



**Australian Government**  
**Organ and Tissue Authority**

# **Breaches of APS Code of Conduct Procedure**

**January 2023**

## Version Control

Version	Author	Status	Date	Revisions
0.1	Julie Sengelman	Draft	April 2019	Initial draft
1.0	Julie Sengelman	CEO Endorsed	July 2019	Published version
2.1	Julie Sengelman	Draft	Nov 2022	Updated draft
3.0	Julie Sengelman	CEO Endorsed	Jan 2023	Published version

## Contents

APS CODE OF CONDUCT	5
APPLICATION AND AVAILABILITY OF PROCEDURES	5
DECISION MAKER AND SANCTION DELEGATE	5
DECISION MAKER TO BE INDEPENDENT AND UNBIASED	6
THE DETERMINATION PROCESS	7
SANCTIONS	8
RECORD OF DETERMINATION AND SANCTION	8
MOVING TO A DIFFERENT AGENCY OR RESIGNATION	9
REVIEW OF DETERMINATION OR IMPOSITION OF SANCTION	9

I, Lucinda Barry, Chief Executive Officer, Organ and Tissue Authority (OTA), establish these procedures under subsection 15 (3) of the *Public Service Act 1999* (the Act) and the *Public Service Amendment Act 2013*.

These procedures commenced on 1 July 2019 and have now been updated.

These procedures supersede the previous procedures made for the OTA under subsection 15 (3) of the Act, but the previous procedures may continue to apply for transitional purposes.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Lucinda Barry". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Lucinda Barry

**Chief Executive Officer**

9 January 2023

## APS CODE OF CONDUCT

Section 13 of the *Public Service Act 1999* (the Act) sets out the standards of behaviour expected of Australian Public Service (APS) employees. Collectively, these standards are known as the Code of Conduct (the Code).

## APPLICATION AND AVAILABILITY OF PROCEDURES

These procedures apply in determining whether a person who is an APS employee in the Organ and Tissue Authority (OTA), or who is a former APS employee who was employed in the OTA at the time of the suspected misconduct, has breached the Code in section 13 of the Act.

These procedures apply in determining any sanction to be imposed on an APS employee in the OTA who has been found to have breached the Code.

These procedures, as they apply to determining whether there has been a breach of the Code, apply to any suspected breach of the Code except for one in respect of which a decision had been made before 1 July 2013 to begin an investigation to determine whether there had been a breach of the Code.

These procedures, as they apply to determining any sanction for breach of the Code, apply where a sanction decision is under consideration on or after 1 July 2013.

In these procedures, a reference to a breach of the Code by a person includes a reference to a person engaging in conduct set out in subsection 15 (2A) of the Act in connection with their engagement as an APS employee.

*Note – Not all suspected breaches of the Code need to be dealt with by way of determination under these procedures. In particular circumstances, another way of dealing with a suspected breach of the Code may be more appropriate, including performance management.*

As provided for in subsection 15 (7) of the Act, these procedures are publicly available on the OTA's website.

## DECISION MAKER AND SANCTION DELEGATE

As soon as practicable after a suspected breach of the Code has been identified and the Agency Head, or a person authorised by the Agency Head, has decided to deal with the suspected breach under these procedures, the Agency Head or that person will appoint a decision maker (the breach decision maker) to make a determination under these procedures.

*Note – The Australian Public Service Commissioner's Directions 2022 provide that where the conduct of an APS employee raises concerns that relate both to effective performance and possible breaches of the Code, the Agency Head must, before making a decision to commence formal misconduct action, have regard to any relevant standards and guidance issued by the Australian Public Service Commissioner.*

Agency Heads are required to consult with the Commissioner about suspected breaches of the Code of Conduct by SES employees. Agency Heads must consult on:

- the process for determining whether the employee has breached the Code of Conduct, and
- if the Agency Head is considering imposing a sanction, what sanction will be imposed.

The role of the breach decision maker is to determine in writing whether a breach of the Code has occurred.

The breach decision maker may seek the assistance of an investigator with matters including investigating the alleged breach, gathering evidence and making a report of recommended factual findings to the breach decision maker.

The person who is to decide what, if any, sanction is to be imposed on an APS employee who is found to have breached the Code must hold a delegation of the power under the Act to impose sanctions (the sanction delegate). Only the Agency Head or a person who has been delegated the power under section 15 of the Act and related powers, such as under section 29 of the Act, may make a sanction decision.

These procedures do not prevent the breach decision maker from being the delegated sanction delegate in the same matter.

