recommendations was accepted; we have therefore assessed it as 'Not accepted'.

# CONCLUSION

---

1. This report is the latest in a series following up on the Government's progress in implementing previous recommendations made by the Public Accounts Committee (PAC) and my Office.
2. In this report, I provide an update on the Government's progress with implementing the recommendations made in two PAC reports. Overall, only six (21 per cent) of the 29 recommendations have been implemented. More than half (16) of the recommendations are assessed as "amber" and for five (31 per cent) of these, action is planned but has yet to start. This is disappointing, given that the recommendations were made more than two years ago, with some dating back to 2018. I appreciate that during this time, we had the COVID-19 pandemic, which would have diverted the Government's attention and resources to deal with the measures that had to be put in place. However, some of the recommendations could have been addressed before the pandemic or picked up again sooner than they were.
3. I also noted differences in the progress made with recommendations by the entities responsible for their implementation. I am pleased to note that the Portfolio of the Civil Service (PoCS) has made some progress with many of the recommendations in the *Workforce Planning and Management in the Cayman Islands Government* report. I have therefore assessed progress with this report as Amber. However, some of the important recommendations have yet to be actioned. For example:
  - PoCS conducted a workforce readiness assessment in July 2019 as a first step toward developing an organisation-wide workforce plan for the whole of the Government. The target date for updating the central workforce plan remains unchanged from the one set four years ago (December 2023), but PoCS has significantly revised the target dates for some of the building blocks for the workforce plan. Without a workforce plan, the Civil Service cannot identify, develop and sustain the necessary workforce skills required to achieve its objectives now and in the future.
  - PoCS has not yet implemented the recommendation to improve its approach to succession planning to fill leadership and business-critical posts in the future. As of July 2022, 590 employees, representing about 13 per cent of all civil servants, are due to retire within the next six years. PoCS needs to identify which of the 590 employees are in business-critical posts and train and develop Caymanians to take up those roles in the future.
  - PoCS started implementing its new Human Resource Management System, my-Vista, in February 2022. The implementation is a step in the right direction. The system will make better information more accessible to managers and Human Resource staff to help them plan and manage the Civil Service workforce. However, PoCS plans to fully implement the system in December 2023, four years later than planned.

4. Concerning the *Efficiency of Summary Courts* report, it is disappointing that almost three years after making the recommendations, only three (23 per cent) of the 13 recommendations have been implemented. All three of these recommendations were directed to the Government. In other words, Judicial Administration has not fully implemented any of the ten recommendations directed to it and it is unclear if one was accepted. In relation to the other nine, only one is in progress. Judicial Administration has plans but has not started addressing four and has made no or limited progress for another four. We have therefore assessed Judicial Administration's progress as Red – No or limited progress. Some critical recommendations remain outstanding. For example:
- Judicial Administration has not yet established a performance management framework for the criminal justice system. The framework would help Judicial Administration understand the reasons for adjournments and delays in court cases and use the information to improve practices.
  - The status of the Outline Business Case for the new court building is not entirely clear, and some of the recommendations made by my Office and the PAC need to be implemented to feed into the business case before it is finalised. None of these have been actioned yet, and almost three years later, there is still no Outline Business Case for the project. Without considering users' needs or long-term projections of demand, the Outline Business Case for the new court building will be flawed and result in a court building that is not fit for its purpose. Judicial Administration is therefore also likely to incur unnecessary costs to modify the building later. I encourage Judicial Administration to perform stakeholder consultations and long-term demand projections as soon as possible and incorporate the results in the Outline Business Case.
5. In January 2022, the Deputy Governor took personal responsibility for coordinating and tabling Government Minutes. It is pleasing to note the positive impact of the Deputy Governor's commitment. Since my last follow-up report in February 2022, the Government has made commendable progress in drafting and tabling Government Minutes, tabling in Parliament the response to three PAC reports. In addition, the Cabinet approved the Government Minutes for another four reports in June 2022, and the Government plans to table these Minutes at the next sitting of the Parliament. However, I continue to be concerned that the lack of regular meetings of the Parliament contributes to the late tabling of Government Minutes, which hampers the accountability process.



Sue Winspear, CPFA  
Auditor General  
George Town, Grand Cayman  
Cayman Islands

28<sup>th</sup> September 2022

# APPENDIX 1 - WORKFORCE PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT IN THE CAYMAN ISLANDS GOVERNMENT (APRIL 2018)

---

The Public Accounts Committee (PAC) held three meetings to consider the report between 24<sup>th</sup> May and 24<sup>th</sup> October 2018. In its report, laid on the Table of the then Legislative Assembly (now Parliament) on 10<sup>th</sup> April 2019, the PAC concluded:

- Strategic workforce is a major issue for organisations worldwide. No matter whether they are a public or private sector organisation, small or large, it is essential that they consider what skills they need to operate and how to manage the talent they have. Demographic, societal and technological changes are affecting both the way services are delivered and availability of the workforce.
- The PAC endorses the recommendations of the Office of the Auditor General.
- The PAC recommends that:
  - The civil service should identify areas that could be done in-house rather than by consultants with a view to training and development of staff as well as the potential savings.
  - Legislation should be reviewed to determine the statutory requirements and the implications for workforce planning and development.
  - The potential workforce and budgetary implication of new laws should be considered and determined prior to legislation being approved and brought into force.

**OAG comment on the Government response:** The Government Minute was tabled in October 2020 and dated July 2020. The Government Minute did not provide any updates on progress with the 13 recommendations made by the OAG in April 2018. As a result of this and the time elapsed since the Government Minute in July 2020, the OAG obtained an update on progress from the Portfolio of the Civil Service (PoCS) between June and September 2022.

The PAC and OAG made a total of 16 recommendations. Of the 16 recommendations, three have been implemented (19 per cent), 11 have been partly implemented, are in progress or action is planned (69 per cent), and there has been no or limited progress with two recommendations (12 per cent). We have therefore assessed the overall progress with implementing the recommendations as **Amber** (Some progress).

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
<p>1. The Government should ensure that Ministries and large departments develop workforce plans to ensure that they can deliver their long-term strategic objectives. These should be combined to develop an organisation-wide workforce plan for the whole of the Government that sets out its workforce needs in the longer-term and how it plans to address these. (OAG)</p>	<p>The Government accepts this recommendation.</p> <p>Given the diversity of public services delivered by the Government, localised ownership by senior leaders is required as both business strategy and critical skills differ widely by functional area - e.g. the skillsets required for Waste Management will be different than those for Education as will be different from those for Policing. Consequently, strategic workforce plans must be developed from the ground up. From this work, common themes can be identified and tackled centrally.</p> <p>Central tools are currently being used to identify common skills gaps and to</p>	<p>No update provided in Government Minute.</p>	<p>Since March 2020, the PoCS has been heavily focused on supporting business continuity and the national pandemic mitigation strategy. As originally indicated, 2022 was the anticipated deadline for implementing the recommendation that Ministries and Departments develop and adopt workforce plans on a rolling basis.</p> <p>December 2023 was the timeline for the PoCS to collate the individual submissions in order to identify common themes within a central workforce plan. Whilst some time was lost</p>	<p><b>Implementation in progress.</b></p> <p>In April 2018, the Government committed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct a workforce planning readiness assessment by December 2018.</li> <li>• Adopt a workforce planning framework by December 2019.</li> <li>• Develop and adopt workforce plans for Ministries and departments on a rolling basis from 2020-2022.</li> <li>• Update the central workforce plan by December 2023.</li> </ul> <p>The workforce planning readiness assessment was completed in July 2019, seven months later than initially planned.</p>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)	
		<p>deploy central responses to the same. An example of this is the use of the CIG-wide Employee Engagement Survey and the resulting prioritization of leadership and management training within the Civil Service 5 Year Strategic Plan (the “5YSP”).</p> <p>Generally, the 5YSP contains a roadmap for addressing organization-wide themes which underpin workforce planning. Specifically, the CIG has committed to the following areas of workforce improvements, among others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Objective 2.1 – Foster World Class Leadership</b> (Initiatives: Establish Leadership Academy, Enhance Succession</li> </ul>		<p>over the past two years as the CIG shifted its focus to the pandemic response, a number of related work initiatives have been delivered.</p> <p>Namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PoCS commissioned a CIG-wide readiness assessment on workforce planning which assessed that a timeline of 3 to 5 years is more realistic. This assessment took into consideration the time required to put in place foundational elements including a Human Resource</li> </ul>	<p>PoCS has revised the deadline for adopting a workforce planning framework by over three years, from December 2019 (pre-covid) to March 2023.</p> <p>PoCS has also revised the deadline for Chief Officers to adopt workforce planning on a rolling basis to the same month (March 2023).</p> <p>However, the target date for updating the central workforce plan remains unchanged from the one set four years ago (December 2023).</p> <p><b>The PAC may wish to ask PoCs about:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The causes of the three-year delay in adopting a workforce planning framework.</b></li> </ul>



Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
	<p>Planning, Develop Strong Managers)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Objective 2.3 – Demonstrate Accountability and High Performance</b> (Initiatives: Provide a framework for improved goal setting which aligns broad outcomes with departmental and employee performance, Facilitate recognition and incentives for high performance, Provide leadership training and coaching on giving effective feedback, Extend use of 360 feedback, Streamline disciplinary process, Enhance management systems available to support and better</li> </ul>		<p>Management System (“HRMS”) to enhance management information and to free up senior HR personnel time to deal with more strategic initiatives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new HRMS has been procured and is currently being deployed across CIG.</li> <li>• PoCS has introduced the overview of CIG’s future HR service model.</li> <li>• A number of HR managers embedded within Ministries and Departments as well as centrally with the PoCS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Assurances that Ministries and Departments can adopt workforce planning in the same month that PoCS implements a workforce planning framework.</b></li> <li>• <b>Assurances that the updated central workforce plan will be finalised in December 2023.</b></li> </ul>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)	
		<p>integrate HCM functions)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Objective 3.1 - Maximise Participation in Effective Learning and Development Opportunities</b> (Initiatives: Develop learning and development policy, Expand range of learning opportunities, Establish curriculum advisory committees comprising internal experts... within respective professional/ vocational clusters, Establish methodology for assessing effectiveness of training in accordance with...training priorities.)</li> <li>• <b>Objective 3.3 - Develop a Civil Service Talent</b></li> </ul>		<p>have been trained in Strategic Workforce Planning.</p> <p>Related work that was undertaken in the 2018 Management Response and that has since been delivered includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Implementation and use of 360 feedback and Leadership Coaching (2021 &amp; 2022);</li> <li>2) Leadership training;</li> <li>3) Expanded range of learning opportunities (e.g. Senior Leadership Events, LinkedIn Learning);</li> <li>4) Establishment of development pathways for cross-government professions and</li> </ol>	

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)	
		<p><b>Plan</b> (Initiative: Develop a [Talent] Plan to identify the workforce requirements for being a World-class Civil Service, Strengthen succession planning for scarce skillsets or areas where Caymanians are historically underrepresented, Establish development pathways for cross-government professions and vocations, Adopt a common framework for strategic workforce planning which can be operated within ministries and departments.)</p> <p>Whilst the 5YSP provides a solid platform for initiating workforce planning, adopting Recommendation</p>		<p>vocations (done via LinkedIn Learning and, previously, Degreed)</p> <p>In line with the timeline as set out in the Readiness Assessment and Blue Print, PoCS is revising the target to implement a simplified framework and template for Ministry/Department use to March 2023. This includes adoption by Chief Officers and Heads of Department.</p> <p>The planned implementation date to update the central workforce plan is still December 2023.</p>	

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
		<p>#1 will ensure more consistent workforce planning at the functional-level and enable more targeted workforce planning centrally.</p> <p><b>Planned implementation date:</b> PoCS implement 5YSP's workforce strategy Jan 2018- Dec 2022.</p> <p>ODG/ SRIU produce CIG policy position and conduct readiness assessment by December 2018 and adopt workforce planning framework (tool and guidelines) by December 2019.</p> <p>Chief Officers/ HoDs develop and adopt workforce plans on a rolling basis 2020-2022.</p>		

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)	
		PoCS update central workforce plan by December 2023.			
2.	<p>The Government should develop a workforce planning framework that includes guidelines and tools to ensure that a consistent approach to workforce planning is adopted across government. (OAG)</p>	<p>CIG agrees that a workforce planning framework should be developed for use by Ministries and Departments across the CIG. This work is planned as part of the 5yrSP under Strategic Initiative 3.3d “Adopt a common framework for strategic workforce planning which can be operated within ministries and departments to fulfil their mandates in accordance with the elected Government’s policy priorities.”</p> <p><b>Planned implementation date:</b> See Response to Recommendation #1.</p>	No update provided in Government Minute.	See Government Update #1 (immediately above).	<p><b>Implementation in progress.</b></p> <p>PoCS has revised the deadline for adopting a workforce planning framework by over three years, from December 2019 (pre-covid) to March 2023.</p> <p>See the OAG comments at Recommendation 1 for potential lines of inquiry for the PAC.</p>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)	
3.	<p>The Government should clarify roles and responsibilities for, and develop a functional leadership approach to, workforce planning across government. (OAG)</p>	<p>The Government accepts this recommendation and agrees that more can be done to reinforce the roles and responsibilities outlined in the PSML, Personnel Regulations and job descriptions for strategic leaders and HR professionals. Workforce planning envisions significant involvement of management at all levels (strategic directors, managers and supervisors) as well as HR and data modelling professionals. This clarification will be made as part of the work to establish policy guidelines for workforce planning.</p> <p><b>Planned implementation date:</b> By December 2018.</p>	<p>No update provided in Government Minute.</p>	<p>The recommendation to clarify roles and responsibilities has been implemented. The CIG’s 2019 Report on Strategic Workforce Planning, identified clear roles and responsibilities at the departmental, Ministry and central PoCS levels which involve organisational leaders, HR professionals and finance professionals.</p>	<p><b>Implementation in progress.</b></p> <p>The Government’s 2019 Report on Strategic Workforce Planning identified clear roles and responsibilities at the departmental, Ministry and central PoCS levels. However, it is unclear if PoCS has shared the report mentioned and/or clarified roles and responsibilities with Ministries and Departments.</p> <p><b>The PAC may wish to ask PoCS if it has communicated to the Ministries and Departments their roles and responsibilities for Strategic Workforce Planning.</b></p>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
<p>4. The Government should collect and monitor additional information to support future recruitment and retention strategies, such as the cost and elapsed time of recruitment campaigns, including staff time spent on them; the success of recruitment campaigns, including information on barriers to successful recruitment; and exit interviews with staff. (OAG)</p>	<p>With the exception of exit interviews which are conducted inconsistently, the CIG already collects a significant amount of data necessary to support recruitment and retention strategies, including data linked to employee engagement, recruitment, learning and development, time recording, leave and absence management, formal qualifications, job evaluations, employee demographics, remuneration and benefits for employees and their dependents, Performance Management and 360 Feedback, and Recruitment costs.</p> <p>However, the data is extremely fragmented and stored in systems that are not fit for purpose and</p>	<p>No update provided in Government Minute.</p>	<p>Government has improved its collection and monitoring of information to support future recruitment and retention strategies. The first module of the new HR Management System (HRMS) to be launched was E-recruitment (February 2022). This module greatly improves centralised data on recruitment activities which are otherwise decentralised activities run by individual departments. E-Recruitment provides information on elapsed time of recruitment</p>	<p><b>Implementation in progress.</b></p> <p>PoCS did not accept the recommendation to increase the amount of data it collects – choosing to utilise existing data better instead.</p> <p>PoCS intended to improve the use of HR data by December 2020 after improving the Government’s HR management system. However, the rollout of the new HR management system was delayed until February 2022 and will not be completed until the end of 2023. Better use of HR data will not be fully achieved until then, more than three years later than planned.</p> <p>In April 2018, the Government committed to routinely performing exit surveys by December 2018.</p>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)	
		<p>require inordinate amounts of staff time to facilitate manual processing and analysis. The extent of data fragmentation renders the information at best labour intensive to access and at worse unusable. However, the solution lay in improving information management systems more often than collecting additional data.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the pronounced challenges previously described, each year the PoCS produces high-level analysis of Annual HR Trends in a report which it publishes. An extensive range of HR indicators are tracked at both a CIG-wide and department-specific level, many of which would aid recruitment and retention.</p>	<p>campaigns, recruitment outcomes and, by way of customer surveys, feedback on recruitment barriers from the perspective of job applicants. CIG already reports on retention at a departmental and organisational level in CIG’s Annual HR Trends Report.</p> <p>Implementation of the full HRMS system is currently in progress and will run through 2023. One module provides survey capability that can allow for more centralised delivery of exit surveys.</p> <p>This recommendation is partially complete.</p>	<p>PoCS has now revised this deadline to December 2023, five years later than planned.</p> <p><b>The PAC may wish to ask PoCS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>About the reasons for the delay in performing exit interviews.</b></li> <li>• <b>To confirm that the new HR management system (my-Vista) will enable centralised access for HR data to support future recruitment and retention strategies.</b></li> <li>• <b>How it is bridging the data gap in the meantime.</b></li> </ul>	



Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)	
		<p>Personnel in each Ministry are trained in the use of government’s HR and Financial systems and can themselves access identical data, albeit specific to the staff within their own Ministry/Department. To enable more evidenced-based workforce planning, information management tools need to be improved and Ministry/Departments have to become more intimately familiar with their data.</p> <p>We therefore do not accept the recommendation to increase the amount of data collected but rather will seek to improve our system capabilities that allow us to better utilise existing data.</p>		<p>The ongoing resolution of exit surveys is due for completion by December 2023.</p>	

