

31 October 2018

Portfolio of Legal Affairs
P.O. Box 104
Grand Cayman KY1-9000
CAYMAN ISLANDS

Dear Ms. Sharma:

RE: Audit of 31 December 2017 financial statements

Purpose and use: We have completed our audit of the 31 December 2017 financial statements of Portfolio of Legal Affairs (“the Portfolio”) and have issued an unqualified audit opinion. In rendering my audit opinion on the financial statements I have relied on the work carried out on my behalf by a public accounting firm who performed their work in accordance with International Standards on Auditing.

Professional standards require that we communicate certain matters to those charged with governance of the Portfolio. This report has been prepared for the sole use of those charged with governance and we accept no responsibility for its use by a third party. Under the *Freedom of Information Law (2015 Revision)* it is the policy of the Office of the Auditor General to release all final reports proactively through our website: www.auditorgeneral.gov.ky.

AUDITORS RESPONSIBILITIES IN RELATION TO THE AUDIT

Auditor’s responsibility under International Standards on Auditing: International Standards on Auditing require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable, rather than absolute, assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit of financial statements is not designed to identify all matters that may be relevant to those charged with governance. Accordingly, the audit does not ordinarily identify all such matters and this report includes only those matters of a governance interest which came to our attention as a result of the performance of our audit.

Responsibilities of management and those charged with governance: Management's responsibilities are detailed in the engagement letter to which this engagement was subject. The audit of the financial statements does not relieve management or those charged with governance of their responsibilities.

Other information in documents containing audited financial statements: We have reviewed the Portfolio's Annual Report for the 18-month period ending 31 December 2017 and have provided comments in a separate communication with management.

GENERAL APPROACH AND OVERALL SCOPE OF THE AUDIT:

The accounting firm applied a top-down, risk-based approach to planning and conducting the audit, through the application of well-reasoned professional judgment. They obtained an understanding of the Portfolio's operations and the related risks, which drove our assessment of materiality and identification of audit risks, including significant risks, which are audit risks that require special audit considerations. They also obtained an understanding of how management controls these risks, by considering management's approach to internal controls, and determined how they will test significant account balances and classes of transactions.

The accounting firm's audit approach was a substantive audit approach; whereby they conducted substantive testing, on sample basis, of significant transactions and balances, and did limited testing of the operating effectiveness of controls.

AUDIT REPORT, SIGNIFICANT IDENTIFIED MISSTATEMENTS (BOTH RECORDED AND UNRECORDED) AND MANAGEMENT REPRESENTATIONS:

We have issued an unqualified audit opinion on the financial statements. There was no uncorrected audit misstatement identified by the accounting firm during the audit.

As part of the completion of our audit we seek written representations from management on aspects of the accounts and judgments and estimates made. Management has provided us with written representations in respect of our financial statement audit in a letter dated 2 May 2018.

SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS FROM THE AUDIT

Going concern doubts: As a result of our audit, we did not become aware of any material uncertainties related to events and conditions that may cast significant doubt on the entity's ability to continue as a going concern.

Significant accounting practices: We are responsible for providing our views about qualitative aspects of the Portfolio's significant accounting practices, including accounting policies, accounting estimates

and financial statement disclosures. Generally accepted accounting principles provide for the Portfolio to make accounting estimates and judgments about accounting policies and financial statement disclosures. We are not aware of any areas where the significant accounting practices have changed from previous year or are not consistent with general industry practice. In addition we are not aware of any new or controversial accounting practices reflected in the Portfolio's financial statements.

Significant risks and exposures: Significant risks and exposures are disclosed in the financial statement footnotes.

Management's judgments and accounting estimates: There were no matters which required management to make significant judgments or which required significant estimates.

Significant deficiencies in internal control: Matters relating to internal controls identified as part of our audit and communicated to us by the accounting firm who carried out the audit on our behalf are communicated in Appendix 1.

Fraud or illegal acts: Applicable auditing standards recognize that the primary responsibility for the prevention and detection of fraud and compliance with applicable laws and regulations rests with both those charged with governance of the entity and with management. It is important that management, with the oversight of those charged with governance, place a strong emphasis on fraud prevention, and fraud deterrence. They are also responsible for establishing and maintaining controls pertaining to the entity's objective of preparing financial statements that are presented fairly, in all material respects, in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework and managing risks that may give rise to material misstatements in those financial statements. In exercising oversight responsibility, those charged with governance should consider the potential for management override of controls or other inappropriate influence over the financial reporting process.

As auditors, in planning and performing the audit, we are required to reduce audit risk to an acceptably low level, including the risk of undetected misstatements in the financial statements due to fraud. However, we cannot obtain absolute assurance that material misstatements in the financial statements will be detected because of such factors as the use of judgment, the use of testing, the inherent limitations of internal control and the fact that much of the audit evidence available to the auditor is persuasive rather than conclusive in nature.

No fraud or illegal acts came to our attention as a result of our audit.

Disagreements with management: We have had no disagreements with management resulting from our audit.

