

*In the matter of the
Complaints Commissioner Law (2006 Revision)*

Special Report to the Legislative Assembly

The Existence of Internal Complaints Processes in Government Entities in 2008

**Prepared by the Office of the Complaints Commissioner
Date: 30 May, 2008**

Published under the Authority of the Office of the Complaints Commissioner



Office of the Complaints Commissioner

PO Box 2252
202 Piccadilly Centre
28 Elgin Avenue
Grand Cayman
KY1-1107
Telephone (345) 943-2220
Facsimile (345) 943-2221

Aim of the Office: To investigate in a fair and independent manner complaints against government to ascertain whether injustice has been caused by improper, unreasonable, or inadequate government administrative conduct, and to ascertain the inequitable or unreasonable nature or operation of any enactment or rule of law.

The Existence of Internal Complaints Processes in Government Entities in 2008

Prepared by the Office of the Complaints Commissioner

30 May, 2008

Forward

In accordance with the powers conferred on the Commissioner under section 6 of the Complaints Commissioner Law (2006 Revision) this report was researched by Gary Cordes and written by Gary Cordes and Scott Swing.

His Excellency the Governor was provided with a copy of this report in advance of its presentation to the Legislative Assembly.

Synopsis

In early 2005 the Commissioner undertook, with the support of the Chief Secretary, a three year programme to encourage government entities to implement or review their internal complaints process (ICP).

An internal complaints process can be defined as any process, whether formal or informal, which allows stakeholders (e.g. community members) to submit complaints to government entities and to have the complaint dealt with in a responsible manner.

In the summer of 2006 the OCC conducted the first survey of government entities to ascertain which ones had an ICP. A second survey was completed in the spring of 2007 to determine what progress had been made by various government entities in developing and implementing their ICPs. This third survey was conducted in the spring of 2008.

The method used to conduct the fact-finding portion of the project was a combination of telephone interviews, e-mail correspondence and in some cases face to face meetings.

The results are summarised as follows. Of the 79 entities studied in the third survey, 9 were excused. Four of the 9 were identified as not requiring an ICP (for example, due to the entity's lack of exposure to the public and therefore a very small likelihood of receiving complaints from the public). Another five were part of the Attorney General's Chambers. Thus, 70 entities were identified as being suitable for operating an ICP and eligible for study in this survey. Of the 70 entities determined as being suitable for introducing and implementing a formal ICP 56 entities (80%) were identified as having a formal ICP. A further 14 entities have an informal procedure in place so that, taken together, the total number of ICPs in place as at spring 2008 was 70 (100%).

Continued encouragement and assistance is warranted in promoting ICPs within all government entities. Entities currently operating an informal ICP would benefit from the introduction of a formal, documented process. This will better ensure that the ICP is embedded within the culture of the organisation.

Special Report

Introduction

In early 2005 the Commissioner undertook, with the support of the Chief Secretary, a three year programme to encourage government entities to implement or review their ICP.

An internal complaints process can be defined as any process, whether formal or informal, which allows stakeholders (e.g. community members) to submit complaints to government entities and to have the complaint dealt with in a responsible manner. The process of receiving and addressing complaints is a vital tool in learning how to better serve one's clients. In the absence, or dysfunction, of an internal complaints process the benefits to an organization could be lost. While the potential benefit to an organization can be great, the ICP itself can be relatively simple.

The program evolved as follows. In early 2005 the Commissioner suggested to the Chief Secretary that it would be appropriate to determine which government entities had implemented an ICP. In supporting the suggestion, the Chief Secretary issued a memorandum asking the Chief Officer of the Portfolio of the Civil Service, Mr. Colin Ross, to issue a memorandum encouraging government entities to contact the Office of the Complaints Commissioner (OCC) for aid in creating, implementing, and reviewing their ICP. Mr. Ross later confirmed that the memorandum was issued.

