

TASMANIAN

Public Interest Disclosures Procedures

April 2021

(Version 1.2)

Document History

Approver	Chief Executive Officer
Date	26 February 2021
Commencement Date	9 April 2021

Document Control

CM Reference	21/13265
Review	9 April 2024

Document Revision

Version	Date	Who	What
1	25/2/21	Nell Streets	Draft procedures for approval by the Ombudsman
1.1	9/4/21	Nell Streets	Document updated to incorporate Ombudsman's comments and approval date
1.2	7/5/21	Nell Streets	Updated list of PID Officers

Accountability and Values

Alignment with Brand Tasmania values	The Public Interest Disclosures Procedures supports the Authority's commitment to its organisational values, and the State Service Code of Conduct and Principles
Applies to	All Brand Tasmania staff
Criticality (High/Medium/Low)	High

Acknowledgement

This Policy borrows from and in some cases replicates information from the Department of Premier and Cabinet. The assistance of the Department of Premier and Cabinet is acknowledged.

Contents

1. Glossary and Acronyms.....	1
2. Public Interest Disclosure Officers.....	2
3. Statement of Support	3
4. Purpose of these procedures.....	4
5. How the Act works	5
6. Roles and Responsibilities	6
6.1. Brand Tasmania Staff.....	6
6.2. CEO.....	6
6.3. PID Officer.....	7
6.4. Investigator.....	7
6.5. Welfare Manager	8
7. Who can make a disclosure?	9
7.1. Public officers.....	9
7.2. Contractors.....	9
7.3. Members of the public.....	9
7.4. Anonymous persons.....	9
8. What can a disclosure be made about?	10
8.1. Improper conduct.....	10
8.2. Corrupt conduct.....	11
8.3. Detrimental action.....	11
9. Where to make a disclosure.....	13
10. How to make a disclosure.....	15
10.1. Disclosure to brand tasmania.....	15
10.2. Written or oral disclosure.....	15
10.3. Disclosure to the Ombudsman	16
10.4. Disclosure to the Integrity Commission	16
11. Confidentiality	17
12. Assessing the disclosure	19
12.1. What should the recipient of the disclosure do upon receipt of the disclosure?	19
12.2. Is it a protected disclosure?.....	19

12.3. Mixed content disclosures	20
12.4. Risk Assessment.....	20
12.5. Referral of a protected disclosure to the Integrity Commission.....	21
12.6. Is the disclosure a public interest disclosure?	21
12.7. Referral of criminal conduct to the Commissioner of Police.....	22
13. Protection	24
13.1. When does protection commence?.....	24
13.2. What protection does the Act provide?	24
14. Investigation	25
14.1. Introduction	25
14.2. Matters that do not have to be investigated	25
14.3. Investigations under Employment Direction No. 5	26
14.4. Appointment of investigator and framing of terms of reference	27
14.5. Investigation plan.....	27
14.6. Procedural fairness	27
14.7. Conduct of the investigation	28
14.8. Referral of an investigation to the Ombudsman.....	29
14.9. Provision of information about the investigation	29
15. Action taken after an investigation.....	30
15.1. Investigator's final report.....	30
15.2. Action to be taken.....	30
16. Managing the welfare of the discloser	32
16.1. Support for the discloser.....	32
16.2. Discloser implicated in improper conduct.....	32
17. Management of the person against whom a disclosure has been made.....	34
18. Approval and review of these procedures	35

Attachments

- 1 Assessment of Disclosure Form
- 2 Risk Assessment Template
- 3 Ombudsman Notification Template
- 4 Ombudsman Flowchart

1. GLOSSARY AND ACRONYMS

Act	The <i>Public Interest Disclosures Act 2002</i> which encourages and facilitates disclosures of improper conduct by public officers and public bodies, to protect persons making those disclosures and others from reprisals, to provide for the matters disclosed to be properly investigated and dealt with to provide all parties involved in those disclosures with natural justice.
Brand Tasmania	Brand Tasmania, a public body as defined in the Act.
Brand Tasmania staff	All employees and officers of Brand Tasmania
CEO	The Chief Executive Officer, Brand Tasmania who is, as defined in section 3 of the Act, the Principal Officer for Brand Tasmania.
DPAC	The Department of Premier and Cabinet
iPac	The DPAC intranet site (available to Brand Tasmania staff).
PID	Public Interest Disclosure.
PID Officer	PID Officer, a person, who is an officer or employee of DPAC, appointed by the Secretary under section 62A(2) of the Act to receive and deal with PIDs.
Procedures	The procedures set out in this document describe how public officers and contractors can make disclosures about improper conduct or reprisal action within Brand Tasmania and how those disclosures will be dealt with.
Public Bodies	Public bodies as defined in section 4(1) of the Act.
Public Officers	Public officers as defined in section 4(2) of the Act.
Secretary	The Secretary, DPAC who is, as defined in section 3 of the Act, the Principal Officer for DPAC.

2. PUBLIC INTEREST DISCLOSURE OFFICERS

Principal Officer

Name	Todd Babiak
Title	Chief Executive Officer
Phone number	6232 7647
e-mail address	todd@brandtasmania.com.au

PID Officers

Name	Kirk Ashwood
Title	A/g Manager Human Resources, Corporate and Culture
Phone number	6270 5489
e-mail address	kirk.ashwood@dpac.tas.gov.au

Name	Andrew Prior
Title	A/g Senior Workplace Relations Consultant, SSMO
Phone number	6232 7276
e-mail address	andrew.prior@dpac.tas.gov.au

Name	Lauren Parr
Title	Manager, Strategic Projects and Programs
Phone number	6232 7087
e-mail address	lauren.parr@dpac.tas.gov.au

Name	Sarah Russell
Title	Assistant Director, Tasmanian Climate Change Office
Phone number	6232 7406
e-mail address	sarah.russell@dpac.tas.gov.au

3. STATEMENT OF SUPPORT

Brand Tasmania is committed to the aims and objectives of the *Public Interest Disclosures Act 2002*. It does not tolerate improper conduct by its employees or officers, or the taking of detrimental action against those who come forward to disclose such conduct.

Brand Tasmania recognises the value of transparency and accountability in its administrative and management practices and supports the making of disclosures that reveal the type of conduct to which the Act is directed.

Brand Tasmania will take all reasonable steps to protect people who make such a disclosure from any detrimental action in reprisal for making the disclosure, and to protect their welfare. It will also afford natural justice to all parties involved in the investigation of a disclosure.

These procedures establish a system for reporting disclosures of improper conduct or detrimental action by officers or employees of Brand Tasmania. The procedures are also intended to assist its officers and employees understand the way in which the Act operates and needs to be administered.

Brand Tasmania's organisational values were developed in 2020 with substantial employee involvement. These values are:

- No one succeeds alone
- We share and communicate
- We're obsessed with quality
- Find ways to make it fun
- Solve problems early

In relation to disclosures about improper conduct, Brand Tasmania agrees to:

- Not tolerate improper conduct by its employees or officers or the taking of detrimental action against those who disclose such conduct.
- Support the disclosure of improper conduct by its employees or officers and protect the rights of persons who make such disclosures.
- Actively care for the welfare and safety of those who disclose improper conduct from any threatened or actual detrimental action or other reprisals.
- Have internal procedures in place and sufficient trained Public Interest Disclosure Officers (PID Officers) to ensure that disclosures are investigated properly and dealt with rigorously.
- Afford natural justice to all parties involved in a public interest disclosure of improper conduct.

4. PURPOSE OF THESE PROCEDURES

These procedures set out how public officers and contractors can make disclosures about improper conduct or reprisal action within Brand Tasmania, and how in the Authority:

- Disclosures are assessed;
- Public interest disclosures are investigated;
- Disclosers are protected; and
- Procedural fairness¹ afforded to those being investigated.

The procedures for dealing with public interest disclosures have been prepared in accordance with the Ombudsman's *Guideline One: Procedures for Public Bodies*. This Guideline can be accessed on the Ombudsman's website at www.ombudsman.tas.gov.au.

These procedures are designed to complement the normal communication channels between supervisors and employees used within Brand Tasmania. Brand Tasmania staff are encouraged to continue to raise appropriate matters at any time with their supervisors, and to use existing grievance procedures within the organisation where appropriate.²

¹ Referred to as natural justice in the Act.