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)	
		<p>The 5YSP anticipates the need to improve HR system capabilities under Strategic Initiative 2.3f (Refer to recommendation # 12 below.). With respect to exit surveys, CIG will adopt a routine practice of using exit surveys.</p> <p><b>Planned implementation date:</b> Exit surveys to be routine practice by December 2018 and Ministry/Department improved use of HR data by December 2020, following improvement in CIG’s HR management systems.</p>			
5.	The Government should improve its approach to succession planning to ensure that it is able to fill leadership and	The Government agrees and has already committed to this action within the 5yrSP under:	No update provided in Government Minute.	This recommendation is in progress. The PoCS recruited a resource to champion	<p><b>Implementation in progress.</b></p> <p>PoCS hired a succession planning champion in 2021 after its initial deadlines for implementing the</p>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
<p>business critical posts in the future. This should include tracking and monitoring the progress of succession plans for Caymanians. (OAG)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic Initiative 2.1C “Develop and Support Succession Planning Arrangements Across the Civil Service”, and</li> <li>• Strategic Initiative 3.3b “Strengthen succession planning for scarce skillsets or areas where Caymanians are historically underrepresented.”</li> </ul> <p><b>Planned implementation date:</b> 2.1C (i) by Jun. 2019. 2.1C (ii) and 3.3b by Dec. 2020.</p>		<p>succession planning (SP) during 2021.</p> <p>Over the past year as supported by the PoCS, departments have begun to identify posts that will become vacant over the next 6 years, to assess whether the role will be retained in the structure and, if so, whether the role is a key post. Agencies have begun to identify potential successors, to assess their readiness level and to identify what, if any, additional development may be required. Already, Caymanians are benefitting from departments’ work in this area and have</p>	<p>recommendation had elapsed.</p> <p>PoCS’s revised implementation date is December 2023, three years later than planned.</p> <p>Based on data provided by PoCS, as of July 2022, 590 employees, representing about 13 per cent of all civil servants, are due to retire within the next six years. PoCS is currently working with departments to identify which of the 590 employees are in business-critical posts.</p> <p><b>The PAC may wish to ask PoCS for an update on:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The exercise to identify which of the 590 roles that will become vacant over the next six years are business-critical posts.</b></li> </ul>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
			<p>been promoted as a result.</p> <p>Two areas of continued work are building consistent understanding of what constitutes a key role among business leaders and implementing the talent management module in the HRMS, which will improve data management to support the process.</p> <p>The PoCS proposes a revised target implementation date of 31 December 2023.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Implementing succession planning for the identified key roles.</b></li> </ul>
6.	The Government should introduce measures to improve the quality of staff	During the last fiscal year, the PoCS has appointed a dedicated HR Advisor, whose focus is to support leaders in managing the	No update provided in Government Minute.	<p><b>Implementation in progress.</b></p> <p>In our April 2018 report, the OAG proposed the following ways in which the Government could improve</p>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
performance management. (OAG)	<p>performance of teams across the civil service. Since June 2016, numerous training sessions have been delivered to hundreds of managers and rank and file staff to better understand the objectives and proper conduct of performance management. Managers are more consistently using performance improvement plans as part of the disciplinary process for persons identified for underperformance.</p> <p>Notwithstanding recent improvements, the CIG accepts that more can and must be done. The 5yrSP anticipates continual improvements in performance management under Strategic Initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.3a “Provide a framework and training</li> </ul>		<p>management. Specifically:</p> <p>2.3a – In 2022, CIG’s performance management process introduced organisational cascades which set priority objectives applicable to every civil servant, as well as targeted objectives applicable to specific groups, such as senior leaders. Also, when setting objectives, the process invites persons to link annual objectives to the applicable Strategic Broad Outcome.</p> <p>2.3b – CIG amended Personnel Regulations to support the use of one-off Honorariums. These have been used</p>	<p>the quality of staff performance management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building more regular performance discussions in to business as usual.</li> <li>• Equipping managers with the skills to have difficult conversations about poor performance.</li> <li>• Building calibration or moderation of scores by senior management in to the performance appraisal process to ensure that it is fair and any inconsistencies are addressed.</li> <li>• Using information to identify staff areas for development and employees who have the potential to grow and develop in to future leaders.</li> </ul> <p>As a direct result of the COVID-19 pandemic, the</p>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
	<p>to improve goal setting which better aligns broad outcomes with departmental and employee performance”,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.3b “Facilitate Recognition and incentives for achieving high performance”</li> <li>• 2.3c “Provide leaders with training and coaching on giving effective feedback and holding direct reports accountable”,</li> <li>• 2.3d “Extend the use of 360 feedback to all formal leadership roles”,</li> <li>• 2.3e “Streamline disciplinary procedures to ensure more timely resolution of [...] poor performance”,</li> <li>• 2.3f “Enhance management systems</li> </ul>		<p>in a number of ways, including to recognise high performance.</p> <p>In 2021-2022, CIG also introduced Team Awards to recognise and incentivise teams working across silos to achieve outcomes.</p> <p>2.3c and 2.3d - Implemented in 2021 &amp; 2022 with the roll-out of 360 feedback and leadership coaching.</p> <p>2.3e PoCS has drafted amendments to the Personnel Regulations and, in 2022, received advice from the Attorney General’s Chambers supporting proposed changes to disciplinary provisions in the Personnel</p>	<p>completion of 2020 performance appraisals was delayed until February 2021. In June 2022, PoCS issued guidance stating that the completion of 2021 performance appraisals was optional rather than mandatory and provided a deadline of end of September 2022 for completion.</p> <p>From our review of PoCS’ guide for the 2021 performance assessments, PoCS has not yet incorporated calibration or moderation of performance scores by senior management into the performance appraisal process. PoCS has incorporated the rest of the recommendations into the process.</p>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)	
		<p>available to support [...] performance management.”</p> <p>Approval has been sought and gained for drafting instructions to make changes to the Personnel Regulations in 2018.</p> <p><b>Planned implementation date:</b> In 2018, the following will be pursued: 2.3b, 2.3d and 2.3e.</p> <p>The other strategic initiatives will be implemented in phases to be completed by 2022. The scheduling of work will be communicated each year via Annual Implementation Plans.</p>		<p>Regulations which are planned for implementation in 2022.</p> <p>2.3f – <b>In progress.</b> In 2022, new performance management capabilities have been enabled in the new HRMS. The module will continue to be enhanced during 2022.</p>	<p><b>The PAC may wish to ask PoCS if, and when, it plans to incorporate calibration/moderation of scores into the performance appraisal process.</b></p>
7.	The Government should clarify how the new competency	This recommendation is partially accepted. The CIG contends the competency	No update provided in Government Minute.	PoCS only partially accepted this recommendation, as	<b>Recommendation implemented.</b>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
<p>framework fits with the current organisational structure to ensure that all staff are clear about how to apply it in the short term. (OAG)</p>	<p>framework already sets out how the framework is to be applied within the current organisational structure (see Core Competency Framework page 4 – “Profile Levels &amp; Profile Level Expectations” and pg. 2 – “Competency Framework” which states: “In addition to the core competencies contained in this framework, some Civil Servants may also have a set of functional competencies which speak to the professional or technical skills required to do their job”).</p> <p>The Core Competency Framework linked to the 5YSP, is the first competency framework adopted within the CIG, and following extensive consultation was specifically designed for</p>		<p>PoCS was confident that the competency framework already set out how it was to be applied within the current org structure.</p> <p>Updates on other activities in this area include:</p> <p>3.2a - Implemented January 2018</p> <p>3.2b - Implemented: Core competencies were initially rolled into Performance Management. They are now embedded in 360 Feedback tools and e-learning pathways based upon the relevant profile of Strategic Director, Manager/Supervisor</p>	



Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)	
		<p>ease of understanding and application.</p> <p>There are 3 profiles: Strategic Directors for senior leaders on Grades D and above, Managers/Supervisors for anyone who manages at least 1 member of staff and Individual Contributors for all other civil servants who do not have responsibility for leading or managing others.</p> <p>The Competency Framework was launched in January 2018 and incorporated into the 2018 performance agreements for Chief Officers and Heads of Departments. In 2019, the core competencies will be adopted for all employees.</p>		<p>or Individual Contributor.</p>	

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
		<p>Embedding the Competency Framework across the CIG is anticipated in the Strategic Plan under Strategic Initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3.2a “Develop and adopt a competency Framework which underpins the behaviours and skills necessary within a WCCS and which underpin the 5 Goals: Customer Experience, Leadership, Talent Development, Communications and Governance,” and</li> <li>• 3.2b “Align the competency framework to recruitment, performance management, succession planning</li> </ul>		