In 2006 the first survey of various entities was conducted and the report "The Existence of Internal Complaints Processes in Government Entities in 2006" was composed. The report was then submitted to the Governor prior to its submission to the Legislative Assembly in January, 2007 under section 20(1) of the Complaints Commissioner Law (2006 Revision).

In October, 2006 the OCC organised a follow-up survey to ascertain what progress had been made by various government entities in developing and implementing their ICPs. The results are reported in "The Existence of Internal Complaints Processes in Government Entities in 2007", which was tabled in the Legislative Assembly on 31 August, 2007.

In spring 2008 the OCC conducted a third survey to ascertain progress made within government entities in establishing ICPs.

The results of this survey are contained herein.

Internal Complaints Processes Explained

An ICP is a procedure which allows residents of the Cayman Islands to submit complaints against a particular entity and to have them addressed in an orderly and timely manner. Some ICPs may be formal and highly structured while others may be informal and flexible. A formal process is more appropriate for those entities that have a high rate of contact with the public or an extended hierarchical management structure. Those entities that do not interact regularly with the public, or have a smaller number of employees, may wish to have a less formal procedure.

Purpose of the Project and Annual Surveys

The purpose of this project has been to increase the recognition of the importance of an ICP and to continue encouraging government entities to develop and implement an appropriate ICP for their organization. A survey was first conducted in the summer of 2006 to determine which entities had an ICP in operation, as well as which entities had made substantial progress in developing an ICP with the goal of implementation. As a continued effort to encourage and monitor the progress of entities in developing ICPs the OCC commenced a second survey in October 2006 concluding in February 2007 and this the third survey.

When, in the course of the survey it was determined that there was no ICP in place, the OCC encouraged those entities to create and implement one in the near future and offered assistance in reviewing and providing feedback on draft procedures.

It should be noted that in keeping with the scope of this project tribunals or similar public bodies were not included in any of the surveys conducted. It should also be noted that the purpose of the project was not to determine the appropriateness of a particular process or its effectiveness in dealing with complaints.

Method

The method used to conduct the fact-finding portion of the project was a combination of telephone interviews, e-mail correspondence and in some cases face to face meetings. In early March 2008 entities were contacted by email requesting current information on their ICPs and encouraging entities again to begin the process of formulating an ICP for their department if they had not yet done so. Where entities failed to respond, within the prescribed time frame, a further email was sent on 28 March notifying them that this report was being drafted and that should they wish to have the most current information included in this report they must provide it by 7 April, 2008. Where time permitted the OCC also attempted to contact several entities by telephone, and a final request to those entities still with no ICP documents having been submitted to the OCC was sent on 28 April, 2008. Responses received by 30 May, 2008 have been taken into account.

A small number of the responding entities, while not having a process in place, worked with the OCC to develop, and implement their ICP prior to the writing of this report.

While the most efficient method of data collection could be considered email, it is recognized that personal contact was well received. The personal contact allowed greater opportunity to add clarity and assist entities in identifying strategies for the development and implementation of ICPs. The e-mail campaign was designed to, and was able to, re-introduce the recipients to the merits and structure of the ICP.

An attachment titled "Creating an Internal Complaints Process" (Annex A), created by the OCC, was included in emails to the entities and utilized as a reference tool when meeting with various entities. It detailed the benefits of having an ICP and described possible implementation techniques.

It is relevant to point out that the term "entity" is used in a manner which does not differentiate between the sizes of working units. In consequence, the Portfolio of Internal and External Affairs and the Women's Resource Centre are both recorded as entities. The government schools are not included as they do not answer to a ministry, but rather to a

department – i.e., the Education Department. Statutory bodies and companies, such as Cayman Airways, are recorded as entities. Extraordinarily, the independent office of the Auditor General was included as an entity by consent.

Entities Contacted

Almost all government entities, seventy-nine in number, were considered in this survey. However, it was determined that four did not require an ICP. An additional five were excused from the survey on the basis that they were part of the Attorney General's Chambers (asserting their constitutional independence). Thus 70 formed the basis of the 2008 survey. The four entities identified as not requiring an ICP were not included because, in their current remit, the entity did not serve members of the public directly, but rather provided support to other government entities. This lack of exposure to the public results in a very small likelihood of complaints from the public. Others answered complaints through their ministry and another was identified as a non-governmental organisation.