² Brand Tasmania staff should refer to the Complaint and Grievance Resolution Policy and Guidelines (CM 21/12743).

5. HOW THE ACT WORKS

Briefly, the Act works in this way:

- It gives certain people – *public officers* and *contractors* – the right to make disclosures about *improper conduct* or *detrimental action* to certain integrity agencies, other persons and bodies (Part 2 of the Act, particularly s 6);³
- It provides certain statutory protections for *protected disclosures*, even if the discloser does not reference the Act (Part 3);
- It dictates how the recipient of the disclosure is to deal with it (Parts 4 to 8);
- It treats the Ombudsman as the oversight agency in relation to the operation of the Act, including the default investigator, monitor of investigations by public bodies, and setter of standards under the Act;
- Where the disclosure is handled by the Ombudsman or a public body, it requires a determination as to whether the protected disclosure is a *public interest disclosure* (ss 30 and 33);
- Subject to exceptions, it requires investigation by the Ombudsman or public body of any public interest disclosure (ss 39 and 63);
- It requires such investigation to be conducted as soon as practicable, but if it is being conducted by a public body, not more than six months from the date of the determination that the disclosure is a public interest disclosure (ss 39A and 77A);
- It controls the manner in which a disclosure is investigated, and provides investigative powers; and
- In the case of an investigation by a public body which results in a finding that the alleged conduct occurred, it requires the public body to take action to prevent that conduct from continuing or recurring, and to take action to remedy any harm or loss which may have arisen (s 75).

A flow chart, which depicts the way in which a public body such as Brand Tasmania should deal with a disclosure, is at Attachment 4 to this document.

³ Members of the public may also make disclosures in limited circumstances, when the Ombudsman or Integrity Commission deems this in the public interest under s 7A of the Act.

6. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

This part explains the roles and responsibilities under the Act of individuals within Brand Tasmania.

6.1. BRAND TASMANIA STAFF

Any member of Brand Tasmania staff is encouraged to report known or suspected incidences of improper conduct or detrimental action in accordance with these procedures.

All Brand Tasmania staff have an important role to play in supporting those who have made disclosures. They must refrain from any activity that is, or could be perceived to be, victimisation or harassment of a person who makes a disclosure. They should protect and maintain the confidentiality of a person they know or suspect to have made a disclosure.

6.2. CEO

The CEO is the Principal Officer for Brand Tasmania and has primary responsibility for ensuring that the provisions of the Act are implemented by the Authority. Section 62A of the Act provides that, as Principal Officer, the CEO has responsibility for:

- Preparing these procedures for approval by the Ombudsman;
- Receiving public interest disclosures and ensuring they are dealt with in accordance with the Act;
- Ensuring the protection of witnesses;
- Ensuring the application of procedural fairness in the Authority's procedures;
- Ensuring the promotion of the importance of public interest disclosures and general education about the Act to all staff, and ensuring easy access to information about the Act and the procedures, and
- Providing access to confidential employee assistance programs and appropriately trained internal support staff for those involved in the process.

The CEO has delegated some of these functions and powers to DPAC PID Officers, appointed by the DPAC Secretary under the Act.⁴

⁴ DPAC provides a number of corporate support services to the Authority. This includes support for Brand Tasmania's PID responsibilities

6.3. PID OFFICER

PID Officers are appointed by the DPAC Secretary (as Principal Officer) under s 62A(2) of the Act.

PID Officers hold a delegation from the CEO to “receive public interest disclosures and ensure they are dealt with in accordance with the Act”, which enables them to:

- Act as a contact point for general advice about the operation of the Act for any person wishing to make a disclosure about improper conduct or detrimental action;
- Make arrangements for a disclosure to be made privately and discreetly and, if necessary, away from the workplace;
- Receive any disclosure from a public officer orally or in writing;
- Record in writing the details of any disclosure which is made orally;
- Impartially assess an allegation and determining whether it is a disclosure made in accordance with Part 2 of the Act (that is, “a protected disclosure”);
- Impartially assess under s 33 of the Act whether a disclosure is a “public interest disclosure”;
- Take all necessary steps to ensure that the identity of the discloser and the identity of the person who is the subject of the disclosure are kept confidential; and
- Undertake any administrative functions required to support the PID officer role under the Act.

A list of DPAC’s PID Officers and their contact details are provided at the beginning of these procedures.

6.4. INVESTIGATOR

Where it is determined that a disclosure is a public interest disclosure, or where the Ombudsman has referred a public interest disclosure to Brand Tasmania for investigation, the CEO appoints an investigator to investigate the matter in accordance with the Act.

An investigator may be a staff member of the Authority or DPAC who has the appropriate skills and experience or an external consultant or contractor engaged for that purpose.

6.5. WELFARE MANAGER

If a disclosure is made, a Welfare Manager will be appointed by the CEO or by a PID Officer, and is responsible for looking after the general welfare of the discloser.

The Welfare Manager will:

- Examine the immediate welfare and protection needs of a person who has made a disclosure, and develop a support plan for them;
- Advise the discloser of the legislative and administrative protections available to them;⁵
- Listen and sensitively respond to any concerns of harassment, intimidation, victimisation or other detrimental action which may be occurring in reprisal for making the disclosure; and
- So far as is practicable, protect the identity of the discloser in the course of carrying out these responsibilities.

A Welfare Manager may be a staff member of the Authority or DPAC who has the appropriate skills and experience or an external consultant or contractor engaged for that purpose.

The Welfare Manager must not be responsible for assessing or investigating the disclosure.

⁵ See Section 13 below for details of the legislative protections.

7. WHO CAN MAKE A DISCLOSURE?

7.1. PUBLIC OFFICERS

Any current public officer⁶ can make a disclosure to Brand Tasmania under the Act. This includes all employees and officers of the Authority

A public officer of another public body may also make a disclosure to Brand Tasmania about the conduct of Brand Tasmania staff.

7.2. CONTRACTORS

Current or past contractors and sub-contractors can make disclosures about public bodies, not public officers, but they can only make a disclosure to the Ombudsman or the Integrity Commission not to Brand Tasmania.

PID Officers in DPAC who become aware of any contractors wanting to make a disclosure about Brand Tasmania are to refer to them to either the Ombudsman or the Integrity Commission.

7.3. MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Members of the public can make a disclosure about a public body including Brand Tasmania, and may be treated in the same way as a contractor if it is in the public interest to do so, but they can only make the disclosure to the Ombudsman or Integrity Commission. The Ombudsman or Integrity Commission determines whether it is in the public interest to treat the discloser as a contractor, not the discloser.

PID Officers in DPAC who become aware of any members of the public wanting to make a disclosure about Brand Tasmania are to refer to them to either the Ombudsman or the Integrity Commission.

7.4. ANONYMOUS PERSONS

An anonymous disclosure may be accepted if the person receiving it is satisfied that the disclosure is being made by a public officer or contractor⁷. If the person is satisfied that an anonymous disclosure is from a contractor it should be referred to the Ombudsman.

⁶ This can include a public officer from another public body.

⁷ see s 8 of the Act

8. WHAT CAN A DISCLOSURE BE MADE ABOUT?

A disclosure can be made about one or more public officers or a public body itself. If a disclosure relates to Brand Tasmania as a whole or the CEO as an individual public officer, it should be referred to the Ombudsman or Integrity Commission as internal investigation would not be appropriate.

8.1. IMPROPER CONDUCT

Disclosures about a public officer need to relate to improper conduct by that officer, in the past, present or future (proposed action).