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)	
		<p>and learning and development”.</p> <p>A communication strategy for the Competency Framework is anticipated for quarter 3 of 2018, to ensure non-managerial employees receive awareness training prior to experiencing core competencies in their performance agreements in 2019.</p> <p><b>Planned implementation date:</b>  3.2a –Completed January 2018.  3.2b – By 2020.</p>			
8.	The Government should consider enhancing the competency framework in the longer term by	This recommendation is agreed as the Framework document clearly states that the core competencies	No update provided in Government Minute.	Implemented – CIG linked the core competencies to CIG’s organisational hierarchy by way of performance	<p><b>Implementation in progress.</b></p> <p>PoCS considered enhancing the competency framework but decided against it.</p>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
<p>including additional competencies and hierarchical levels, in order to better reflect the complexity of government by more clearly distinguishing what is expected of different grades and groupings of staff. (OAG)</p>	<p>will be periodically reviewed and updated.</p> <p>The review will not be undertaken immediately, given that the current framework was adopted in January 2018. However, following its roll out to all staff in 2019, there will be an opportunity to review the breadth of competencies and adequacy of the existing hierarchical profiles.</p> <p>Functional competencies will also be developed for various professional groups as part of the 5YSP.</p> <p><b>Planned implementation date:</b> A decision of whether to Review the Framework to be taken by March 2020, following the first full performance cycle where all employees have</p>		<p>management, learning and development and 360 Feedback.</p> <p>CIG’s HR considered further enhancing the competency framework and decided against it at this time. Instead, policy work is focused on building profession-specific competencies. Work is advancing in this area.</p> <p><b>Target implementation date: July 2023</b></p>	<p>PoCS’ revised implementation date to build profession-specific competencies is July 2023, more than five years after the original recommendation made by the OAG.</p> <p><b>The PAC may wish to ask PoCS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Why it decided not to enhance the competency framework.</b></li> <li>• <b>About reasons for the delay in implementing the recommendation (now planned for five years after it was originally made).</b></li> </ul>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)	
		adopted the core competencies within their performance management.			
9.	<p>The Government should ensure that it tracks and monitors the take up of training and development and ensure that it is in line with learning and development plans. (OAG)</p>	<p>This recommendation is agreed.</p> <p>It should be noted that centrally sponsored learning and development is tracked. Many departments also track L&amp;D using bespoke systems underpinned by annual performance documents. However, previously identified data fragmentation make alignment with other HR functions including personal development plans limited.</p> <p>It is anticipated in the 5YSP under Strategic Initiative 2.3f “Enhance management systems</p>	No update provided in Government Minute.	<p>Implemented – Where L&amp;D plans identify training priorities, these can be tracked by entering the training objective (for current or future roles) within the performance management module of the new HRMS. Where performance objectives are set for any employee, that employee and their Manager can track progress against targets. Also training, which is provided via the Civil Service College, whether in</p>	<p><b>Implementation in progress.</b></p> <p>Monitoring and tracking of L&amp;D plans has not yet been fully implemented because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Government made performance appraisals for 2021 optional because of the significant business disruption experienced during the year. The deadline for completion of the 2021 performance appraisals is 30 September 2022.</li> <li>• In addition, the rollout of the new HR management system only started in February 2022 and will not be completed until the end of 2023.</li> </ul>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
	<p>available to support and better integrate HCM functions” (See Recommendation #12 below).</p> <p><b>Planned implementation date:</b> By December 2022.</p>		<p>person or online, is tracked centrally.</p>	<p><b>The PAC may wish to ask PoCS if all Civil Service entities will be required to enter and track training and development needs identified during the performance appraisal process in the new HR system (my-Vista) in the future.</b></p>
<p>10. The Government should establish a formal talent management programme that identifies potential employees for leadership and identifies critical skills vacancies, now and in the longer-term, to ensure successful implementation of its upcoming five-year strategic plan. (OAG)</p>	<p>This recommendation is agreed and partially anticipated under Strategic Initiative 2.1B “Coordinate Leadership Cohorts [...] including aspirational leaders (i.e. high potentials in leadership pipeline.)”</p> <p>Cohorts of leaders and aspiring leaders are already undertaking Continuing Professional Development (CPD) in 2018 including the following:</p>	<p>No update provided in Government Minute.</p>	<p>Implemented - There are multiple formal channels for identifying potential future leaders.</p> <p>Civil Servants can opt into leadership learning cohorts at all levels – Aspiring Leaders (pre-college level course work suited to introducing persons to supervisory roles) to ILM levels 3 to 7 (roughly</p>	<p><b>Recommendation implemented.</b></p>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attendance of over 30 leaders and aspiring leaders at the IPAC Leadership Conference in Toronto (Feb 2018),</li> <li>• PoCS-sponsored CPD for senior and aspiring leaders: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Nita Clarke presenting on Engaging for Success</li> <li>○ ORC delivering training on Engagement and Engagement Action Planning.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• UK National School of Government International delivered training on change management,</li> <li>• Chamber of Commerce Leadership Cayman programme,</li> <li>• UCCI and FIU Executive Certificate in Global</li> </ul>		<p>equivalent to an associates to post-graduate degree level for management and senior leadership roles).</p> <p>Additionally, ongoing work within departments to identify successors for key roles and to support them with learning plans, is another way CIG is preparing future leaders.</p> <p>Secondments and Acting Appointments are widely used to provide persons with practical exposure and experience in new roles, including leadership roles. Use of this talent development tool has</p>	

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)	
		<p>Leadership for senior and mid-level leaders and persons who aspire to such roles.</p> <p>Additionally, work is contemplated to be performed by the curriculum advisory committees (Strategic Initiative 3.1c), which is comprised of internal experts in various professions who are led by the “Head of Profession”, and who identify critical skills at present and forecasted for the future, to inform career pathways, training priorities, succession planning and talent acquisition strategies.</p> <p>Subject to future budgetary approvals, an accelerated development programme is contemplated for persons</p>		<p>prepared civil servants at all levels, including as future Chief Officers.</p>	



Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)	
		<p>with high-potential for future promotion.</p> <p>Policy consideration is currently being given to re-assess the approach to internal promotions to better balance the requirements of open recruitment and meritocracy with the need to more easily facilitate promotions resulting from succession planning.</p> <p><b>Planned implementation date:</b> 2018 – 2022.</p>			
11.	The Government should review the resource levels and capacity of HR staff in ministries and departments to ensure that that they are sufficient to support	This recommendation is accepted to be completed in phases as initiatives contemplated within the 5YSP will significantly impact HR delivery.	No update provided in Government Minute.	Implemented - PoCS commissioned a review of Strategic Workforce Planning (SWP) in July 2019. The Report found that staffing levels would need to be	<p><b>Implementation in progress.</b></p> <p>PoCS now serves as the HR Curriculum Advisory Committee. PoCS developed a new HR Model that it communicated to stakeholders, including Chief</p>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
<p>workforce planning and management at both strategic and operational levels. (OAG)</p>	<p>In the short term, the PoCS will clarify organisational understanding of the role of HR and identify functional competencies, skills gaps and training priorities for HR professionals at all levels. This work is anticipated in the 5YSP under strategic initiative 3.1c “Establish curriculum advisory committees comprising internal experts to provide guidance on identifying annual training priorities for persons within the respective professional/vocational clusters.”</p> <p>In the medium term, it is agreed that a policy discussion will take place with the Deputy Governor and Chief Officers about improving HR outcomes</p>		<p>significantly increased to ensure adequate resources to support SWP, given that HR in CIG is decentralised, HR processes are largely manual and CIG agencies vary widely in size and complexity. The Report considered various HR models and recommended a hybrid approach which retained local embedding of HR, introduced shared services for smaller entities and required additional staff but fewer than is necessary under a fully decentralised approach. The efficiencies are also dependent upon greater use of</p>	<p>Officers, between February and April 2022.</p> <p>However, PoCS has revised the deadline for fully addressing the recommendation to June 2025, three years from now and 18 months after fully implementing the new HR Management System, my-Vista.</p> <p><b>The PAC may wish to ask PoCS if it has developed a plan or road map for transitioning to the new HR Model after my-Vista is fully rolled out in December 2023.</b></p>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
	<p>across Ministries and Departments. This will include a re-examination of the effectiveness of decentralisation and whether a modified approach is required.</p> <p><b>Planned implementation date:</b> Establish HR Curriculum Advisory Committee - by December 2018.</p> <p>HR Decentralisation Policy discussion – December 2021.</p>		<p>technology, which is currently being rolled out. This approach is captured in CIG’s new HR Model.</p> <p>CIG’s new HR Service Delivery Model sets out our intended approach to better utilise HR staffing complements. This was communicated to stakeholders, including Chief Officers, between February to April this year. The model is dependent upon adopting technology that will allow us to shift high volume and routine transactions to employee self-service and automated workflows. It then shifts valuable HR resources to more</p>	

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
			<p>complex and meaningful HR interventions. The realisation of this model is not complete but the building blocks are in progress with the ongoing rollout of MyVista. The system will be implemented by December 2023, but the benefits of shifting HR contributions will take up to an additional 18 months to realise (June 2025).</p> <p>At present, PoCS as head of profession serves as the HR Curriculum Advisory Committee. This function has been absorbed into our 'business-as-usual'.</p>	