Results

The purpose of increasing the recognition by all government entities of the importance of an ICP was achieved though continued contact with government entities through email and direct verbal contact. Contact with government entities provided confirmation as to which ones currently have an ICP in operation.

The results of the OCC's survey are below (for the full data table see Annex B).

Total number of entities within study remit	79
Total number of entities studied (being 9 less than those within remit, 5 being part of the Attorney General's Chambers and 4 identified as not requiring an ICP)	70
Total number of entities with a documented ICP	56
Total number of entities with an informal ICP	14
Total number of entities without an ICP	0

Those entities that have an ICP are as follows (* indicates informal process only):

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Agriculture, Department of | 26. District Administration* |
| 2. Auditor General's Office | 27. Economics and Statistics Office* |
| 3. Boatswain's Beach (Turtle Farm) | 28. Education, Department of |
| 4. Cadet Corps | 29. Elections Office |
| 5. Cayman Islands Development Bank* | 30. Electricity Regulatory Authority |
| 6. Cayman Airways | 31. Emergency Communications |
| 7. Cayman Islands Airports Authority | 32. Employment Relations, Department of |
| 8. Cayman Islands Investment Bureau | 33. Environment, Department of |
| 9. Cayman Islands Law School | 34. Environmental Health, Department of |
| 10. Cayman Islands Monetary Authority | 35. Finance & Economics, Portfolio of |
| 11. Cayman Islands National Museum | 36. Fire Services |
| 12. Cayman Islands Port Authority | 37. General Registry |
| 13. Cayman Islands Postal Service* | 38. Government Information Services |
| 14. Cayman Islands Shipping Registry* | 39. Health Insurance Commission |
| 15. Cayman National Cultural Foundation | 40. Health Services Authority |
| 16. CAYS Foundation* | 41. Her Majesty's Prison Service |
| 17. Children & Family Services, Department of | 42. Information and Communications Technology Authority |
| 18. Cinematographic Authority | 43. Internal and External Affairs, Portfolio of* |
| 19. CINICO | 44. Immigration, Department of* |
| 20. Civil Aviation Authority | 45. Judicial Department* |
| 21. Civil Service, Portfolio of | 46. Lands and Survey, Department of* |
| 22. Communications Works and Infrastructure, Ministry of | 47. Meteorological Office |
| 23. Computer Services, Department of | 48. Mosquito Research and Control* |
| 24. Counselling Services | 49. National Archive |
| 25. Customs | 50. National Gallery |
| | 51. National Housing* |

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| 52. National Pensions Office | 63. School's Inspectorate |
| 53. National Roads Authority | 64. Stock Exchange Authority* |
| 54. Passport Office | 65. Sunrise Adult Training Centre |
| 55. Planning, Department of | 66. Tourism, Department of |
| 56. Probation and Aftercare | 67. Vehicle Licensing and Transport,
Department of |
| 57. Public Health, Department of | 68. Water Authority |
| 58. Public Service Pensions Board | 69. Women's Resource Centre |
| 59. Public Works, Department of | 70. Youth and Sports, Department of |
| 60. Public Libraries | |
| 61. Radio Cayman* | |
| 62. RCIP | |

Conclusion

Of the 70 entities determined as being suitable for introducing and implementing a formal ICP 56 entities (80%) were identified as having a formal ICP. A further 14 entities have an informal procedure in place so that, taken together, the total number of ICPs in place as at spring 2008 was 70 (100%).

While the results of the survey are very encouraging it is somewhat disappointing that a few major government service providers such as the Postal Service, Immigration and Lands and Survey, do not yet have a formal ICP in place. The Postmaster General states she may have an ICP in place at the end of 2008. Given the size of this entity and its considerable interface with the public, the Postmaster General's unwillingness to embrace a formal ICP within the past three years is regrettable. Similarly disappointing is the fact that the Ministry of District Administration and the Portfolio of Internal and External Affairs have not yet formalised their ICPs.