Section 3 of the Act defines improper conduct as:

- (a) conduct that constitutes an illegal or unlawful activity; or*
- (b) corrupt conduct; or*
- (c) conduct that constitutes maladministration; or*
- (d) conduct that constitutes professional misconduct; or*
- (e) conduct that constitutes a waste of public resources; or*
- (f) conduct that constitutes a danger to public health or safety or to both public health and safety; or*
- (g) conduct that constitutes a danger to the environment; or*
- (h) misconduct, including breaches of applicable codes of conduct; or*
- (i) conduct that constitutes detrimental action against a person who makes a public interest disclosure under this Act –*

that is serious or significant as determined in accordance with guidelines issued by the Ombudsman.⁸

Examples of improper conduct include:

- A member of staff accepts a gift (say a weekend at a resort) from a potential supplier involved in a tender process with the Authority;
- A member of staff responsible for collecting fees and charges from the public diverts money received to their personal bank account;
- A member of staff regularly takes home, for personal use, substantial amounts of office supplies and equipment purchased by the Authority; and
- A member of staff spends \$15,000 of public money on a staff Christmas party.

⁸ See Public Interest Disclosure Guideline Two: Serious or Significant Improper Conduct, available at www.ombudsman.tas.gov.au

8.2. CORRUPT CONDUCT

Corrupt conduct is further defined in s3 of the Act as:

- (a) conduct of a person (whether or not a public officer) that adversely affects, or could adversely affect, either directly or indirectly, the honest performance of a public officer's or public body's functions; or*
- (b) conduct of a public officer that amounts to the performance of any of their functions as a public officer dishonestly or with inappropriate partiality; or*
- (c) conduct of a public officer, a former public officer or a public body that amounts to a breach of public trust; or*
- (d) conduct of a public officer, a former public officer or a public body that amounts to the misuse of information or material acquired in the course of the performance of their functions as such (whether for the benefit of that person or body or otherwise); or*
- (e) a conspiracy or attempt to engage in conduct referred to in paragraph (a), (b), (c) or (d).*

Examples of corrupt conduct include:

- A member of staff takes a bribe in exchange for the discharge of a public duty;
- A member of staff favours unmeritorious applications for jobs or permits by friends and relatives; and
- At the request of a friend, a public officer accesses and discloses disciplinary record or other personal information about another officer.

8.3. DETRIMENTAL ACTION

Detrimental action, or reprisal action, against a discloser can be a form of improper conduct. It is defined in s3 of the Act, as including:

- (a) action causing injury, loss or damage; and*
- (b) intimidation or harassment; and*
- (c) discrimination, disadvantage or adverse treatment in relation to a person's employment, career, profession, trade or business, including the taking of disciplinary action; and*
- (d) threats of detrimental action.*

Examples of detrimental action include:

- Refusal of a deserved promotion;
- Demotion, transfer, isolation in the workplace or changing a person's duties to their disadvantage;
- Threats, abuse or other forms of harassment directly or indirectly against the discloser, their family or friends; and
- Discrimination against the discloser or their family and associates in applications for jobs, permits or tenders.

9. WHERE TO MAKE A DISCLOSURE

For the protections in the Act to apply, a disclosure needs to be made to the right person or body. The following table sets this out, in accordance with s7 of the Act:

Officer or public body to which the disclosure relates	Where the disclosure may be made
A member, officer or employee of a public body other than the Police Service or a State Service Agency	that public body; or the Integrity Commission; or the Ombudsman
A member, officer or employee of a public body that is a State Service Agency	that State Service Agency; or the Integrity Commission; or the Ombudsman
The principal officer of a public body or State Service Agency	the Ombudsman; or the Integrity Commission
A member of the Police Service, other than the Commissioner of Police	the Commissioner of Police
The Commissioner of Police	the Ombudsman
A member of the Legislative Council	the President of the Legislative Council
A member of the House of Assembly	the Speaker of the House
A councilor, within the meaning of the <i>Local Government Act 1993</i>	the Ombudsman
A person employed under the provisions of the <i>Parliamentary Privilege Act 1898</i>	the Ombudsman; or the Integrity Commission
The Auditor-General	the chairman of the Public Accounts Committee.
The Ombudsman	the Joint Standing Committee on Integrity
A person employed in an office of a Minister, Parliamentary Secretary or other Member of Parliament	the Ombudsman
In any other case, including if the disclosure is about a public body as opposed to an individual public officer	the Ombudsman; or the Integrity Commission

Specifically, in relation to Brand Tasmania, the correct entities to which a disclosure should be made are:

Officer or public body to which the disclosure relates	Where the disclosure may be made
An officer or employee of Brand Tasmania, other than the CEO	Brand Tasmania; or the Integrity Commission; or the Ombudsman
The CEO	the Ombudsman; or the Integrity Commission
A person employed in an office of a Minister, Parliamentary Secretary or other Member of Parliament	the Ombudsman
Brand Tasmania, as a public body, rather than an individual officer(s) or employee(s)	the Ombudsman; or the Integrity Commission

10. HOW TO MAKE A DISCLOSURE

10.1. DISCLOSURE TO BRAND TASMANIA

Public officers can make a disclosure about public officers of Brand Tasmania orally or in writing to one of the following:

- The CEO, who is the Principal Officer of the Authority for the purposes of the Act;
- or
- A PID Officer of DPAC.

A list of DPAC PID Officers and their contact details are provided at the beginning of these procedures.

If someone wants to make a disclosure about the CEO or Brand Tasmania in general, as a public body, they should be referred to the Ombudsman or the Integrity Commission.

10.2. WRITTEN OR ORAL DISCLOSURE

It is preferable that a disclosure be made in writing.

It should be addressed to Brand Tasmania, marked for the attention of the CEO or a PID Officer. A disclosure can be sent, delivered or left at:

Brand Tasmania
GPO Box 123
HOBART TAS 7001

or at

Executive Building
15 Murray Street
HOBART TAS 7000

Website: www.brandtasmania.com.au
Email: welcome@brandtasmania.com.au
Phone: 6232 7647

A public officer can also make an oral disclosure over the phone or in person to a PID Officer. An oral disclosure should be made in private. If a public officer is concerned about making a disclosure in person in the workplace, they can call or email the PID Officer to request a meeting in a location away from the workplace.

It is not a requirement that the person contemplating making a disclosure refers to the Act or is aware of the Act.

10.3. DISCLOSURE TO THE OMBUDSMAN

A disclosure may also be made directly to the Ombudsman.
The contact details for the Ombudsman are:

Ombudsman Tasmania
GPO Box 960
HOBART TAS 7001

or at

Level 6, 86 Collins Street
HOBART TAS 7000

Website: www.ombudsman.tas.gov.au
Email: ombudsman@ombudsman.tas.gov.au
Phone: 1800 001 170

10.4. DISCLOSURE TO THE INTEGRITY COMMISSION

A disclosure may also be made directly to the Integrity Commission. The Commission can deal with a protected disclosure about individuals under the *Integrity Commission Act 2009* or refer it to a public body or the Ombudsman. A protected disclosure about a public body would be referred to the Ombudsman.

The contact details for the Integrity Commission are:

Integrity Commission
GPO Box 822
HOBART TAS 7001

or at

Level 2
Surrey House
199 Macquarie Street
HOBART TAS 7000

Website: www.integrity.tas.gov.au
Email: contact@integrity.tas.gov.au
Phone: 1300 720 289

11. CONFIDENTIALITY

Brand Tasmania will take all reasonable steps to protect the identity of a discloser. Maintaining confidentiality is crucial to ensure that detrimental action is not taken against the discloser in reprisal for making the disclosure.

All reasonable care will also be taken to protect the privacy of witnesses and of the person against whom the disclosure has been made.

Section 23 of the Act requires any person who receives information in the course of or as a result of a protected disclosure or its investigation, not to disclose that information except in certain limited circumstances.

Disclosure of information in breach of this section constitutes an offence that is punishable by a maximum fine of 60 penalty units or six months imprisonment, or both.

The circumstances in which a person may disclose information obtained about a protected disclosure include:

- Where exercising their functions or the functions of the public body under the Act;
- When making a report or recommendation under the Act;
- When publishing statistics in the annual report of a public body; and
- In proceedings for certain offences under the Act.

The Act, however, prohibits the inclusion of particulars in any report or recommendation that is likely to lead to the identification of the discloser. The Act also prohibits the identification of the person who is the subject of the disclosure in any particulars included in an annual report made in accordance with Part 9 of the Act.

It may be necessary to consider disclosing information where:

- It is essential, having regard to the principles of natural justice, that the identifying information be disclosed to the person who is the subject of the disclosure;
- The investigating body believes that the disclosure of the identifying information is necessary for the matter to be effectively investigated; or
- The identity of the discloser is likely to be guessed from the circumstances of the disclosure and the risks for the discloser are better managed if their identity is known and specific warnings or risk management actions can be taken.