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)	
12.	<p>The Government should urgently integrate its Human Resource systems to ensure that they are more efficient, making better information more easily accessible to managers and HR staff to help them plan and manage the workforce. (OAG)</p>	<p>This recommendation is agreed and anticipated within the 5YSP under strategic initiative 2.3f “Enhance management systems available to support and better integrate HCM functions including workforce planning, performance management, succession planning, training and development, etc.”</p> <p><b>Planned implementation date:</b> By December 2019.</p>	<p>No update provided in Government Minute.</p>	<p>Implementation in progress – CIG is implementing a new HRMS, which will greatly improve accessibility of information to allow for better workforce planning and management.</p> <p><b>Revised target for full implementation: December 2023</b></p>	<p><b>Implementation in progress.</b></p> <p>In 2018, the Government committed to rolling out a new HR management system by December 2019.</p> <p>The Government has now revised the target for the system’s full implementation to December 2023, four years later than planned.</p> <p><b>The PAC may wish to ask PoCS for reasons for the delay in implementing the new HR management system.</b></p>
13.	<p>The Government should address gaps in its workforce information, including sickness absence, and carry out regular analysis to provide better information for</p>	<p>See response to Recommendation 12 above in respect to improving HR systems to facilitate analysis of workforce information.</p>	<p>No update provided in Government Minute.</p>	<p>Implementation in progress – CIG is implementing a new HRMS, which will greatly improve accessibility of information to allow for better workforce</p>	<p><b>Action planned to implement the recommendation.</b></p> <p>It has been over four years since the OAG made this recommendation.</p>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
<p>workforce planning and management. (OAG)</p>	<p>Currently, the PoCS already carries out significant analysis of HR information which is available to Ministries in the form of the Annual HR Trends Report. On behalf of the ODG, the SRIU recently carried out an analysis of sick leave and is in the process of making recommendations to improve sick leave management.</p> <p>However, there remains a need for individual Ministries/Departments to monitor, analyse and respond to trends emerging at their civil service-entity levels, particularly as these correlate to their forecasted demand of services, scarcity of supply of talent, and the format of</p>		<p>planning and management.</p> <p>For example, the new time recording system has been implemented in Q1 of 2022.</p> <p>The SRIU stood down its manual approach to the analysis. Such reporting capabilities are now available through CIG’s new HR Management System, whilst work is ongoing to drive consistent practice in timely reporting.</p>	<p>It is unclear if PoCS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has addressed gaps in its workforce information, including sickness absence, pending its implementation of a new Human Resource Management System.</li> <li>• Made changes to sick leave management based on the Strategic Reforms Implementation Unit’s (“SRIU”) 2018 analysis.</li> <li>• Has conducted a further study of sickness absence since 2018.</li> </ul> <p><b>The PAC may wish to ask PoCS about:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The information available from the new HR management system, my-Vista.</b></li> <li>• <b>Recommendations made by the SRIU for sick leave</b></li> </ul>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
	<p>future service delivery in their respective agencies.</p> <p><b>Planned implementation date:</b> None given.</p>			<p><b>management after the 2018 analysis.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further analysis of sick leave data since 2018.</li> <li>• Any changes made to improve sick leave management based on the SRIU's 2018 analysis of sick leave data (and any subsequent analysis performed by PoCS).</li> </ul>
	The PAC endorses the recommendations of the Office of the Auditor General. (PAC)	N/A	The management response did not provide and update on implementation of the OAG recommendations.	See comments on recommendations 1 – 13 above.
14.	The civil service should identify areas that could be done in-house rather than by consultants with a view to training and development of staff	N/A	The Government agrees in principle with this recommendation. Training and development are priorities in the 5 Year Strategic Plan and are also recognized in the CIG Core	<p>The SRIU Professional Certification Programme is building Civil Service capabilities in the areas of business case development, project</p> <p><b>Recommendation implemented.</b></p> <p>The Government has trained staff with a view to getting more work done in-house rather than by consultants. We are aware from other</p>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
as well as the potential savings. (PAC)		<p>Competency Framework, where as individuals we have a responsibility to develop ourselves and managers have responsibility to develop their teams. This is an area where there has been significant increased activity and investment over the past few years, in particular in the areas of project management, business case development, change management, and leadership. There has also been some training in business process review and, more recently, in the area of innovation. As civil servants gain the practical experience in the areas they have received training and development for, we expect to see a decreased need to engage</p>	<p>management and change management. CIG has also increased staffing of Management Support Advisors in the MSU, who act as internal consultants within CIG.</p> <p>These programs have led to greater in-house expertise and building of the capabilities of our Civil Service.</p> <p>Examples of the Civil Service utilizing internal resources, rather than external consultants, include internally developed business cases to support major procurement projects and the delivery of complex programmes</p>	<p>work that as a result, in-house project managers have developed business cases for some projects like the Owen Roberts International Airport redevelopment.</p> <p><b>The PAC may wish to ask the Government for examples of other major procurement projects and complex programmes that have been delivered using in-house project managers.</b></p>



Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)	
			external consultants to provide some of those services. It should be noted that this model has been successfully used in the past to build our competence and decrease our reliance on external consultants in the area of financial management and audit preparation.	of change using in-house project managers.	
15.	Legislation should be reviewed to determine the statutory requirements and the implications for workforce planning and development. (PAC)	N/A	As Government moves towards the implementation of workforce planning, it is anticipated that any legislative requirements to facilitate it will be addressed as part of that work.	To date, no legislative change has been identified as being necessary to give effect to Strategic Workforce Planning. As the work progresses, if it is identified that legislative change is required, it will be addressed at that time.	<p><b>Limited progress.</b></p> <p>A full assessment of any legislative requirements depends on adopting a workforce planning framework and developing a central workforce plan.</p> <p>As stated in its response to Recommendation 1, PoCS has revised the deadline for adopting a workforce planning framework by over three years, from</p>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)	
				<p>December 2019 (pre-covid) to March 2023. However, PoCS still plans to update the central workforce plan by December 2023.</p> <p>The OAG will continue to follow up on this recommendation.</p>	
16.	<p>The potential workforce and budgetary implication of new laws should be considered and determined prior to legislation being approved and brought into force. (PAC)</p>	N/A	<p>The Government accepts this recommendation and notes that these considerations form part of the existing policy approval process whilst acknowledging that there is room to enhance our forecasting capabilities.</p>	<p>Implemented - Existing policy processes require explicit consideration of the workforce and budgetary implications when seeking Cabinet approval. Where a business case is also required, this adds greater depth to these considerations.</p> <p>Examples of policy process templates</p>	<p><b>No progress.</b></p> <p>The OAG is aware that Cabinet Papers include sections on workforce and financial implications.</p> <p>In our view the response does not address the recommendation made by the PAC. Our understanding of the PAC's recommendation is that Bills tabled should include information on potential workforce and budgetary</p>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (April 2018)	Response in Government Minute (July 2020)	Government Update (June – September 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
			<p>which address affordability, including HR costs, are the Cabinet Paper template, which requires discussion of Civil Service Implications, as well as CIG’s business case templates.</p>	<p>implications to allow for informed debate in the Parliament.</p> <p><b>The PAC may wish to ask the Government how it plans to ensure that the potential workforce and budgetary implications of news laws are considered before legislation is approved and brought into force.</b></p>

## APPENDIX 2 – EFFICIENCY OF SUMMARY COURTS (NOVEMBER 2019)

---

The Public Accounts Committee (PAC) held two meetings to consider the report on 7<sup>th</sup> January 2020 and 6<sup>th</sup> February 2020. In its report, laid on the Table of the then Legislative Assembly (now Parliament) on 1 July 2020, the PAC concluded:

- The importance of an efficient and effective justice system in promoting a fair and democratic society and contributing to economic growth is well documented. Fair, accessible and efficient courts serve to create positive relations among citizens and between the individual citizen and the state, helping to build public trust and confidence in the courts.
- The objective of the Office of the Auditor General’s audit was to evaluate the efficiency of the Cayman Islands judicial system in handling Summary Court (including Traffic Court) cases.
- The Committee fully endorses the 9 recommendations made by the Auditor General as set out in Appendix 2 to the OAG report and encourages Judicial Administration and the Government to implement these as soon as possible.
- The Committee is concerned about the volume of court adjournments and the lack of information on the reason for adjournment. The Committee recommends that Judicial Administration collect information on the reason for adjournments and uses this to inform decision making and improve practices.
- The Committee is concerned about progressing with the development of a new court facility when it does not appear to have a strong up-to-date Outline Business Case that justifies the investment needed. The Committee recommends that Judicial Administration, working with the Government’s Major Projects Office, ensures that the Outline Business Case for the project is updated to include long-term projections of demand. These projections should include potential case load, the implications of plans to remove traffic cases from the court process, and potential new ways of working that have been adopted during the recent COVID-19 pandemic.
- The Committee is concerned that the accountability arrangements for Judicial Administration appear to be blurred, and in particular the role of the Court Administrator, as Chief Officer, and to whom she is accountable. The Committee recommends that the Government make clear the reporting and accountability relationships between the Court Administrator, the Chief Justice and the Deputy Governor.
- The Committee was concerned to hear that the Government had announced cost of living awards for all civil servants without the additional cost of these being factored in to Judicial Administration’s budget. The Committee recommends that the Government properly budgets for pay awards to civil servants, factors these in to budgets and provides appropriate funding to entities.