Several entities, while already having a formal ICP in place, recognized after reviewing documentation provided by the OCC that changes could be made to their procedures which could create an even more effective ICP.

Entities currently operating an informal ICP would benefit from the introduction of a formal, documented process. Formalising the ICP better ensures the ICP is embedded within the culture of the organisation, for example, by forming part of the induction training for new staff and being written into internal procedures manuals.

The OCC remains willing to assist government entities to further develop and improve their ICPs.

Office of the Complaints Commissioner

Annex A: Creating an Internal Complaints Process

Office of the Complaints Commissioner
PO Box 2252
202 Piccadilly Centre
28 Elgin Avenue
Grand Cayman KY1-1107
943-2220

1. Introduction

The Commissioner encourages each governmental organisation to create, and to periodically revise, their organisation's internal complaints review process.

An internal complaints review process provides the organisation with an opportunity to assess the level of the quality of the service, and the timeliness of the service, that it provides to the public. The results of the assessment provide the information required to improve upon the delivery of its services.

The need to monitor and to improve the service given by governmental organisations has become a very important topic in our society. Now, much more so than in the past, governmental organisations have a direct impact on almost every person. There are an ever increasing number of programs and regulations administered by civil servants, and the rules that accompany the programs often-times are very complex. Also, people who use services are no longer as patient and forgiving as they once were. They demand timely and quality service.

An internal complaints process allows the organisation to gain valuable information from the people it serves, and it allows the organisation to improve its reputation. Information given by people complaining comes free of charge and often contains useful criticism. An organisation that listens, and corrects any errors, will be spoken of well by those who once were dissatisfied. It will also gain the respect of the broader community.

It is the duty of governmental organisations to serve the public. It is the role of civil servants to serve in a kind, courteous and competent manner. An internal complaints process will aid in achieving these service outcomes. All complaints may have value. Even frivolous complaints, or complaints made in bad faith, can inform management of the challenges faced by employees.

In the final analysis, an internal complaints process ensures that the organisation correctly completes the service, or makes the right decision, and it encourages the communication of reasons for actions.

2. Elements of an Internal Complaints Process

A well-designed complaints process will inspire confidence in the process, and increase the likelihood that the potential benefits, stated in the Introduction, will be realised. In the following paragraphs, the elements of an internal complaints process will be discussed. Once the process has been adapted to the working environment of an individual organisation, it must be implemented and publicised.

2.1 Definition of a complaint?

The organisation must work within its legislative mandate. This may limit the nature and type of complaints that can be addressed by the internal complaints process. For example, some legislation does not provide legal authority for an organisation to reconsider a decision but rather refers the matter to an appeal tribunal. However, all organisations can receive and address complaints about aspects of the delivery of the service, such as delay in providing a response or processing an application or a rude staff member.

It may be useful to gather complaints about the legislation and its effects on the public even though no immediate result can be promised.

2.2 Who can complain?

Complaints should be received from anyone. If a person has a complaint that is relevant to the organisation's role and responsibility in the community, it is best to receive the complaint. Of course, receiving a complaint does not necessarily mean that the complaint is valid. However, receiving the complaint allows the complainant to vent and allows the organisation to learn what is important to various people in the community and how various people perceive the role of the organisation. Receiving the complaint also allows the organisation to further educate people on the role of the organisation or alternate methods of seeking assistance, e.g. appeals or reviews provided for the relevant law.

2.3 How must the complaint be made?

Complaints should be received in writing or orally. Often people who are dissatisfied are not willing to spend further time writing a letter of complaint so a rule requiring complaints to be made in writing is counterproductive. However, it is worth considering whether or not a staff member should be assigned to make a note of an oral complaint and to ask the complainant to read it for accuracy and sign it. Contact details should also be noted.