In these circumstances, the person who made the disclosure is to first be consulted before any action is taken. Obtaining permission in writing from the discloser prior to identifying them is also to be considered.

Brand Tasmania will ensure that all relevant files, whether paper or electronic, are kept securely and using security access controls and active caveats in the Brand Tasmania records and information management system to ensure those documents can only be accessed by the CEO, PID Officer(s), a relevant investigator, and (in relation to welfare matters only) the Welfare Manager.

All printed and electronic material will be kept in physical and/or digital files that are clearly marked as 'Confidential PID', and all materials relevant to a public interest disclosure and an investigation, such as interview recordings, witness statements and investigation reports, will be stored securely with access restricted to the relevant officers as indicated above.

Brand Tasmania officers who usually have system administration access to all electronic records, such as IT support staff, and records and information management managers and practitioners, will have that access removed for Confidential PID files.

A special electronic mailbox, PID@dpac.tas.gov.au, will be established for receipt of public interest disclosures with access restricted to the relevant officers as indicated above. If another member of Brand Tasmania staff is contacted, for example by email to another address, and they think the information they are being given is a disclosure about improper conduct they should immediately refer the person making contact to a PID Officer.

Care is also taken to ensure that all relevant phone calls and meetings are conducted in private.

Section 90 of the Act exempts documents from release under the *Right to Information Act 2009* to the extent that:

- They contain information regarding a disclosure; or
- Information that is likely to lead to the identification of the person who:
 - made the disclosure, or
 - the person who is the subject of the disclosure.

12. ASSESSING THE DISCLOSURE

The Act requires the taking of two distinct steps when assessing a disclosure. It first needs to be determined whether or not it qualifies as a protected disclosure, and thus attracts the protections contained in the Act. In order to do so it must satisfy the following prerequisites:

- Has it been made to the correct person or body; and
- If it has been correctly made to Brand Tasmania:
 - has it been made by a public officer (or, if the disclosure is anonymous, is the person receiving it satisfied that it is being made by a public officer),
 - is it about the conduct of a public officer,
 - does the discloser believe the public officer has, is or is proposing to engage in improper conduct,
 - is it about conduct that could objectively fall within the definition of improper conduct, and
 - does it concern conduct that occurred on or after 1 January 2001?

The next step is to determine if it is a public interest disclosure. This requires an assessment of the evidence provided by the discloser to determine if it shows or tends to show a public officer has, is or is proposing to engage in improper conduct.

12.1. WHAT SHOULD THE RECIPIENT OF THE DISCLOSURE DO UPON RECEIPT OF THE DISCLOSURE?

If the disclosure is oral, the recipient⁹ should make a file note as soon as possible. The note should record the time the disclosure was made, the circumstances under which it was made and, so far as is possible, the exact words used by the discloser. The recipient should ask the discloser to consider putting the disclosure in writing as soon as possible.

Unless the recipient is the CEO (or the disclosure is about the CEO), the recipient should immediately inform the CEO of the disclosure, and should provide the CEO with a copy of the disclosure, or record of the disclosure, and any accompanying documents.¹⁰

If the disclosure is about the CEO, contact the Ombudsman for advice.

12.2. IS IT A PROTECTED DISCLOSURE?

The protections for disclosers, provided in Part 3 of the Act, only apply where the disclosure is a protected disclosure made in accordance with Part 2 of the Act.

The CEO or a PID Officer will assess whether a disclosure has been made in accordance with Part 2 as soon as possible after it has been received.

⁹ In this context recipient means a PID Officer or the CEO. If another member of Brand Tasmania staff is contacted by someone and they think the information they are being given is a disclosure they should immediately refer the person making contact to a PID Officer.

¹⁰ Contractors or members of the public who wish to make a disclosure should be advised to contact the Ombudsman or Integrity Commission, as per Section 7.2.

The *Assessment of Disclosure Form* at Attachment 1 is to be completed as part of this process. It contains a series of questions going to the essential elements of a protected disclosure, and what is needed to be established before a disclosure can be a protected disclosure.

A separate *Assessment of Disclosure Form* will usually also be completed for each disclosure. This means, for example, that if a discloser is complaining about three different public officers, this constitutes three disclosures and three assessments should be completed.

If it is determined that it is a protected disclosure, the discloser is to be given information about the protections in the Act (such as a copy of Part 3 of the Act). These protections are to be explained to the discloser if necessary. The discloser is also to be informed of the process which will be followed with respect to the disclosure.

The CEO or a PID Officer is to also immediately appoint a Welfare Manager to protect the interests of the discloser and ensure that the discloser is advised of the name and contact details of that person.

A risk assessment is also to be completed.

12.3. MIXED CONTENT DISCLOSURES

Many disclosures will also contain personal grievances.

When conducting assessments of complaints or grievances the assessor¹¹ needs to be alert to identifying those aspects that could constitute a protected disclosure.

It is not a requirement that a discloser specify they are making a disclosure, the onus rests on Brand Tasmania to identify whether or not the Act applies. The assessor may discuss with the person whether they wish to make a public interest disclosure if it appears their concerns would meet the threshold.

Those matters that can be dealt with under the *Brand Tasmania's Complaint and Grievance Resolution Procedure* and those that are more appropriately dealt with under these procedures should be dealt with separately where possible.

If a complaint or grievance about an employee or officer of Brand Tasmania warrants an investigation under Employment Direction No. 5: *Procedures for the investigation and determination of whether an employee has breached the Code of Conduct*, then the matter may also potentially be assessed under these public interest disclosure procedures.

12.4. RISK ASSESSMENT

A risk assessment is to occur as soon as possible after the disclosure has been assessed as being a protected disclosure under the Act.

The risk assessment template at Attachment 2 is to be completed by the CEO or a PID Officer and any appropriate risk mitigation action required be implemented.

¹¹ The PID Officer or CEO

A single assessment can be made of all relevant risks, or separate assessments of the different risks relating to a particular disclosure, such as the risks to the discloser, the subject of the disclosure, any witnesses, or Brand Tasmania.

The discloser is usually the most able to identify potential reprisal risks, so input is to be sought from the discloser and the Welfare Manager in completing the risk assessment.

All reasonable steps to reduce risks of reprisal to the discloser are to be taken.

12.5. REFERRAL OF A PROTECTED DISCLOSURE TO THE INTEGRITY COMMISSION

Under Part 4A of the Act, Brand Tasmania may refer a protected disclosure, as distinct from a public interest disclosure, to the Integrity Commission where it considers that the disclosure relates to misconduct as defined in s 4(1) of the *Integrity Commission Act 2009*. Consideration should also be given to:

- Whether independent investigation of the subject matter of the disclosure by the Integrity Commission is preferable; and
- The views of the discloser and the Integrity Commission about whether the matter should be referred.

Brand Tasmania will notify the discloser of the referral under s 29D of the Act within a reasonable time (unless the disclosure was made anonymously).

The Integrity Commission may deal with the disclosure under its legislation, or it may refer the disclosure to the Ombudsman or a public body, as the case may require, for action in accordance with the Act.

12.6. IS THE DISCLOSURE A PUBLIC INTEREST DISCLOSURE?

Once a disclosure has been assessed as being a protected disclosure, a further determination must be made as to whether or not it is a public interest disclosure. The CEO or a PID Officer will make this determination under s 33 of the Act within 45 days of the receipt of the disclosure. The *Assessment of Disclosure Form* at Attachment 1 is used to ensure all the necessary requirements are considered.

For a disclosure to be a public interest disclosure, the CEO, or PID Officer with appropriate delegations, must be satisfied that the disclosure shows or tends to show that the public officer to whom the disclosure relates has:

- Engaged, is engaging or proposes to engage in improper conduct in their capacity as a public officer, or
- Taken, is taking or proposes to take detrimental action in reprisal for the making of the protected disclosure.

A disclosure must be more than a mere allegation without substantiation to meet this threshold. A disclosure must include an indication of the existence of evidence that, if substantiated, would show or tend to show that the alleged improper conduct occurred.