**OAG comment on the Government response:** The Government Minute was tabled in June 2022 and dated September 2021. As a result, the OAG obtained an update on progress from Judicial Administration in August 2022.

The PAC and OAG made a total of 13 recommendations. Of the 13 recommendations, it is unclear if one (eight per cent) was accepted. Of the remaining 12, three have been implemented (23 per cent), five are in progress, or action is planned to implement them (38 per cent), but action to implement the recommendations has not started for four of these five, and there has been no or limited progress with four recommendations (31 per cent). We have therefore assessed the overall progress with implementing the recommendations as **Red** (Limited or no progress).

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (November 2019)	Response in Government Minute (June 2022)/ Judicial Administration Update (August 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
<p>1. Judicial Administration, together with all the criminal justice partners, should establish a performance management framework for the criminal justice system that includes measures and agreed standards, including the time taken for cases to proceed through the courts, the number of outstanding trials and the views of court users. Progress against these measures and standards should be monitored and reported regularly. (OAG)</p>	<p>Chief Officer would receive instructions from the Hon. Chief Justice to determine the nature and extent of engagement.</p> <p><b>Date of planned implementation:</b></p> <p>Chief Officer to discuss with Chief Justice only and obtain his guidance on how to proceed – April 2020.</p>	<p>In a court context, performance management within a criminal justice system as it relates to criminal justice partners is largely governed by court rules and practice directions. This is not the sole remit of administration. Accordingly, formulation of court policy as it affects the courts and the administration of justice lies with the Chief Justice and to some extent the Grand Court Rules Committee. The Chief Officer will provide input on policy issues and implement final policy directives as and when they are provided.</p> <p>In 2020, the Hon. Chief Justice introduced Grand Court Rules governing Criminal Case Management to govern the Grand</p>	<p><b>Action planned to implement the recommendation.</b></p> <p>In the Government Minute, Judicial Administration reported that several actions were underway or planned. However, in its later update to the OAG in August 2022, Judicial Administration did not provide updates on them. Therefore, it is unclear if the plans were implemented.</p> <p>Judicial Administration now plans to implement The International Framework for Court Excellence in 2023, more than three years after the OAG made the recommendation.</p>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (November 2019)	Response in Government Minute (June 2022)/ Judicial Administration Update (August 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
		<p>Court and has invited the Summary Court to review the Rules with a view to adopting similar standards for the movement of criminal cases through the Summary Court. It is expected that Summary Court Case Management Rules will be established by the end of 2021.</p> <p>Under the leadership of the Chief Magistrate this area is currently under review and appropriate stakeholder engagement will be taking place with a view to introducing a Summary Court case progression rules to support improved case progression management within that division.</p> <p>Further standards will also be monitored with the support of a newly procured Court Database which allows Judicial Administration to use analytics to support its case management</p>	<p><b>The PAC may wish to ask Judicial Administration:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>About reasons for the delay in implementing the recommendation.</b></li> <li>• <b>Whether the Summary Court established the Summary Court Case Management Rules by the end of 2021 as planned.</b></li> <li>• <b>For an update on stakeholder engagement in relation to Summary Court case progression.</b></li> <li>• <b>For an update on the implementation of the new Court Case database, including a target completion date.</b></li> <li>• <b>For a progress update on using analytics and monitoring and updating of key performance standards.</b></li> </ul>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (November 2019)	Response in Government Minute (June 2022)/ Judicial Administration Update (August 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
		<p>against established organizational standards.</p> <p>With the establishment of the rules and implementation of the new Court Management database, improved trial management can occur along with monitoring and updating of key performance standards.</p> <p>Judicial Administration therefore considers this recommendation as having been addressed.</p> <p><b>Update (August 2022):</b></p> <p>To this extent the Cayman Courts will in 2023 commence steps to adopt Court Excellence framework created by the International Consortium of Court Excellence.</p> <p>This exercise will in due course serve to enhance existing court performance initiatives already implemented by Judicial Administration.</p>	

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (November 2019)	Response in Government Minute (June 2022)/ Judicial Administration Update (August 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
<p>2. Judicial Administration should, with justice partners, monitor and evaluate the use of out-of-court disposals with a view to increasing their use in the justice system in the longer term if found to be efficient and effective. (OAG)</p>	<p>This is a jurisdictional point, as there is currently no requirement legislative or other requirement for justice partners to report out of court disposals to Judicial Administration.</p> <p>This would require legislative reform and/or Cabinet Policy approval - inter-ministerial engagement and resources to implement this process between justice partners. To be discussed with Hon. Chief Justice to obtain his guidance.</p> <p><b>Date of planned implementation:</b></p> <p>Chief Officer to discuss with Chief Justice Only and obtain his guidance on how to proceed – April 2020.</p>	<p>To the extent it is able to do so, the Judicial Administration already emphasizes the use of “out of court” disposal by way of a well-established mediation program.</p> <p>The realization of the widest potential of the recommendation as proposed by the OAG will require a bespoke legislative framework to establish a suite of out of court disposals in various areas of the criminal justice system.</p> <p>Whilst Judicial Administration is regarded as a key stakeholder on any wider government reform that is to take place to widen the scope of out of court disposals through legislation, such initiatives are likely to be led by the Hon. Attorney General through the Law Reform Commission to assess what out of court disposal options could be introduced into the</p>	<p><b>No progress.</b></p> <p>The OAG recommendation was two-fold:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That Judicial Administration work with others to monitor and evaluate the use of out-of-court disposals; and</li> <li>• That Judicial Administration work with others to increase the use of out-of-court disposals if they are deemed to be efficient and effective.</li> </ul> <p>The first part of the recommendation must be completed before the second part.</p> <p>From the response received it is not clear of the first part of this recommendation has been completed.</p> <p><b>The PAC may wish to ask Judicial Administration:</b></p>



Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (November 2019)	Response in Government Minute (June 2022)/ Judicial Administration Update (August 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
		<p>legislative justice framework that does not currently exist.</p> <p>The judiciary, through the Honourable Chief Justice, will continue to provide judicial input on any recommendations raised through such an initiative.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>What action it has taken to work with others to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of out-of-court disposals that are already in use.</b></li> <li>• <b>If it has discussed the need to extend the use of out-of-court disposals with other partners in the criminal justice system.</b></li> </ul>
3.	<p>Judicial Administration should develop a risk register and change management plan for the implementation of AMANDA JEMS and identify success measures for the project, including how it will monitor progress in order to demonstrate value for money. (OAG)</p>	<p>Judicial Administration agrees to the recommendation. Training in risk management required. Change Management Plan can be implemented.</p> <p><b>Date of planned implementation:</b> Change Management Plan – January 2020.  Risk Register – July 2020.</p> <p>In August 2021, a standing ICT Steering Committee was established within Judicial Administration to oversee all IT related projects that occur within the organization.</p> <p>This Committee oversees all IT related change management initiatives including the approval of Change Management Plans.</p> <p>The Committee will also have the responsibility to monitor and assess all risks and to liaise with the Risk Manager on the</p>	<p><b>Action planned to implement the recommendation.</b></p> <p>The original OAG recommendation was about the AMANDA JEMS system upgrade that Judicial Administration was implementing at the time.</p> <p>We understand from our financial audit work that the upgrade was delayed because of several changes in ownership of the system’s vendor. In addition, the vendor planned to discontinue support for the</p>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (November 2019)	Response in Government Minute (June 2022)/ Judicial Administration Update (August 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
		<p>development and Maintenance of a Risk Register regarding IT projects.</p> <p>For the purpose of this response, the implementation of the new court database will be managed under the auspices of the ICT Steering Committee.</p> <p>The establishment of a Risk Register and ongoing monitoring of success measures and risks will form a part of the change management and implementation plan.</p> <p>Judicial Administration therefore considers this recommendation as having been addressed.</p>	<p>system. As a result, Judicial Administration discontinued the system upgrade project and wrote off in 2020, the entire \$75k cost it had incurred for the upgrade as of December 2019. Judicial Administration is now implementing a new Court database system, “Curia”, to replace AMANDA JEMS. As of December 2021, Judicial Administration had spent \$125k on developing the Curia system.</p> <p><b>The PAC may wish to ask Judicial Administration if it has a change management plan, a risk register and success measures for the new Court database, “Curia”.</b></p>
4.	Judicial Administration and the other criminal justice organisations should work together to ensure that their IT systems enable effective sharing of information to	<p>This is a jurisdictional point. These agreements have to be made at a Cabinet level with resources to support this initiative. Judicial Administration in principle</p> <p>In principle this recommendation is supported by Judicial Administration.</p> <p>A fundamental part of Judicial Administration’s introduction of</p>	<p><b>Limited progress.</b></p> <p>Efforts to use IT systems to enable effective information sharing between Judicial Administration and other</p>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (November 2019)	Response in Government Minute (June 2022)/ Judicial Administration Update (August 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
<p>avoid duplication and reduce the risk of errors in data input. (OAG)</p>	<p>supports this recommendation and through its own IT developments has overtly attempted to create its own system to be integrated with other systems in the future, if the need arises. JA cannot speak to whether other government IT systems have this capability. Engagement with E-Government to be continued and if this recommendation is to be realised IT funding and resources would have to be applied to implement.</p> <p><b>Date of planned implementation:</b></p> <p>Chief Officer to discuss with Chief Justice only and obtain his guidance on how to proceed – April 2020.</p>	<p>new technology incorporates compatibility assessments and dialogue with key stakeholders, in particular the RCIPS where there is a significant amount of data that is shared between the entities.</p> <p>With respect to the new court database, stakeholder discussions with the RCIPS regarding the scope of information sharing is to commence with discussions between the two organisations.</p> <p>Of immediate urgency is the introduction of an Electronic Traffic Ticket system. Ongoing collaboration between the two entities (RCIPS and Judicial Administration) has been taking place for a number of years. Renewed engagement is currently taking place in consultation with the Hon. Chief Justice as this area of business has a significant impact on the business of the</p>	<p>criminal justice partners are in their early stages. For example, some discussions are yet to start or started recently (August 2022).</p> <p>The OAG will follow up on Judicial Administration’s progress with onboarding other criminal justice organisations to its new “Curia” platform in due course.</p> <p><b>The PAC may wish to ask Judicial Administration about:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>An update on the Electronic Traffic Ticket system, including a target date for implementation.</b></li> </ul>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (November 2019)	Response in Government Minute (June 2022)/ Judicial Administration Update (August 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
		<p>courts and court efficiency as a whole.</p> <p>It is expected that from these renewed discussions, meaningful movement in this area will take place.</p> <p>On a much wider front, as Judicial Administration IT projects are overseen by the Judicial Administration ICT Steering Committee, a formal invitation has already been made to the Computer Services Department as a key stakeholder to sit on the committee, as that agency will play an ongoing part in providing technical support to the various inter agency information sharing mechanisms to take place between the Judicial Administration IT system and the other government IT systems. A formal response is still being awaited on their participation on the committee.</p>	