Whether given in writing or orally, the complaint should carry equal weight. If not, then the complainant should be told the written complaints are treated differently.

2.4 Who will receive the complaint?

2.4.1 Senior Official

It is recommended that the complaints process be administered by a senior official within the organisation who is given reasonable powers. This will encourage the process'

credibility, effectiveness and accountability. The powers needed include the power to make a decision, reverse a previous decision and correct processes. (It is about the process not the staff member who applied or misapplied the rules. Staff issues are addressed by internal discipline.) Guidance can be taken from the mission statement of the organisation. No topic should be off-limits.

2.4.2 Experienced Official

It is recommended that the complaints process be administered by an officer who has an in-depth knowledge of the organisation gained through a reasonable number of years of experience in various divisions. Experience equips the officer with 'moral' authority to seek solutions and it assists the officer to locate the persons and solutions required.

2.4.3 Independent or Sequential Review

Depending on the size and culture of the organisation, the complaint can be received by a separate or 'independent' office in the department, or the complaint can be received by the senior official in the division of the organisation from which the complaint arose. For example, in larger organisations with a paramilitary structure such as the Police Service, a group of employees are set aside to hear and address complaints about service (and to investigate and address employee discipline). In small organisations with a familiar culture, such as the Law School, complaints by the students (primary users) and by the legal profession (secondary users) are handled by the Director.

It is possible to have a complaints process that uses established lines of accountability – a 'sequential' system. In this process, the complaint is first addressed by the line supervisor. While this may be the most cost-effective process in smaller organisations, the effectiveness of the process is subject to additional variables. For example, the supervisor may have limited powers, and thus be able only to address the specific complaint. Also the supervisor might not be empowered to (or inclined to) gather information that would influence the improvement of systems or effect changes to the system in question. Other duties reduce the likelihood that well reasoned recommendations are made. Recommendations made may be diluted as they are passed up the chain of command.

2.5 How is the Complaint Considered?

2.5.1 Time

The officer must acknowledge receiving the complaint and indicate the time-frame in which the complaint will be addressed. The time-frame must be reasonable in the light of the importance of the matter under consideration.

2.5.2 Gather information

All concerned parties must be given the opportunity to provide information and all relevant information must be gathered.

2.5.3 Confidentiality and Privacy

The process must protect the complainant's right of confidentiality (e.g. her application information or service concern must not be passed to other members of the organisation outside of the division) and privacy (e.g. not seek irrelevant - but interesting – personal information from her while investigating the complaint.)

2.5.4 Realistic Expectations

The complainant should be told that making a complaint does not mean that a decision will be reversed (as the original decision may be correct). Nor can the organisation guarantee that the Minister or the Legislature will improve a law or policy. Also, some complaints may take longer than others to investigate.

2.5.5 Decision and Reasons

The process must be concluded with a written decision including reasons for the decision. The reasons must be given in plain language and in sufficient detail (judged in the light of the gravity of the complaint) to allow the complainant to understand the result.

2.5.6 Remedies

The internal complaints procedure should include a wide range of remedies. The option to admit errors and apologize for them should be seen as not a weakness but as strength. For example, in addition to putting matters right, a letter of apology might be appropriate and, in some cases, compensation might be paid.

2.5.7 Share Result

Members of the organisation can learn from a complaint that has been received and addressed if this information is shared. They will be reminded of the existence of the internal complaints process. Also they will be informed of the manner in which a particular complaint arose and was resolved. Therefore the results of complaints should be shared within the organisation and, perhaps, publicly.

3. Document process and make it public

The internal complaints process should be clearly set out in the organisation's policy and procedures. Staff must be trained in the process and data must be collected. A clear summary of the process must be made available to the public, perhaps through information posters in waiting room and brochures. Employees should tell the public of the internal complaints process when it appears that the member of the public is not satisfied.

4. Make Exceptions

The internal complaints process must include a degree of flexibility. In some cases the complaint is so sensitive and grave that only the head of the organisation might properly receive it. In other cases, the process may not be suitable for some unanticipated reason.