Other miscellaneous matters: We are not aware of any consultations between management and other auditors about audit and accounting matters. We have no questions regarding management integrity. No serious difficulties were encountered in the performance of our audit. We are not aware of any impairment to our independence as auditors.

Other engagement commitments: There were no other specific matters agreed upon in the terms of our engagement.

If you would like to discuss the results of our audit or any other matters in further detail please feel free to call the Deputy Auditor General, Mr. Garnet Harrison at (345) 244-3213 or me at (345) 244-3201.

Yours sincerely,



Sue Winspear, CPFA
Auditor General

APPENDIX 1: MATTERS RELATING TO INTERNAL CONTROLS

In planning and performing our audit of the financial statements of the Portfolio of Legal Affairs (“the Portfolio”) as of and for the 18-month period ended 31 December 2017, we considered its internal controls over financial reporting in order to determine our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing our opinion on the financial statements and not to provide assurance on internal control. Our consideration of internal control would not necessarily identify all matters relating to internal controls that might be significant deficiencies (or other deficiencies that are not significant deficiencies) in the design or in the operation of internal controls, as defined under International Standards on Auditing below:

ISA 265 “Communicating deficiencies in internal control to those charged with governance and management” includes the following definitions of a deficiency and a significant deficiency in internal control:

Deficiency in internal control – This exists when:

- (i) A control is designed, implemented or operated in such a way that it is unable to prevent, or detect and correct, a misstatement in the financial statements on a timely basis; or
- (ii) A control necessary to prevent, or detect and correct, misstatements in the financial statements on a timely basis is missing.

Significant deficiency in internal control – A deficiency or combination of deficiencies in internal control that, in the auditor’s professional judgment, is of sufficient importance to merit the attention of those charged with governance.

We did not identify any deficiencies in internal control that we consider to be significant deficiencies, as defined above. However, we noted certain matters involving the system of internal control and its operation, and are submitting for your consideration related observations and recommendations designed to help the Portfolio improve the system of internal control.

* * * *

This report has been prepared for the sole use of those charged with governance and we accept no responsibility for its use by a third party. Under the *Freedom of Information Act (2015 Revision)* it is the policy of the Office of the Auditor General to release all audit reports upon request.

APPENDIX 1: MATTERS RELATING TO INTERNAL CONTROLS (continued)

1. No minutes of meetings held/no meeting held to discuss the performance of the Portfolio

Observation:	The team noted that no minutes of meetings/no meetings are documented/held for the Portfolio in the current and prior periods.
Potential effects:	From a governance perspective, the lack of evidence of key decisions being made and approvals of transactions could result in matters be missed which could have a material impact on the financial statements.
Recommendation:	All key decisions on the performance of the Portfolio, inclusive of the budgeting process be documented in the form of minutes of meetings.
Management response:	<i>Standard procedure were followed throughout the period to ensure that all key decisions/transactions which might have had a material impact on the financial statements were captured. The Chief Officer of the Entity received regular account updates from the CFO, and discussed key operations, as they arose, throughout the period. All expenditures were approved by senior management, processed and documented in accordance with the standard procedures during the financial period.</i>

2. Overdrawn bank account non-compliant with the *Public Management and Finance Law (2017 Revision)*

Observation:	During the audit, it was noted that one of the bank accounts of the Portfolio was in overdraft. According to the <i>Public Management and Finance Law (2017 Revision)</i> section 41(1)(d) – “A ministry or portfolio shall not permit any of its bank accounts to be overdrawn.”
Potential effects:	Non-compliance with the <i>Public Management and Finance Law (2017 Revision)</i> .
Recommendation:	Management implement processes to ensure that adherence to the relevant laws and regulations are achieved.
Management response:	<i>The Entity receives sufficient funding on a regular basis to meet all its obligations and commitments. Funds are initially deposited into the main operating account and subsequently transferred to secondary accounts as needed. The overdraft position resulted due to a timing difference in transferring funding to a secondary account. Management will review its existing processes.</i>

3. No tendering out of services provided by the Entity

Observation:	In performing the audit procedures, it was made known that the use of consultants and the services provided by the Security Centre are not tendered out to ensure value for money is being obtained.
Potential effects:	The Portfolio, as an extension of Government could be failing to meet the objective of obtaining value for money.
Recommendation:	The Portfolio of Legal Affairs should develop framework agreements or call-off contracts for the provision of legal services. In addition, the Portfolio should ensure that business cases are prepared to justify the need for consultants and the provision of services.
Management response:	<i>In relation to the provision of legal services, the Entity continued to ensure value for money was achieved by engaging external counsel in limited instances where specialist expertise was needed and/or where the Entity lacked sufficient internal resources to deal with the particular matter. In addition, the Entity engaged the services of counsel with whom it has had long-standing relationships and demonstrated skills/experience in the relevant area of law and at rates which were considerably lower than those charged by local external counsel. Moving forward, the Entity will engage with various firms as to the possibility of call-off or similar agreements for legal services. Justification statements will be prepared to record the need for external legal services.</i>