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (November 2019)	Response in Government Minute (June 2022)/ Judicial Administration Update (August 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
		<p>This recommendation is being addressed by the Judicial Administration to the extent of its limited remit to do so.</p> <p><b>Update (August 2022):</b></p> <p>As a result of the CURIA platform project, stakeholder engagement with approximately 24 CIG agencies that interface with the criminal courts commenced in August 2022. This is to facilitate customization of the platform to allow government agencies not only to file their relevant case documents with the courts, but also to support two-way communication and information sharing between IT systems where possible.</p> <p>This stakeholder engagement and platform customization is expected to run into 2023, with entities, incrementally onboarding</p>	

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (November 2019)	Response in Government Minute (June 2022)/ Judicial Administration Update (August 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
		<p>onto the platform as external users.</p> <p>This initiative will require the support of other Agency executives and also the Computer Services Department.</p> <p>This recommendation is being addressed by the Judicial Administration to the extent of its limited remit.</p>	
<p>5. Judicial Administration should undertake financial analyses to identify the current costs of different types of cases being processed through the Summary Courts. This can be used as a baseline to track the impact of future measures to improve efficiency. (OAG)</p>	<p>Chief Officer would receive instructions from the Hon. Chief Justice to determine the means by which such cost analysis is to be conducted and the accompanying rationale where applicable for the same. This will require additional financial IT funding to customise JA database to monitor and calculate the costs in different cases.</p>	<p>Whilst performance management and efficiency measures are being introduced within the court system, there is currently no plan to extend such measurement to include a cost exercise for each case.</p> <p><b>Update (August 2022):</b></p> <p>This subject may form part of the Court Excellence initiative once the CURIA platform has been implemented.</p>	<p><b>It is not clear if Judicial Administration accepted the recommendation.</b></p> <p>It is unclear from Judicial Administration's responses if it accepted the recommendation, and what action, if any, is to be taken.</p> <p>However, we note that Judicial Administration stated that it is introducing efficiency measures. It is unclear how it will fully</p>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (November 2019)	Response in Government Minute (June 2022)/ Judicial Administration Update (August 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
		<p><b>Date of planned implementation:</b></p> <p>July 2020 only for cost analysis rationale to be completed.</p>	<p>measure efficiency without cost information.</p> <p><b>The PAC may wish to ask Judicial Administration:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Whether they accepted the recommendation.</b></li> <li>• <b>How Judicial Administration plans to measure efficiency without information on costs.</b></li> <li>• <b>When Judicial Administration will be in a position to confirm if costs of cases will be included in the Court Excellence initiative.</b></li> </ul>
6.	<p>Judicial Administration should, as a matter of urgency, engage with all court users to ensure that the design of the new court buildings takes into account the current and future needs of all stakeholders. (OAG)</p>	<p>Judicial Administration supports ongoing engagement with stakeholders, recognising that the modifications to the existing plan is constrained to funding, and improvements or changes will be more geared towards services as opposed to the plant. Qualified Court</p>	<p>This recommendation is supported to the extent that when the OBC team reviews the expansion of the court plant renewed engagement with stakeholders will take place. Earlier engagement occurred in 2015/2016 with stakeholder</p> <p><b>Limited progress.</b></p> <p>In November 2019, Judicial Administration committed to engaging with stakeholders about the design of the court buildings by April 2020. The engagement has not yet happened more than two years</p>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (November 2019)	Response in Government Minute (June 2022)/ Judicial Administration Update (August 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
	<p>Consultants are already engaged in this process.</p> <p><b>Date of planned implementation:</b></p> <p>April 2020</p>	<p>groups, but due to the passage of time, there is an opportunity to update stakeholder input.</p> <p><b>Update (August 2022):</b></p> <p>Stakeholder input has not commenced to date, however, Court accommodation assessment is underway with court facilities experts.</p>	<p>later. We note that Judicial Administration has not provided a new date for when this will be completed. This is essential information that needs to be factored into the Outline Business Case.</p> <p><b>The PAC may wish to ask Judicial Administration:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>When updated stakeholder engagement for the new court building will start and finish.</b></li> <li>• <b>About the target date for finalising the Outline Business Case for the new court building.</b></li> </ul>
7.	<p>Judicial Administration should ensure that the Outline Business Case for the new court building is in line with good practice, including a clear evidence base that</p>	<p>This recommendation is agreed. A professional firm has been retained through an open procurement process and the government’s expectation continues to be that industry standards on the preparation of</p>	<p><b>Implementation in progress.</b></p> <p>In November 2019, Judicial Administration stated it had limited control over the Outline Business Case (OBC) preparation and that the OBC was near completion. However, Judicial</p>



Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (November 2019)	Response in Government Minute (June 2022)/ Judicial Administration Update (August 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
demonstrates the need for investment. (OAG)	<p>requirements of being skilled in the preparation of Business Cases. This requirement would have had to have been formed at the initial stages when the tender for Business Case developers was sought by the CIG. It is expected that good practice is being employed by the contracted party. The Outline Business Case is near completion save for final review of the draft.</p> <p><b>Date of planned implementation:</b></p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>the Outline Business Case will continue to apply.</p> <p>This recommendation is considered to have been addressed.</p>	<p>Administration’s updated response in August 2022 suggests that the OBC is still being prepared.</p> <p><b>The PAC may wish to ask Judicial Administration about:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The status of the Outline Business case for the new court buildings.</b></li> <li>• <b>The oversight arrangements it has in place to ensure that the Outline Business Case prepared by the consultant is fit for purpose and is in line with good practice.</b></li> </ul>
8. Judicial Administration should develop a workforce plan that identifies the number of staff required to ensure that Summary Courts and other courts operate	Management agrees with this proposal. This assessment will be required to analyse the growth of business in the Courts and the human resources required to support that business need. POCS or	This initiative is currently being undertaken by the organisation. Notwithstanding this taking place, like other government entities the implementation of the workforce plan is largely dictated by	<p><b>Limited progress.</b></p> <p>Almost three years after the report was published, it is unclear how much progress Judicial Administration has</p>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (November 2019)	Response in Government Minute (June 2022)/ Judicial Administration Update (August 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
efficiently and effectively in the future. (OAG)	<p>other consultancy services will be required to support Judicial Administration in this exercise. Some additional funding would be required for the assessment and appropriate funding allocated by the legislature to hire the relevant staff to meet the identified business need.</p> <p><b>Date of planned implementation:</b> Completion of Analysis – July 2020.</p> <p>Proposal for additional staff through Budget review – September 2020.</p>	<p>availability of funding through the budget process.</p> <p>In keeping with the statutory constitutional requirement in section 107 of the 2009 Constitution Order, during the 2022 budget preparation process and moving forward a new and more collaborative approach to negotiating and settling the Judicial Administration budget has begun.</p> <p>It is expected that continued engagement on this front will support future workforce planning initiatives of the organisation to ensure that the Summary Courts and other courts operate efficiently and effectively in the future.</p> <p>Judicial Administration therefore considers this recommendation as having been addressed.</p> <p><b>Update (August 2022):</b></p>	<p>made with developing a workforce plan.</p> <p><b>The PAC may wish to ask Judicial Administration about:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Progress with developing a workforce plan.</b></li> <li>• <b>The target date for finalisation of the workforce plan.</b></li> </ul>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (November 2019)	Response in Government Minute (June 2022)/ Judicial Administration Update (August 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
		<p>This recommendation is ongoing. Work in this area has commenced, but is not complete as yet.</p> <p>This recommendation is considered to have been addressed by Judicial Administration.</p>	
<p>9. The Government should set up a senior strategic justice group that includes chief officers from all the organisations involved in delivering criminal justice in the Cayman Islands. (OAG)</p>	<p>Chief Officer would receive instructions from the Hon. Chief Justice to determine the nature and extent of engagement.</p> <p><b>Date of planned implementation:</b></p> <p>Chief Officer to discuss with Chief Justice only and obtain his guidance on how to proceed – April 2020.</p>	<p>Criminal justice is a broad topic which covers many bespoke areas beyond that of court administration.</p> <p>To that extent, where necessary, the Chief Officer for Judicial Administration (or her designate) from time to time participates in various boards or strategic working groups depending on the relevant area of criminal justice.</p> <p>Internally, however, as it affects judicial administration specifically, there are a number of bodies that have been formally established to facilitate specific outcomes that positively impact the</p>	<p><b>Recommendation implemented.</b></p> <p>The Government has set up several strategic justice groups in line with the OAG’s recommendation.</p> <p><b>The PAC may wish to ask how many times these various groups have met and what impact they have had on improving the criminal justice systems as a whole.</b></p>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (November 2019)	Response in Government Minute (June 2022)/ Judicial Administration Update (August 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
		<p>administration of justice within a court setting.</p> <p>The Criminal Justice Reform Committee (“CJRC”) established by the Chief Justice was led by Justice Quin and is now led by Justice Richards. It is a standing committee of the Courts, and its membership includes all stakeholders in the criminal justice system. The CJRC is charged with the responsibility of making recommendations for sentencing reform, as well as general improvements in the law and procedures for the administration of criminal justice.</p> <p>At present there is also an appropriately established Criminal Justice Board group, headed by the Chief Magistrate, to discuss and maintain open lines of communication on specific Summary Court related criminal justice matters. This board consists of the Chief Magistrate</p>	

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (November 2019)	Response in Government Minute (June 2022)/ Judicial Administration Update (August 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
		<p>and senior agency stakeholder who specialize in providing services to the court, such as probation, social services, prisons, RCIPS.</p> <p>Fluid and continuous engagement between key senior officer stakeholders i.e. the Court Administrator, Commissioner of Police and Director of Public Prosecution and Director of Prisons take place regularly with a view to shared strategic decision making that affects the smooth running of the administration of justice.</p>	
	The PAC fully endorses the 9 recommendations made by the Auditor General as asset out in Appendix 2 to the OAG report and encourages Judicial Administration and the Government to	N/A	See 1 – 9 above.

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (November 2019)	Response in Government Minute (June 2022)/ Judicial Administration Update (August 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
implement these as soon as possible.			
10. The Committee recommends that Judicial Administration collect information on the reason for adjournments and uses this to inform decision making and improve practices. (PAC)	N/A	<p>The Judicial Administration accepts this recommendation. The New Court database will address this issue and support improved case management.</p> <p><b>Update (August 2022):</b></p> <p>The Judicial Administration accepts this recommendation. Case progression rules have largely addressed this concern in the Grand Courts and case progression officers are to be introduced in the Summary Courts by the end of 2022.</p> <p>The Criminal Curia Platform for internal court users is currently being tested and continues to be under development and case progression which would include features of measuring cases for delays in court proceedings will be integrated into the system and</p>	<p><b>Action planned to implement the recommendation.</b></p> <p>Judicial Administration plans to implement the recommendation after it rolls out its new Court system database Curia.</p> <p>The OAG will follow up on this in due course, i.e., after Judicial Administration has fully implemented the new Court database system and case progression rules for Summary Courts.</p>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (November 2019)	Response in Government Minute (June 2022)/ Judicial Administration Update (August 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
		<p>form a part of the court user database.</p> <p>This should go a long way to addressing the impact too many adjournments are having in the court system and delay in justice.</p>	
11.	<p>The Committee recommends that Judicial Administration, working with the Government’s Major Projects Office, ensures that the Outline Business Case for the project is updated to include long-term projections of demand. These projections should include potential case load, the implications of plans to remove traffic cases from the court process, and potential new ways of working that have been adopted during the recent COVID-19 pandemic. (PAC)</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>This is accepted. MPO and the Business Case team continues to work together with a view to wrapping up the OBC.</p> <p>Justification for the expansion has been well established, however, updating of the full scope of the long-term needs will be updated as recommended by the Auditor General’s report.</p>	<p><b>Action planned to implement the recommendation.</b></p> <p>See OAG’s comments at recommendation 7.</p> <p><b>The PAC may wish to ask Judicial Administration:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>When it will finalise its long-term projections of demand.</b></li> <li>• <b>To provide assurances that the long-term projections will be factored into the Outline Business Case.</b></li> </ul>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (November 2019)	Response in Government Minute (June 2022)/ Judicial Administration Update (August 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
<p>12. The Committee recommends that the Government make clear the reporting and accountability relationships between the Court Administrator, the Chief Justice and the Deputy Governor. (PAC)</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The accountability of the Chief Officer is twofold:</p> <p>To the Deputy Governor for all things that impact wider government policy and legal compliance with the Public Service Management Act and the Public Management and Finance Act.</p> <p>To the Hon. Chief Justice: As the head of Judicial Administration which is an independent branch of government, policy decision making is exclusively his responsibility and cannot be passed to the administrative head of the organisation.</p> <p>To the extent that the Court Administrator is obliged to implement policy established by the Chief Justice as Head of the Judiciary that will have an impact on judicial administration, the Court Administrator discharges this obligation through various</p>	<p><b>Recommendation implemented.</b></p>



Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (November 2019)	Response in Government Minute (June 2022)/ Judicial Administration Update (August 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
		<p>initiatives to be carried out and implemented by the civil service.</p> <p>To this extent the recommendations made by the Auditor General that will impact the administration of justice must, as a result of the constitutional responsibility and separation of powers of the judiciary, have input and direction of the Hon. Chief Justice as the head of the judiciary.</p>	
<p>13. The Committee recommends that the Government properly budgets for pay awards to civil servants, factors these in to budgets and provides appropriate funding to entities. (PAC)</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>When Cabinet makes the decision to award a cost of living adjustment (COLA), it does not always coincide with the preparation of the Budget – which is prepared every two years. Therefore, the cost of a COLA is not always included in the Budget.</p> <p>Before a COLA award is made, the Ministry of Finance is consulted and the Ministry ensures that there are sufficient savings within</p>	<p><b>Recommendation implemented.</b></p> <p>The OAG is aware, from our financial audits, that cost of living adjustment (“COLA”) awards for civil servants are financed from savings within core government entities’ budgets or through supplementary appropriations.</p>

Recommendation	Original management response to OAG recommendation (November 2019)	Response in Government Minute (June 2022)/ Judicial Administration Update (August 2022)	OAG comment (September 2022)
		<p>the Government’s overall Budget to cover the full cost of the COLA. Where a Department does not have sufficient savings within their individual budget, savings are transferred from where savings have been identified to the Department that needs additional funding.</p>	

## **Contact us**

### Physical Address:

3rd Floor Anderson Square  
64 Shedden Road, George Town Grand Cayman

### Business hours:

8:30am - 4:30pm

### Mailing Address:

Office of the Auditor General  
P. O. Box 2583 Grand Cayman KY1- 1103  
CAYMAN ISLANDS  
Email: [auditorgeneral@oag.gov.ky](mailto:auditorgeneral@oag.gov.ky)  
T: (345) 244 3211 Fax: (345) 945 7738

## **Complaints**

To make a complaint about one of the organisations we audit or about the OAG itself, please contact Patrick Smith at our address, telephone or fax number or alternatively email: [patrick.smith@oag.gov.ky](mailto:patrick.smith@oag.gov.ky)

## **Freedom of Information**

For freedom of information requests please contact Patrick Smith at our address, telephone or fax number. Or alternatively email: [foi.aud@gov.ky](mailto:foi.aud@gov.ky)

## **Media enquiries**

For enquiries from journalists please contact Angela Cullen at our phone number or email: [Angela.Cullen@oag.gov.ky](mailto:Angela.Cullen@oag.gov.ky)



**September 2022**