5. Be Accessible

Public organisations must ensure that all persons have access to the internal complaints process. It is the one process that can improve defects in the other processes of the organisation.

6. Measuring Performance of the Internal Complaints Process

It is recommended that each organisation should include in its performance measurements targets for the addressing of complaints through its internal process.

Measurements should include targets such as the number of hours within which a telephone message left at the Complaint's desk is answered, the number of days within which a letter is sent to the complainant, and the number of days within which the complaint must be investigated. Also a target should be set concerning the preparation and communication of the result of the investigation.

The setting of targets, and the meeting the targets, will impress on the members of the organisation the importance of this process. Also, it will give additional emphasis and profile to the process, which in turn again enhances the importance of the process. Targets allow proper administration of the process. Finally, measuring performance allows the reports to the public about the volume and nature of complaints and their outcomes.

Sources:

Ombudsman of Ontario, 2003

Ombudsman of British Columbia, 2001

Ombudsman of Quebec

END of Annex A

Annex B: Data Table

Section A includes entities which did not have an ICP, or did not respond to earlier surveys, but now have an ICP.

Section B includes entities which were confirmed as having an ICP in the 2006 report.

Section C includes entities which were confirmed as having an ICP in the 2007 report.

Section D includes entities which were confirmed as not being suitable or eligible for study in this survey.

Section A

	Entity	Contact Person	ICP as at SPRING 2008	Evidence of ICP provided/Comments as at SPRING 2008
1	Agriculture, Department of	Adrian Estwick/Brian Crichlow	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
2	Boatswain Beach (Cayman Turtle Farm)	Joseph Ebanks	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
3	Cayman Islands Airport Authority	David Frederick	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
4	Cayman Islands Investment Bureau	Dax Basdeo	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
5	Cayman Islands National Museum	Doss Solomon	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
6	Cayman Islands Postal Services	Sheena Glasgow	Informal	Postmaster General responded "Sitting down and writing about how to deal with complaints is just not my priority. Dealing with the complaint and often resolving the problem behind the complaint is far more important to me."
7	Cayman National Cultural Foundation	Marcia Muttou	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
8	Children and Family Services, Department of	Deanna Look-Loy	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
9	Computer Services, Department of	Wesley Howell	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
10	General Registry	Delano Solomon	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08

	Section A (continued)			
	Entity	Contact Person	ICP as at SPRING 2008	Evidence of ICP provided/Comments as at SPRING 2008
11	Meteorological Office	Fred Sambula	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
12	National Roads Authority	Brian Tomlinson	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
13	Passport Office	Janice McLean	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
14	Planning, Department of	Kenneth Ebanks	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
15	Public Service Pensions Board	Jewel Evans- Lindsey	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
16	Public Works, Department of	Max Jones	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
17	Radio Cayman	Norma McField/Paulette Conolly-Bailey	Informal	Complaints from the public are referred by station staff to either Paulette Conolly-Bailey or Norma McField who will investigate the complaint and work to resolve the issue. If the complainant is not satisfied with the result, or if the issue is such that the station management can not address the issue it will be referred to the Ministry. In the event that the complaint relates to ICTA rule infractions the station's managers will attempt to resolve the issue. However some issues relating to ICTA rules can not be addressed by the station and therefore would go directly to the ICTA.
18	Sunrise Adult Training Centre	Roberta Gordon	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08