Where the CEO or a PID Officer determines that the disclosure amounts to a public interest disclosure, they will:

- Advise the CEO (if not the person assessing the disclosure);
- Notify the Ombudsman within 14 days of the decision using the notification template at Attachment 2;
- Notify the person making the disclosure within 14 days of the decision (unless they are anonymous and uncontactable); and
- Proceed to have the disclosed matter investigated under Part 7 of the Act.

If the CEO or PID Officer determines that the disclosure is not a public interest disclosure, they will:

- advise the CEO (if not the person assessing the disclosure);
- notify the Ombudsman within 14 days of the decision using the notification template at Attachment 2; and
- notify the person making the disclosure within 14 days of the decision (unless they are anonymous and uncontactable) – see s 35.

The Ombudsman must then review this decision under s 35(2).

If, on review of the matter, the Ombudsman agrees that the disclosure is not a public interest disclosure, it does not need to be dealt with under the Act. The CEO, or the PID Officer in consultation with the CEO, will then decide how the disclosure should be dealt with.

If the Ombudsman determines on review that the disclosure is a public interest disclosure, it may be referred back to the public body under s 42 for investigation under the Act or the Ombudsman will deal with the disclosed matter.

12.7. REFERRAL OF CRIMINAL CONDUCT TO THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE

It is possible that, before or during the investigation of a public interest disclosure, facts are uncovered that indicate the possibility that a criminal offence might have been committed. If this happens, Brand Tasmania will not commence, or will suspend, the investigation and will consult with the Ombudsman as to the future conduct of the matter.

Under s 41 of the Act, the Ombudsman has the power to refer a public interest disclosure to the Commissioner of Police for investigation.

If the Ombudsman is satisfied that the disclosed matter should be referred to the Commissioner, the CEO will consider whether the disclosure should be referred to the Ombudsman under s 68 of the Act.

Early referral of the matter may avoid interference with the evidentiary trail and so will be done at the first possible opportunity. Referral to the Commissioner through the Ombudsman will also avoid any question of a breach of confidentiality under s 23 of the Act.

Once a disclosure is referred to the Commissioner through the Ombudsman, the investigation under the Act ceases. There may still be administrative or operational issues which have been identified during the disclosure process or investigation, however, these can be dealt with under other Brand Tasmania internal processes. The CEO, or the PID Officer acting in consultation with the CEO, will decide how the matter should be dealt with.

13. PROTECTION

13.1. WHEN DOES PROTECTION COMMENCE?

Where Brand Tasmania receives a disclosure which complies with the requirements of Part 2 of the Act, the disclosure immediately attracts the protections set out in Part 3 of the Act. This is so whether or not the disclosure is factually correct (although one of the requirements of Part 2 is that the discloser genuinely believes that the alleged improper conduct or detrimental action in fact occurred).

The protection can also extend to a person who intends to make a disclosure¹².

13.2. WHAT PROTECTION DOES THE ACT PROVIDE?

Part 3 of the Act gives various types of protection to a person who makes a protected disclosure. Below is a summary of some elements of Part 3.

A person who makes a protected disclosure:

- Is not subject to any civil or criminal liability, or to any liability arising by way of administrative process, for making the protected disclosure (s 16);
- Does not by doing so commit an offence under a provision of any other Act that imposes a duty to maintain confidentiality, or which imposes any other restriction on the disclosure of information (s 17(1)(a)); and
- Does not by doing so breach an obligation by way of oath, or rule of law or practice, or under an agreement, which requires the discloser to maintain confidentiality or otherwise restricts the disclosure of information (s 17(1)(b)).

If a disclosure is not made to the correct entity, the protections may not apply. For example, a discloser will not be protected if otherwise confidential information is disclosed to the media.

Part 3 also contains various provisions which are intended to protect a discloser from detrimental action by way of reprisal for a protected disclosure. These are:

- Section 19, which makes it an offence to take such detrimental action;
- Section 20, which creates a liability to pay damages for such detrimental action; and
- Section 21, which gives a person who believes that detrimental action has been taken against them the right to apply to the Supreme Court for an order requiring the person who has taken the detrimental action to remedy that action, or for an injunction.

¹² see s19 of the Act

14. INVESTIGATION

14.1. INTRODUCTION

Any disclosure to Brand Tasmania determined to be a public interest disclosure under s 33 must be investigated under the Act, unless there is a good reason not to do so pursuant to s 64.

Brand Tasmania must investigate every disclosure referred to it for investigation by the Ombudsman under s 63(b).

If an investigation is required, the CEO will appoint an investigator to carry it out. The investigator may be a Brand Tasmania staff member with appropriate skills and experience or a consultant or contractor engaged for the purpose.

The objectives of an investigation are to:

- Collate information relating to the allegation as quickly as possible, which may involve taking steps to protect or preserve documents, materials and equipment;
- Consider the information collected and to draw conclusions objectively and impartially; and
- Maintain procedural fairness in the treatment of witnesses and generally to all parties involved in the disclosure.

14.2. MATTERS THAT DO NOT HAVE TO BE INVESTIGATED

Before starting an investigation, the CEO or PID Officer is to first consider whether the disclosed matter needs to be investigated.

Section 64 of the Act specifies certain circumstances under which a public body may legitimately decide not to investigate. The *Disclosure Assessment Template* at Attachment 1 is used to assist in assessing whether any of the grounds in s64 apply.

Any decision not to proceed with an investigation on a ground specified in s 64 is to be made by the CEO.

If it is decided that the disclosed matter is not to be investigated, written notice will be given within 14 days of this decision to both the Ombudsman and (except in the case of an uncontactable anonymous discloser) the person who made the disclosure. Reasons for the decision will accompany the notice. Notice to the Ombudsman will be provided using the *Notification Template* at Attachment 2.

The Ombudsman will review the decision. If the Ombudsman agrees that the disclosure should not be investigated, the matter does not need to be dealt with under the Act. Importantly, the discloser still retains the protections. The CEO, or the PID Officer in consultation with the CEO, will decide how the matter should be dealt with.

If the Ombudsman determines that the disclosure should be investigated, they will advise the CEO.

Section 64 may be reconsidered at a later time during the investigation.

14.3. INVESTIGATIONS UNDER EMPLOYMENT DIRECTION NO. 5

If Brand Tasmania has already investigated the subject matter of a disclosure, it may not need to be investigated again under the Act¹³. It is not a relevant consideration, however, when determining whether or not to investigate a public interest disclosure that the matter may be, or is being, investigated under Employment Direction No. 5 (ED5) or another internal process.

ED5 investigations and the process under the Act for assessing and investigating disclosures are separate processes and the investigations are conducted separately. The interaction between the two processes will be considered on a case-by-case basis, for example, whether evidence gathered during a public interest disclosure investigation can be used in an ED5 investigation given the confidentiality requirements of s23.

As a minimum, however, if a public officer has raised an allegation about another public officer that may need to be investigated under ED5, then it may also be considered under these public interest disclosure procedures. The two processes have a different focus. An ED5 investigation is aimed at investigating potential breaches of the State Service Code of Conduct by an employee and ensuring they are afforded procedural fairness, including informing them of the substance of the alleged breach and the intention to investigate.

In contrast, a protected disclosure, whilst it can also be about a breach of the code, provides protections to a discloser and imposes confidentiality requirements on the handling of the matter. The purpose of the investigation of a public interest disclosure is to establish if improper conduct has occurred and to make recommendations, which may include taking disciplinary action. Procedural fairness requirements still apply during a public interest disclosure investigation but the public officer may not be notified of the disclosure or the investigation at the outset, or at all, if the investigation finds it is unsubstantiated.

If an ED5 investigation concludes prior to the conclusion of a public interest disclosure investigation and the CEO considers that the subject matter of the disclosure has been adequately dealt with through the ED5 process, they may decide not to further investigate the matter pursuant to s64(b). The notification process outlined above will need to be followed.

In considering these matters the CEO may seek legal advice or contact the Ombudsman for more information.

