

# INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT

# CIG E-MAIL COMMUNICATION RESPONSIVENESS

PORTFOLIO OF THE CIVIL SERVICE

Audit Reference 2019H1-08

JULY 2019



## INTERNAL AUDIT SERVICE

CAYMAN ISLANDS GOVERNMENT

This document was produced for THE CAYMAN ISLANDS GOVERNMENT. Unauthorised use or distribution is prohibited. No part of this document may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission from the Internal Audit Service or the Deputy Governor.

## 1. Introduction & Objectives

- 1.1. The Internal Audit Service (IAS) conducted a “CIG E-mail communication responsiveness” review as part of the agreed 2018/19 Internal Audit Plan.
- 1.2. This area was identified as a component part of one of the priority goals of CIG’s Strategic Plan for a World Class Civil Service: “Delivering an outstanding customer experience”. The public is increasingly looking to interact with CIG through its expanding web-based delivery channels. One such interaction is through the published e-mail contact points and online contact forms. The inherent risk is that once created, these contact points are neglected and become dysfunctional.
- 1.3. The primary objective of the review was to provide assurance that, at the time of testing, contact emails and contact forms in the public domain were valid and their use resulted in timely responses.

## 2. Audit Scope / Limitations on Work Undertaken

- 2.1. The audit scope included all e-mail contact points and on-line contact forms found published on core CIG government websites, as well as those published in Yello Media Group’s widely distributed “2019 Find Yello Cayman Islands Directory”.
- 2.2. Statutory Authorities & Government Companies (SAGC’s) and the Offices of the Auditor General and Ombudsman were excluded.
- 2.3. The review was designed to be a simple measure of responsiveness to a simplistic standard e-mail enquiry. The scope did not extend to reviewing the quality of responses to any actual communications from the public.
- 2.4. There were no limitations encountered during the course of the audit that impacted our ability to meet the agreed objective.

## 3. Audit Methodology

- 3.1. Work was planned to achieve the stated objective, and included the following steps:
  - Identifying the published e-mail addresses and online contact forms from public-facing core CIG websites, and from the widely distributed “2019 Find Yello” printed directory;
  - Sending a simple message requiring a response to these contact points; *and*
  - Analysing the responses received.

3.2. The message was sent from a 'gmail' account to appear as a legitimate public enquiry. It read:

"Good day. Could you please provide the name and phone number of an individual who can assist with a freedom of information request?  
*Kind regards, Thomas Watler*"

## 4. Audit Conclusion

4.1. Based on the work undertaken and the evidence reviewed, the IAS concludes:

**"Government's published e-mail addresses and website contact forms are not providing the public with a reliable contact channel.**

**Over a third of the 128 tested contact points failed to elicit a response.**

**Whilst such a failure rate undoubtedly falls short of Government's expectations, it is acknowledged that the majority of entities did respond, and did so in a timely fashion with an average response time of just over 6 hours."**

4.2. Our overall conclusion is made to help inform management action. In addition, we have made 3 recommendations designed to protect or enhance government operations. They have been accepted by Management with the timescales shown, and subject to any comments made, in the subsequent recommendations section of this report.

## 5. Recommendations & Management Responses / Action Plan

5.1. Recommendations are made with the intent to protect or enhance government operations. They are categorized as either high or standard priority. A recommendation is considered to be high priority if not implementing it is likely to result in any of the following:

- Substantial losses to the entity;
- Serious failure to comply with legal or regulatory requirements;
- Serious reputational damage to the entity;
- Inaccurate management information for important decision making purposes; *or*
- A material impact on financial reporting.

### HIGH PRIORITY RECOMMENDATIONS

<b>1</b>	<b><i>The entities assessed as ‘non-responders’ should be informed and requested to take remedial action.</i></b>	
	<i>NOTE: Internal Audit Service can legitimately undertake this function if requested to help.</i>	
	<b>Management Response:</b> Agreed. We will make contact with the entities concerned.	
	<i>Recommendation Owner:</i> Management Support Advisor, MSU	<i>Target Implementation Date:</i> August 2019

### STANDARD PRIORITY RECOMMENDATIONS

<b>2</b>	<b><i>Management should develop and publish recommended quality standards to govern e-mail responsiveness across Government operations.</i></b>	
	<b>Management Response:</b> Agreed. Goal 1 and Strategic Objective 1.2a of the 5 Year Strategic Plan will set operational standards which will include response to emails, which will set visible performance targets for employees. We will also publish the attainment or otherwise of these targets.	
	<i>Recommendation Owner:</i> Management Support Advisor, MSU	<i>Target Implementation Date:</i> December 2019

<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b><i>Management should introduce a monitoring programme to ensure CIG e-mail responsiveness meets the quality expectations of a ‘World Class’ Civil Service. The frequency of such monitoring would be proportionate to the results arising from each review that is undertaken.</i></b></p>	
	<p><b>Management Response:</b></p> <p>Agreed. See Recommendation 2 response – We will be publishing these targets and the customers will be able to see compliance.</p>	
	<table border="0"> <tr> <td data-bbox="240 583 711 657"> <p><i>Recommendation Owner:</i> Management Support Advisor, MSU</p> </td> <td data-bbox="862 583 1240 657"> <p><i>Target Implementation Date:</i> December 2019</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p><i>Recommendation Owner:</i> Management Support Advisor, MSU</p>
<p><i>Recommendation Owner:</i> Management Support Advisor, MSU</p>	<p><i>Target Implementation Date:</i> December 2019</p>	



# INTERNAL AUDIT SERVICE

## CAYMAN ISLANDS GOVERNMENT

**“Trusted advisors providing objective assurance, advice and insight  
to *enhance and protect* the Cayman Islands Government.”**