Section B

	Entity	Contact Person	ICP as at SPRING 2008	Evidence of ICP provided/Comments as at SPRING 2008
19	Auditor General's Office	Dan Duguay	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
20	Cadet Corps	A.C. Bobbeth O'Garro	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
21	Cayman Airways	Patrick Strasburger	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
22	Cayman Islands Development Bank	Angela Miller	Informal	The OCC was advised (as part of the 2006 review) that there is a complaints register and a procedure to follow when a complaint is lodged.
23	Cayman Islands Law School	Mitchell Davies	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
24	Cayman Islands Port Authority	Paul Hurlston	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
25	Cayman Islands Shipping Registry	Arthur Joel Walton & Kathryn Dinspel-Powell	Informal	The CISR noted (as part of the 2006 Survey) that they have a written procedure in place for dealing with complaints, compliments and suggestions.
26	CAYS Foundation	Acting CEO Angela Sealey	Informal	The OCC was advised (as part of the 2006 Survey) that the children are encouraged to resolve their issues or complaints at the lowest level possible as part of their social skills training which includes a more formal internal grievance procedure. However, parent's complaints are made to the Care Manager and then the CAYS CEO if the matter is not resolved.
27	CINICO	Gordon Rowell	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08

Section B (continued)				
	Entity	Contact Person	ICP as at SPRING 2008	Evidence of ICP provided/Comments as at SPRING 2008
28	Civil Service, Portfolio of	Peter Gough	Yes	The Portfolio of the Civil Service confirmed, as part of the 2006 Survey that they have a formal complaints procedure by which complaints are received, acknowledged and investigated.
29	Counseling Services	Shayne Scott	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
30	Education, Department of	Maria Bodden	Yes	The Education Department was not contacted by the OCC because they have implemented an ICP as a result of the OCC's previous recommendations.
31	Emergency Communications	Leslie Vernon	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
32	Employment Relations, Department of	Lonny Tibbetts	Yes	ICP provided in 2007
33	Environmental Health, Department of	Roydell Carter	Yes	Confirmed as part of an OCC audit in 2007
34	Health Insurance Commission	Mervyn Conolly	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
35	Health Services Authority	Lizette Yearwood	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
36	Her Majesty's Prison Service	Director Dwight Scott	Yes	ICP provided Spring 07
37	Immigration, Department of	Kerry Nixon	Informal	As the result of a 2006 OCC investigation, Immigration was to formalized their ICP and have it functioning through their customer service desk. However the department has reverted back to a system that is less structured. Persons having complaints must write a letter to the CIO and Deputy CIO, Kerry Nixon is currently charged with addressing all such complaints.
38	Information & Communications Technology Authority	Echard McLaughlin	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08

	Section B (continued)			
	Entity	Contact Person	ICP as at SPRING 2008	Evidence of ICP provided/Comments as at SPRING 2008
39	Judicial Department	Valdis Foldats	Informal	Judicial Administration was not contacted as the OCC had prior knowledge of its ICP. The complainant makes a complaint to the Clerk of the Court, Mr. Foldats.
40	Lands and Survey, Department of	Alan Jones	Informal	Mr. Jones stated (as part of the 2006 Survey) that they have procedures in place but that they will need to be revised in the near future.
41	National Housing	Maxine Gibson	Informal	National Housing (as part of the 2006 Survey) confirmed that they have an informal complaints process. All complaints are handled by the director who delegates as and if appropriate.
42	Probation/Aftercare	Theresa Echenique Owen	Yes	PACU confirmed (as part of the 2006 Survey) that forms are posted in the waiting area complete with envelopes addressed to the manager who meets with complainant. If it is not resolved then it will be heard by the parole board.
43	Public Health	Dr. Kumar	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
44	RCIP	Inspector Eustace Joseph	Yes	Police Law
45	School's Inspectorate	Deputy Director Mary Bowerman	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08

	Section B (continued)			
	Entity	Contact Person	ICP as at SPRING 2008	Evidence of ICP provided/Comments as at SPRING 2008
46	Stock Exchange Authority	Valia Theodoraki / Gerry Halischuck	Informal	Complaints received are addressed immediately by either Mr. Halischuck or the CEO. In appropriate circumstances, including potentially where SEA efforts prove insufficient to resolve the matter adequately, the subject matter of a complaint can be addressed with the Board of the Exchange (known as the Council) and ultimately with the Stock Exchange Authority.
47	Tourism, Department of	Joanne Gammage	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
48	Vehicle Licensing and Transport Department (Public Transport Unit)	Deputy Supervisor Roger Ebanks	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
49	Water Authority	Dr. Gelia Frederick-van Genderen	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
50	Women's Resource Centre	Tammy Ebanks Bishop	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08

