

BEST PRACTICES

1. **Institution:** Integrity Commission
2. **Title:** Public Complaints Mechanism, Acts of Corruption under Article VI of the Convention
3. **Description:** A public complaint must be made in writing and delivered to the Office of the Integrity Commission. Once the complaint is received it is recorded and if necessary, the complainant may be interviewed. The Commission then makes an assessment of the complaint and authorizes an investigation to be conducted by one investigator or a team of investigators. Once the investigation is complete, a Sub-committee reviews the investigator's findings and may make recommendations to the Commission. A report is then submitted to the Commission, which then decides whether there are reasonable grounds to refer the matter to the Director of Public Prosecutions or a Service Commission or to close the investigation. Both the complainant and the person being investigated are informed of the action to be taken.
4. **Reasons/Importance:** The regulation of the behaviour of all persons in public life and those who exercise public functions is pivotal to ensuring the proper and efficient performance of their duties. Public officials are required to treat all persons fairly and impartially without undue or preferential treatment in favour of any group or individual. In the instance where a person in public life acts contrary to the ethical standards and boundaries associated with the fair and transparent administering of public resources, it becomes important for affected persons to have access to a mechanism by which they can report such misgiving.
5. **Approach:** The design and methodology employed was to establish the Integrity Commission under the Integrity in Public Life Act Chap 22:01 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act"). The powers of the Commission are set out in sections 5(1) and 5(2) of the Act. The Act was last amended in 2010 to include the requirement for persons in public life to furnish a declaration of income, assets and liabilities within three months of entering public

office. This is evidence of the desire to ensure that the legislative mechanism is constantly updated.

6. Implementation: The Integrity Commission continues to educate the public on matters of integrity and the public complaints mechanism.
7. Outcome: The expected outcome of the Integrity Commission was to encourage person with knowledge of corruption being committed by persons in public life to make complaints via the complaint mechanism. In its 2017 Annual Report, the Commission noted that it addressed forty-three (43) complaints and completed investigations into fourteen (14) or thirty-three percent (33%) of them as compared to thirty-seven percent (37%) for the year 2016. Though the number for 2017 seems to have lessened as compared to 2016, the Commission noted that this was not an indicator of productivity as a number of these matters were voluminous, time consuming and labour intensive due to varying degrees of complexity.
8. Potential for technical cooperation: Yes, this best practice can be utilized by other countries.
9. Follow-up: The Commission is responsible for follow-up on investigations which results from complaints received.
10. Lessons: The Commission noted in its 2017 Annual Report that during the course of its investigations, a substantial number of complaints were rejected because of the insufficiency of the evidence in support of the complaint or a lack of probative value of such supporting evidence. Therefore the outcome of those investigations were that the action and / or omission complained of, disclosed no breach of the Act or the Prevention of Corruption Act or the individual complained against is neither a person in public life nor a person exercising a public function. To prevent recurrence of this issue, the Commission has embarked on further education campaigns.

11. Documents: For further information please see the following links:

<http://integritycommission.org.tt/New/type.html>

<http://integritycommission.org.tt/New/Reports/annu.pdf>

12. Contact:

Telephone:- 623-8305, 624-4736, 625-2393/962

Fax:- 624-5415

E-mail registrar@integritycommission.org.tt

Mailing Address - P.O. Box 1253, Port of Spain

Location

The Integrity Commission of Trinidad and Tobago Level 14,

Tower D

International Waterfront Centre

1 A Wrightson Road

Port of Spain.

BEST PRACTICES

1. Institution: Recruitment Unit, Public Service Commission (PSC)
2. Title: “Guidelines for the Selection of Candidates”. This best practice relates to the topic of systems of government hiring under Article III of the Convention.
3. Description: The “*Guidelines for the Selection of Candidates*” manual was prepared in December 2017 to assist Permanent Secretaries and Heads of Departments in the recruitment and selection of officers/persons for offices that are specific to their respective Ministries/Departments in accordance with Regulations 13 (5) to (7); 15 and 16 (3) to (6) of the Public Service Regulations. The Manual provides guidelines for the exercise of each function, as well as, specimens of relevant documents. The issuance of guidelines for government hiring should be considered a best practice as it lays down a specific procedure to be followed when hiring new public servants. These criteria aims to ensure that only the most suitable candidates are required so as to increase public sector efficiency and effectiveness. Since its implementation in 2017, the guidelines have allowed Permanent Secretaries and Head of Departments to filter only top quality applicants from the hundreds of applications received, in a significantly shorter period of time, thus lending to its sustainability.
4. Reasons/Importance: The arduous process of filling public sector vacancies triggered the need for the issuance of the “Guidelines for the Selection of Candidates”. A 2015 assessment of the operations of the Recruitment Unit documented the following critical observations. Certain positions have exponentially higher application rates leading to a massive strain on the PSC. Screening does not provide the required filtration in order to reduce the numbers of candidates for interviews. Peculiar positions with unique requirements pose certain difficulties to fill. The Recruitment Unit can spend up to 24 months trying to fill peculiar positions. The interface between Ministries and the PSC

cannot support requests for filling vacancies, this leads to quality issues regarding requests in terms of accuracy, completeness and timeliness.

5. Approach: The design and methodology employed was to draft a manual which provides guidelines for the exercise of each function, as well as, specimens of relevant documents.
6. Implementation: The PSC has since distributed its “Guidelines for Selection of Candidates” Manual to all Permanent Secretaries and Head of Departments across all Ministries.
7. Outcome: The expected outcome of the PSC is to achieve institutional strengthening. This process will involve changes to the organisational structure and work processes and is expected to address the challenges identified in (4) above. As a result of the issuance of the guidelines, Permanent Secretaries and Heads of Departments have been able to short list applicants to aid in filtration of applicants for specific positions.
8. Potential for technical cooperation: Yes, this best practice can be utilized by other countries.
9. Follow-up: The PSC is responsible for follow-up on implementation of guidelines by Permanent Secretaries and Heads of Departments. It must be noted that though Ministries and Departments are being authorized to advertise, screen, shortlist and assess candidates utilising the guidelines of the PSC, all appointments and promotions could only be made by the PSC.
10. Lessons:
11. Documents: (*See Trinidad and Tobago Country Report MESICIC Round 5 Section II Appendix*)
12. Contact: 52-58 Woodford Street, Newtown, Port of Spain.

[Tel:\(868\)623-2991/7](tel:(868)623-2991/7)

scd@gov.tt