*Note – Any delegation of powers under the Act that is proposed to be made to a person who is not an APS employee must be approved in writing in advance by the Australian Public Service Commissioner. This is required by subsection 78 (8) of the Act. This would include delegation of the power under subsection 15 (1) to impose a sanction.*

*Note – Appointment as a breach decision maker under these procedures does not empower the breach decision maker to make a decision regarding sanction. Only the Agency Head or a person who has been delegated the power under section 15 of the Act and related powers, such as under section 29 of the Act, may make a sanction decision.*

## DECISION MAKER AND SANCTION DELEGATE TO BE INDEPENDENT AND UNBIASED

The breach decision maker and the sanction delegate must be, and must appear to be, independent and unbiased.

The breach decision maker and the sanction delegate must advise the Agency Head in writing if they consider that they may not be independent and unbiased or if they consider that they may reasonably be perceived not to be independent and unbiased, for example if they are a witness in the matter.

## THE DETERMINATION PROCESS

The process for determining whether a person who is, or was, an APS employee in the OTA has breached the Code must be carried out with as little formality, and with as much expedition, as a proper consideration of the matter allows.

The process must be consistent with the principles of procedural fairness.

*Note – Procedural fairness generally requires that:*

- *the person suspected of breaching the Code is informed of the case against them (i.e. any material that is before the decision maker that is adverse to the person or their interests and that is credible, relevant and significant)*
- *the person is provided with a reasonable opportunity to respond and put their case, in accordance with these procedures, before any decision is made on breach or sanction*
- *the decision maker acts without bias or an appearance of bias*
- *there is logically probative evidence to support the making, on the balance of probabilities, of adverse findings.*

A determination may not be made in relation to a suspected breach of the Code by a person unless reasonable steps have been taken to inform the person of:

- the details of the suspected breach of the Code (including any subsequent variation of those details)
- where the person is an APS employee, the sanctions that may be imposed on them under subsection 15 (1) of the Act and give the person a reasonable opportunity to make a written statement or provide further evidence in relation to the suspected breach, within 7 calendar days or any longer period that is allowed. The statement may be a written or an oral statement.

A person who does not make a statement in relation to the suspected breach is not, for that reason alone, to be taken to have admitted to committing the suspected breach.

For the purpose of determining whether a person who is, or was, an APS employee in the OTA has breached the Code, a formal hearing is not required.

The breach decision maker (or the person assisting the breach decision maker, if any) where they consider in all the circumstances that the request is reasonable, must agree to a request made by the person who is suspected of breaching the Code to have a support person present in a meeting or interview they conduct.

## SANCTIONS

The process for deciding on sanction must be consistent with the principles of procedural fairness.

If a determination is made that an APS employee in the OTA has breached the Code, a sanction may not be imposed on the employee unless they have been given a written statement setting out:

- the determination that has been made
- the sanction or sanctions that are under consideration
- the factors that are under consideration in determining any sanction to be imposed
- a reasonable opportunity to make a written statement in relation to the sanction or sanctions under consideration within 7 calendar days, or any longer period that is allowed by the sanction delegate. The sanction delegate may decide to give the employee the opportunity to make both a written and an oral statement.

The Agency Head or delegate may impose the following sanctions where an employee is found to have breached the Code:

- termination of employment
- reduction in classification
- re-assignment of duties
- reduction in salary
- deductions from salary, by way of fine
- a reprimand.

## RECORD OF DETERMINATION AND SANCTION

If a determination in relation to a suspected breach of the Code by a person who is, or was, an APS employee in the OTA is made, a written record must be made of:

- the suspected breach
- the determination
- where the person is an APS employee--any sanctions imposed as a result of a determination that the employee has breached the Code
- if a statement of reasons was given to the person regarding the determination in relation to suspected breach of the Code, or, in the case of an employee, regarding the sanction decision--that statement of reasons or those statements of reasons.

*Note – The Archives Act 1983 and the Privacy Act 1988 apply to the OTA records.*



## MOVING TO A DIFFERENT AGENCY OR RESIGNATION

This clause applies if:

- a person who is an ongoing APS employee in the OTA is suspected of having breached the Code
- the employee has been informed of the matters mentioned above
- the matter has not yet been resolved
- a decision has been made that, apart from this clause, the employee would move to another agency in accordance with section 26 of the Act (including on promotion).

Unless the OTA Agency Head and the new Agency Head agree otherwise, the movement (including on promotion) does not take effect until the matter is resolved.

For the purpose of this clause the matter is taken to be resolved when:

- a determination in relation to suspected breach of the Code is made in accordance with these procedures
- the Agency Head decides that a determination is not necessary.

Where an employee resigns during the course of an investigation the Agency Head, or delegate may choose, depending on the circumstances, to discontinue the process.

## REVIEW OF DETERMINATION OR IMPOSITION OF SANCTION

Section 33 of the Act makes provision for a non-senior executive service employee to seek a review of an employment-related action, including a determination that the Code of Conduct has been breached and the imposition of a sanction or sanctions (other than termination of employment). The application must be made to the [\*Merit Protection Commissioner\*](#).

The [\*Fair Work Act 2009\*](#) provides a review process for termination of employment.