¹³ as provided by s64(b)

14.4. APPOINTMENT OF INVESTIGATOR AND FRAMING OF TERMS OF REFERENCE

The CEO – not a PID Officer – determines who is to carry out the investigation. The investigator will be given formal terms of reference, signed by the CEO. The terms of reference will specify:

- The matters to be investigated;
- The date by which the investigation is to be concluded;
- The requirement for regular reports to be made to the CEO, including details of compliance with any measures identified in the risk assessment; and
- The resources available to the investigator for the purposes of the investigation.

The completion date should be as soon as practicable but, in any event, not more than six months from the date of the determination that the disclosure is a public interest disclosure under s 77A(1). If at any stage before or during the investigation it appears that the investigation cannot be completed within six months, Brand Tasmania may apply to the Ombudsman for an extension of up to a further six months.

14.5. INVESTIGATION PLAN

The investigator is to prepare an investigation plan for approval by the CEO. The plan should list the issues which are to be investigated and describe the steps which the investigator intends to take when investigating each of those issues.

Risk assessment should be considered as part of the investigation planning and appropriate steps taken to reduce identified risks during the investigation. The plan should be updated as necessary during the course of the investigation.

14.6. PROCEDURAL FAIRNESS

The principles of procedural fairness must be carefully observed in the course of the investigation, with respect to all parties involved. These principles are referred to as natural justice in the Act.

The principles are a set of procedural standards which need to be met in order to satisfy a person's right to a fair hearing. If natural justice is not provided, the investigation findings may be questionable and could be challenged.

Brand Tasmania complies with the following requirements in ensuring that procedural fairness is accorded to all parties involved.

No one is to be involved in the investigation:

- Who is known to be biased against any person who is potentially subject to an adverse finding;
- Who is known to hold any biases which are relevant to the subject matter of the investigation; or
- Against whom there are reasonable grounds for apprehending or suspecting bias.¹⁴

If the investigator is aware of any reason why they may be susceptible to an allegation of bias on the basis of these principles, they should immediately inform the CEO. It is best to err on the side of caution and to consider an external investigator if there might be a perception of bias over the investigation.

Any person who is potentially subject to an adverse finding or comment must be told of:

- The allegations made against them, or which have arisen against them as a result of the investigation;
- All of the information which is adverse to their interests and which is, on an objective basis, credible, relevant and significant to the investigation; and
- The proposed adverse findings, and their possible consequences.

This must be done before any final conclusions are formed by the investigator. The person subject to the potential adverse finding must be given a reasonable time to respond.

Despite the above, there is no requirement to inform the person who is subject to the disclosure as soon as it is received, or as soon as the investigation has commenced.

The final investigation report should be drafted in a way that demonstrates that procedural fairness has been afforded. For instance, it should record and deal with all submissions and evidence which a person has put in their defence.

14.7. CONDUCT OF THE INVESTIGATION

The Integrity Commission's *Guide to Managing Misconduct in the Tasmanian Public Sector*¹⁵ is a useful guide on the conduct of a public interest disclosure investigation.

The investigator should make contemporaneous notes of all discussions and phone calls, and audio recordings of significant interviews with witnesses should be made where possible.

All information gathered in the course of the investigation must be securely stored.

Interviews should be conducted in private, and the investigator should take all reasonable steps to protect the identity of the discloser. The name of the discloser or any particulars which might identify that person must not be revealed unless necessary, and then only with the discloser's knowledge.

¹⁴ The test for establishing the existence of apprehended bias is whether a fair minded lay observer, taking into account all relevant circumstances, might reasonably apprehend that the decision-maker might not bring an impartial mind to the resolution of the questions that they are required to decide.

¹⁵ Accessible at <https://www.integrity.tas.gov.au/publications/prevention-resources/guides>.

14.8. REFERRAL OF AN INVESTIGATION TO THE OMBUDSMAN

Under s 68 of the Act, a public body may refer the investigation of a public interest disclosure to the Ombudsman where the public body considers that its own investigation is being obstructed or that it is otherwise not within the capacity of the public body to complete the investigation.

An investigation can also be referred to the Ombudsman if evidence of possible criminal conduct is found, to enable the Ombudsman to refer the matter to Tasmania Police for investigation (see [Referral of criminal conduct to the Commissioner of Police](#) above for more detail).

Any decision as to whether the investigation should be referred to the Ombudsman is made by the CEO.

14.9. PROVISION OF INFORMATION ABOUT THE INVESTIGATION

The CEO or the PID Officer must ensure that the discloser is kept regularly informed concerning the handling of their protected disclosure and any investigation.

Section 74 of the Act requires a public body, at the request of the Ombudsman or the person who made the disclosure, to give the Ombudsman or that person reasonable information about the investigation. The information must be given within 28 days of the request.

As provided by s 74(3), however, such information does not have to be given to the discloser if:

- It has already been given to the person; or
- The giving of the information would endanger the safety of another or may prejudice the conduct of the investigation.

15. ACTION TAKEN AFTER AN INVESTIGATION

15.1. INVESTIGATOR'S FINAL REPORT

At the conclusion of the investigation, the investigator must submit a written report of their findings to the CEO. The report should contain:

- The allegation(s);
- A description of the manner in which the investigation was conducted, with sufficient detail to demonstrate that natural justice was observed;
- An account of all relevant information received;
- Details of the evidence and submissions supplied by any person against whom an adverse finding is made, and the evaluation of that material by the investigator; and
- The findings made and conclusions reached, and the basis for them.

Note in particular that the report should not include any comment adverse to any person unless that person has been given an opportunity to be heard on the matter and their defence is fairly set out in the report.

A public body must take action, under s 75 of the Act, to redress any improper conduct found and try to prevent its recurrence. Accordingly, if the investigator has found that the alleged improper conduct has occurred, the investigator may wish to include recommendations as to:

- Any steps that need to be taken by Brand Tasmania to prevent the conduct from continuing or occurring in the future; and
- Any action that should be taken by Brand Tasmania to remedy any harm or loss arising from that conduct.

The steps to be taken may include bringing disciplinary proceedings against the person responsible for the conduct or referring the matter to an appropriate authority for further consideration. For example, if the investigation has revealed conduct that may constitute an unreported criminal offence, consideration should be given to whether the matter should be referred to Tasmania Police.

The internal investigation report must be accompanied by:

- The transcript or other record of any oral evidence taken, including audio or video recordings; and
- All documents, statements or other exhibits received by the investigator and accepted as evidence during the course of the investigation.

15.2. ACTION TO BE TAKEN

If the investigation makes a finding that a public officer in Brand Tasmania has engaged, is engaging or proposes to engage in improper conduct, Brand Tasmania must, in accordance with s75, take all reasonable steps to prevent the conduct from continuing or occurring in the future and may take action to remedy any loss or harm arising from the conduct. The

CEO will take into consideration any recommendations in the investigator's report, but can take different or broader action if appropriate.

The CEO will provide a written report to the Minister responsible for the administration of that part of the Authority in which the improper conduct occurred and the Ombudsman, setting out the findings of the investigation and any remedial steps taken. The report must not disclose particulars likely to lead to the identification of the discloser. The Ombudsman will also be provided with the full internal investigation report and accompanying evidence. See the *Notification Template* at Attachment 2.

As required by s 77 of the Act, the CEO is also to inform the discloser of the findings of the investigation, and of any steps taken under s 75 as a result of those findings having been made.

Where the investigation concludes that the disclosed conduct did not occur, the CEO will report that finding to the Ombudsman, in accordance with the *Notification Template* at Attachment 2, and to the discloser.

16. MANAGING THE WELFARE OF THE DISCLOSER

16.1. SUPPORT FOR THE DISCLOSER

The CEO or the PID Officer must appoint a Welfare Manager to support all persons who have made a protected disclosure. This must occur within five working days of the protected disclosure being received.

The Welfare Manager must contact the discloser as soon as possible and not more than five working days after being appointed.

A discloser who believes that they are being subjected to detrimental action in reprisal for having made the disclosure should report it to the CEO or a PID Officer, as this can be a potential further protected disclosure. If they believe that the reprisal is not being effectively dealt with by the Authority, they may report the matter to the Ombudsman. Keeping the discloser informed

The CEO or the PID Officer must ensure that the discloser is kept informed of action taken in relation to their disclosure, and the time frames that apply.