Section C

	Entity	Contact Person	ICP as at SPRING 2008	Evidence of ICP provided/Comments as at SPRING 2008
51	Cayman Islands Monetary Authority	Cindy Scotland	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
52	Cinematographic Authority	Tamara Ebanks	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
53	Civil Aviation Authority	Richard Smith	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
54	Communications, Works and Infrastructure, Ministry of	Tamara Ebanks	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
55	Customs, Department of	Carlton Powery	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
56	District Administration	Jennifer Ahearn/Leyda Nicholson-Coe	Informal	Mr. Gomez confirmed by telephone (as part of the 2007 Survey) that the Ministry has an ICP. Ms. Ahearn reaffirmed (as part of this survey) that the Ministry's informal complaints process has been a long-standing policy of the Ministry to receive complaints and deal with them in an expeditious manner, with the nature of the complaint dictating the process.
57	Economics and Statistics Office	Maria Zingapan	Informal	Ms. Zingapan confirmed (as part of the 2007 Survey) that they do have an informal ICP. She has also committed to reviewing their procedure and consider creating a more structured ICP.
58	Elections Office	Kearney Gomez	Yes	Mr. Gomez stated that the complaints process for the Elections Office is founded in legislation and must be pursued through the Courts.
59	Electricity Regulatory Authority	Philip Thomas	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
60	Environment, Department of	Gina Ebanks-Petrie	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
61	Fire Services	Dennom Bodden/Rosworth McLaughlin	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08

	Section C (continued)			
	Entity	Contact Person	ICP as at SPRING 2008	Evidence of ICP provided/Comments as at SPRING 2008
62	Government Information Services	Angela Piercy	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
63	Internal & External Affairs, Portfolio of	Donovan Ebanks	Informal	Mr. Ebanks (as part of the 2007 Survey) said that the Portfolio currently have an informal complaints process. Mr. Ebanks has expressed interest in considering some changes which may improve their ability to track and monitor complaints.
64	Mosquito Research and Control	Dr. William Petrie	Informal	Current ICP is informal with the exception of complaints made about mosquitoes which are very carefully tracked through a computer based system.
65	National Archive	Kim Seymour	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
66	National Gallery	Nancy Barnard	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
67	National Pensions Office	Cyril Theriault	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
68	Portfolio of Finance & Economics	Sonia McLaughlin / Anne Owens	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
69	Public Libraries	Benedicta Conolly	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08
70	Youth and Sports, Department of	Dalton Watler	Yes	ICP provided Spring 08

Section D

	Entity	Contact Person	ICP as at SPRING 2008	Evidence of ICP provided/Comments as at SPRING 2008
1	Law Reform Commission	Cheryl Neblett	N/A	The OCC's request for information on ICP was referred to the Attorney General who in turn responded to the OCC requesting clarification as to the purpose of the OCC inquiry and referring to the independent nature of that office. As the result of the Attorney General's Chambers asserting their constitutional independence the offices under his preview were excused from this survey.
2	Law Revision Commission	Michael Bradley	N/A	Note comment for Law Reform Commission
3	Legal Affairs, Department of	Hon. Samuel Bulgin QC	N/A	Note comment for Law Reform Commission
4	Legal Department	Cheryl Richards	N/A	Note comment for Law Reform Commission
5	Legislative Drafting	Myrtle Brandt	N/A	Note comment for Law Reform Commission
6	Telecommunications Office	Kernilon Owens	N/A	Not Applicable as complaints dealt with via Ministry
7	Vehicle & Equipment Services, Department of	Dale Dacres	N/A	Not required - no public interface
8	Crisis Centre	Anne Hodge	N/A	NGO
9	Financial Reporting Authority	Mr. Lindsey Cacho	N/A	Not required - no public interface