The discloser must be informed of the objectives of any investigation that takes place, the findings of the investigation, and the steps taken by Brand Tasmania to address any improper conduct that has been found to have occurred.

The discloser must be given reasons for all decisions made by Brand Tasmania in relation to a disclosure.

All communication with the discloser is to be in plain English.

Occurrence of detrimental action

If a discloser reports an incident of detrimental action allegedly taken in reprisal for the making of a disclosure, the Welfare Manager should:

- Record details of the incident;
- Advise the discloser of their rights under the Act; and
- Assist the discloser to advise a PID Officer or the CEO of the detrimental action.

The taking of detrimental action in reprisal for the making of a disclosure can be an offence under the Act as well as grounds for making a further disclosure. Where such detrimental action is reported, the PID Officer or the CEO will assess the report as a new disclosure under the Act, and it will be dealt with accordingly.

16.2. DISCLOSER IMPLICATED IN IMPROPER CONDUCT

Where a person who makes a disclosure is implicated in improper conduct, Brand Tasmania will handle the disclosure and protect the discloser from reprisals in accordance with the Act, the Ombudsman's guidelines and these procedures.

At the same time the Authority acknowledges that the act of disclosing should not shield disclosers from the reasonable consequences flowing from any involvement in improper

conduct. Section 18 of the Act specifically provides that a person's liability for their own conduct is not affected by the person's disclosure of that conduct under the Act. In some circumstances, however, an admission may be a mitigating factor when considering disciplinary or other action.

The CEO is to make the final decision as to whether disciplinary or other action will be taken against a discloser. Where disciplinary or other action relates to conduct that is the subject of the person's disclosure, the disciplinary or other action will only be taken after the disclosed matter has been appropriately dealt with.

In all cases where disciplinary or other action is being contemplated, the CEO must be satisfied that it has been clearly demonstrated that:

- The intention to proceed with disciplinary action is not because of the making of the disclosure (as opposed to the content of the disclosure or other available information);
- There are good and sufficient grounds that would fully justify action against any non-discloser in the same circumstances; and
- There are good and sufficient grounds that justify exercising any discretion to institute disciplinary or other action.

The PID Officer or CEO are to thoroughly document the process, including recording the reasons why the disciplinary or other action is being taken, and the reasons why the action is not in retribution for the making of the disclosure.

The PID Officer or CEO are to advise the discloser of the proposed action to be taken, and of any mitigating factors that have been taken into account. They should advise the discloser that they can raise any concerns about the action taken being a potential reprisal with the Ombudsman.

17. MANAGEMENT OF THE PERSON AGAINST WHOM A DISCLOSURE HAS BEEN MADE

Brand Tasmania recognises that employees against whom disclosures are made must also be supported during the handling and investigation of disclosures.

When a person who is the subject of the disclosure is made aware of the allegations or of an investigation, they are to be provided with an appropriate contact person to whom to direct queries. Information about employee assistance programs or other supports are also provided, if appropriate.

Brand Tasmania will take all reasonable steps to ensure the confidentiality of the person who is the subject of the disclosure during the assessment and investigation process.

Where an investigation does not substantiate a disclosure, the fact that the investigation has been carried out, the results of the investigation, and the identity of the person who is the subject of the disclosure will remain confidential.

The PID Officer or CEO are to ensure that the person who is the subject of any disclosure investigated by or on behalf of Brand Tasmania is afforded [procedural fairness](#) in accordance with these procedures.

Where the allegations in a disclosure have been investigated, and the person who is the subject of the disclosure is aware of the allegations or of the investigation, the PID Officer or CEO will formally advise the person who is the subject of the disclosure of the outcome of the investigation.

Brand Tasmania will give its full support to a person who is the subject of a disclosure where the allegations contained in a disclosure are clearly wrong or unsubstantiated.

If the matter has been publicly disclosed, the CEO will consider any request by that person to issue a statement of support setting out that the allegations were wrong or unsubstantiated.

18. APPROVAL AND REVIEW OF THESE PROCEDURES

These procedures were approved by the Ombudsman under s 60(3) of the Act on 9 April 2021.

The procedures are submitted to the Ombudsman for review at least once in each three year period to ensure they meet the objectives of the Act and accord with the Guidelines and Standards published by the Ombudsman under s 38(1)(c) of the Act.

The date by which the procedures must be submitted to the Ombudsman for review is 9 April 2024.

Assessment of disclosure form

Public Interest Disclosures Act 2002

File number:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Date of assessment:

Click or tap to enter a date.

Name of assessing officer:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Summary of disclosure:

Include details of how the disclosure was received, the subject of the disclosure and details of the allegations.

An assessment of disclosure form will usually need to be completed for each disclosure. This means, for example, that if a discloser is complaining about three different public officers, this constitutes three disclosures and three assessments may be required.

Part 1: Is the disclosure a protected disclosure?

Question 1: Is the discloser a public officer?

The discloser needs to be a current public officer. See s4(2) and s4(4) of the Act for the definition of a public officer. If the discloser is anonymous, it is enough to be satisfied that the discloser is a public officer.

If the discloser is a contractor, member of the public or no longer a public officer at the time the disclosure is made, refer them to the Ombudsman or Integrity Commission.

☐ Yes ☐ No

Please provide details if relevant:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Question 2: Is the disclosure about a public officer?

A disclosure can be made even if the discloser cannot identify the public officer – see s9 of the Act. If a disclosure is about the principal officer or the public body itself, refer the discloser to the Ombudsman or Integrity Commission.

☐ Yes ☐ No

Question 3: Has the disclosure been made to the right person or body?

See s7 of the Act and reg 8 of the Public Interest Disclosures Regulations 2013.

☐ Yes ☐ No

Please provide details:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Question 4: Does the discloser believe that a public officer has, is or proposes to engage in improper conduct?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If no, provide details:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Question 5: Does the disclosure relate to improper conduct?

Is the disclosure about conduct that could objectively fall within one of the categories of improper conduct, i.e:

- conduct that constitutes an illegal or unlawful activity; or
- corrupt conduct; or
- conduct that constitutes maladministration; or
- conduct that constitutes professional misconduct; or
- conduct that constitutes a waste of public resources; or
- conduct that constitutes a danger to public health or safety or to both public health and safety; or
- conduct that constitutes a danger to the environment; or
- misconduct, including breaches of applicable codes of conduct; or
- conduct that constitutes detrimental action against a person who makes a public interest disclosure under this Act –that is serious or significant as determined in accordance with guidelines issued by the Ombudsman?

For example, a discloser may believe that taking a non-confidential work file home is serious or significant improper conduct but it may not objectively fall within that definition.

☐ Yes ☐ No

Please provide details:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Question 6: Does the disclosure concern conduct that occurred on or after 1 January 2001?

This is the only time limitation that is relevant when assessing if a disclosure is a protected disclosure. Delays in making a disclosure any time on or after 1 January 2001 can be relevant when deciding whether to investigate a public interest disclosure under s64 of the Act.

☐ Yes ☐ No

Assessment of Answers to Part 1 Questions

If **ALL** the answers to the above are yes, the disclosure is a protected disclosure.

The discloser should be notified as soon as possible, if the disclosure is a protected disclosure and the assessment of whether it is a public interest disclosure has not been undertaken simultaneously.

If **ANY** of the answers to the above are no, the disclosure is not protected and the Act does not apply. Refer the discloser to the appropriate body and/or handle the matter under complaint or grievance policies.

In either case, the discloser should be given reasons in writing. A copy of the assessment should be given to the Principal Officer without delay, where the person who carried out the assessment is not the Principal Officer.

Part 2: Should the protected disclosure be referred to the Integrity Commission?

Does the disclosure relate to misconduct, as defined in the *Integrity Commission Act 2009*?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, should the disclosure be referred to the Integrity Commission under section 29B of the Act?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide details

Click or tap here to enter text.

If the disclosure is referred, the assessment process is complete after the discloser is notified of the referral.

Part 3: Is the protected disclosure a public interest disclosure?

Are you satisfied that the protected disclosure shows, or tends to show, that the public officer to whom the disclosure relates –

- a) has engaged, is engaged or proposes to engage in improper conduct in his or her capacity as a public officer; or
- b) has taken, is taking or proposes to take detrimental action in contravention of s 19 of the Act?

A mere allegation without substantiation is not sufficient – the disclosure must contain evidence or point to its existence (name documents, refer to potential witnesses etc) that shows or tends to show that the public officer is, has, or is proposing to engage in improper conduct.

This determination under s33 of the Act must be made within 45 days of the disclosure being received.

☐ Yes ☐ No

Provide reasons for your decision and attach evidence if available

Click or tap here to enter text.

Next steps

Notify the discloser and the Ombudsman of the assessment determination. Use the notification template attached to the public interest disclosure procedures when notifying the Ombudsman.

If the answer is no, the assessment is complete, and Part 4 does not need to be completed. The Ombudsman will review the determination.

If the answer is yes, the public interest disclosure must be investigated unless a ground exists not to under s64 of the Act.

Part 4 – Is there a ground under s64 not to investigate the public interest disclosure?

Question 1: Is the public interest disclosure trivial, vexatious, misconceived or lacking in substance?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, provide details. Compelling reasons will be required to justify not investigating on this ground:
[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Question 2: Has the subject matter of the public interest disclosure already been adequately dealt with by the Ombudsman or a public body, statutory authority, Commonwealth statutory authority, commission, court or tribunal?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide details
[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Question 3: Has the discloser commenced proceedings in a commission, court or tribunal in relation to the same matter, and does that commission, court or tribunal have power to order remedies similar to those available under this Act?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide details
[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Question 4: Did the discloser:

- have knowledge for more than 12 months of the public interest disclosure matter before making the disclosure; and
- fail to give a satisfactory explanation for the delay in making the disclosure?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, provide details of this issue being put to the discloser and analysis concerning why any explanation provided was not satisfactory:
[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Question 5: Does the public interest disclosure relate solely to the personal interests of the discloser?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Most disclosures will contain some element of personal interest. This should only be used as a basis to not investigate in clear circumstances.

If yes, please provide details:
[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Question 6: Is the public interest disclosure based on false or misleading information?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide details and consider whether an offence may have been committed under s87 of the Act.
[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Question 7: Has the matter the subject of the public interest disclosure already been determined AND this additional disclosure fails to provide significant or substantial new information?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide details
Click or tap here to enter text.

Assessment of Answers to Part 4 Questions

If the answers to **ALL** the questions in Part 4 are no, the disclosure **must** be investigated in accordance with the public interest disclosure procedures. Referral to the Ombudsman can occur if internal investigation is not possible or appropriate.

If the answer is yes to **one or more of the above questions**, will the public interest disclosure be investigated?

Although the public interest disclosure may not need to be investigated if an answer to any of the Part 4 questions is yes, it may still be appropriate to investigate in some circumstances.

☐ Yes ☐ No

Provide reasons for your decision:
Click or tap here to enter text.

Notify the discloser and the Ombudsman if it is decided not to investigate. The Ombudsman will review the decision. Use the notification template attached to the public interest disclosure procedures when notifying the Ombudsman.

Summary

Part	Question	Answer
Part 1	Is the disclosure a protected disclosure?	Choose an item.
Part 2	Should the protected disclosure be referred to the Integrity Commission?	Choose an item.
Part 3	Is the protected disclosure a public interest disclosure?	Choose an item.
Part 4	Should the public interest disclosure be investigated?	Choose an item.

Approval

Approved by:

Name of Public Interest Disclosure Officer or Principal Officer:

Choose an item.

Date of approval:

Click or tap to enter a date.

Risk assessment template

Public Interest Disclosures Act 2002

File number:

Date of assessment:

Name of assessing officer:

Click or tap here to enter text. Click or tap to enter a date. Click or tap here to enter text.

Risk assessed to:

Please select all relevant options

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Discloser | <input type="checkbox"/> Other employees including potential witnesses |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Your public body | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (e.g. Tasmanian Government, the general public) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> The subject of the disclosure | |

Type of risk / possible harm

Such as:

- Adverse employment action
- Workplace injury
- Physical violence
- Verbal abuse
- Stress
- Untenable work environment
- Withdrawal of cooperation due to fear of reprisal/lack of support
- Reputational damage
- Risk to public safety
- Misuse of public funds
- Disruption to functioning of public body

Please provide details:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Likelihood risk/s will occur

- ☐ Unlikely
- ☐ Possible
- ☐ Likely

Considerations:

- Can confidentiality be maintained?
- Is the discloser (or others) concerned about reprisals?
- How many public officers are involved in the alleged improper conduct?
- What is their level of seniority?
- What is the seriousness of the alleged conduct?
- Is there a history of conflict in the workplace?

Please provide your reasons:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Seriousness of consequences if risk/s occurs

- ☐ Minor
- ☐ Moderate
- ☐ Major

Considerations:

- What is the potential impact if the risk occurs?
- Will the impact be limited, with the person able to readily deal with it?
- Will the impact have consequences which will affect the person's work or their personal and home life?
- Will the consequences be short-term, medium-term or long-term?

Please provide your reasons:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Evaluation of level of risk

Risk occurrence	Minor consequence	Moderate consequence	Major consequence
Unlikely	Low	Low	Medium
Possible	Low	Medium	High
Likely	Medium	High	High

Determine your level of risk:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Steps needed to mitigate risk

Consult with discloser and other parties as required. Possible strategies include:

- maintaining confidentiality as much as possible
- ensuring all parties are aware of their obligations
- when the identity of the discloser will be known or guessed by the subject of the disclosure and/or associates, proactively identifying the discloser (with their written permission) and advising relevant parties of the consequences of taking reprisal action and that their actions are being monitored
- altering reporting structures
- increasing monitoring of the work environment
- standing down the subject of the disclosure
- temporarily relocating the subject of the disclosure or the discloser to a different location/ role
- independently verifying the work performance of the discloser
- providing access to specialist support services if required
- making a statement to all staff or the media to address concerns

Please provide details:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Action to be taken

Considerations:

- risk rating
- ease or difficulty of mitigating risk
- financial cost of taking action
- consequences of not taking action should risk occur

Please provide details of your risk action plan:
Click or tap here to enter text.

Approval

Approved by:

Public Interest Disclosure Officer or Principal Officer (Type Name)

Click or tap here to enter text.

Date of approval

Click or tap to enter a date.

Risk assessment review

Risk assessment to be reviewed on (date) Click or tap to enter a date. or when (event)
Click or tap here to enter text. occurs.

Name of reviewing officer:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Date of assessment:

Click or tap to enter a date.

Notes on changes to risk since last assessment

Click or tap here to enter text.

Review outcome

- ☐ No change to action plan
- ☐ Further action required

Please provide details:

Click or tap here to enter text.

*Thank you to the Queensland Ombudsman for the use of some of its
risk assessment materials in this template.*

Ombudsman notification template

Public Interest Disclosures Act 2002

Public body name:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Date of disclosure:

Click or tap to enter a date.

Contact person: *(include telephone and email contact details)*

Click or tap here to enter text.

Date of s 33 determination: *(to be made within 45 days of date of disclosure)* **Date of notification:**

Click or tap here to enter text.

Click or tap to enter a date.

Notification type

- ☐ Section 34 – Determination that disclosure is a public interest disclosure
Notification to be made within 14 days of decision
- ☐ Section 35 – Determination that disclosure is not a public interest disclosure
Notification to be made within 14 days of decision
- ☐ Section 65 – Decision not to investigate public interest disclosure under s 64
Notification to be made within 14 days of decision
- ☐ Section 76 – Findings of investigation and steps taken under s 75
Investigation to be completed within 6 months unless Ombudsman extension granted

Evidence attached

- ☐ Copy of original disclosure or record of oral disclosure
- ☐ Disclosure assessment
- ☐ Risk assessment/s
- ☐ Investigation report including:
 - the transcript or other record of any oral evidence taken, including audio or video recordings; and
 - all documents, statements or other exhibits received by the investigator and accepted as evidence during the course of the investigation.
- ☐ Any other material used to make determination (list):
 - Click or tap here to enter text.
 - Click or tap here to enter text.
 - Click or tap here to enter text.





