

GPAC Governance Process Policy
HANDLING OPERATIONAL COMPLAINTS

Number: GP-16

Date Approved: September 15, 2016

To ensure that the Commission fulfills its accountability to the ownership, but does not interfere in matters it has delegated to the CEO, the following process shall be followed in the case of a Commission member receiving a complaint regarding an operational matter.

1. The Commission member shall inquire if the proper internal communication protocol for registering concerns has been followed. If not, the individual shall be directed to the CEO, and the Commission member shall take no further action.
2. The Commission Member shall not offer any evaluative comments or solutions.
3. If the internal protocol has been followed and the concern has not been resolved through that action, the Commission member shall explain to the individual that the Commission has delegated certain responsibilities to the CEO, and that the Commission holds the CEO accountable. The Commission member shall indicate that the CEO will be asked to ensure that the matter is looked into and respond directly.
4. The Commission member shall inform the CEO or individual designated by the CEO of the complaint, request that it be handled, and if desired, that the CEO inform the Commission member of the outcome.

Approved: 

Reviewed: _____

Date: 10/10/14

Date: _____

GPAC Governance Process Policy
HANDLING OF APPARENT POLICY VIOLATIONS

Number: GP-17

Date Approved: September 15, 2016

The Commission as a whole – not an individual Commission member - has a responsibility to regularly monitor the performance of the CEO as outlined in the policies on Commission-CEO Relationship. If there is a reasonable appearance of policy violation, even though a particular policy is not scheduled for monitoring, the Commission may choose to request a monitoring report at any time. The Commission may also use the occasion of a concern to re-evaluate the adequacy of its policy to address the issue raised.

1. Conditions which may trigger a request for monitoring beyond the normal schedule may include:

1.1.A Commission member has been contacted regarding a complaint. After the Commission member has followed the procedure for handling complaints (See Policy on Handling Complaints), the individual again contacts the Commission member indicating that the complaint still exists, and in the Commission member's opinion the incident appears to be a potential policy violation.

1.2. One or more Commission members receive complaints or become aware of a number of similar instances that taken together raise questions of general policy violation.

1.3. A single incident of complaint is of a nature that regardless of how it is resolved, there is a serious question of policy violation.

2. If any of the above conditions exist:

2.1. The Commission member shall inform the Chair of the situation.

2.2. The Chair shall request the CEO to provide to the Commission his or her interpretation of the policy, rationale for the interpretation, and evidence of policy compliance with reference to the situation(s) in question.

2.3. The Commission as a whole shall determine whether the CEO's interpretation falls within "any reasonable interpretation" of the policy.

2.4. If the CEO's interpretation falls within "any reasonable interpretation," and there is evidence of compliance with that interpretation, the matter shall be dropped at the Commission level. (The CEO will handle the issue directly with the complainant.)

2.5. If the CEO's interpretation falls outside of "any reasonable interpretation," or there is a clear violation of a reasonable interpretation, the Commission shall determine the degree of seriousness of the issue and deal with the CEO regarding performance.

3. If the incident(s) in question do(es) not appear to be a potential violation of policy:

3.1. Commission member should consider if he or she believes the policy should be reconsidered to prevent a future occurrence of a similar situation.

3.2. If the Commission member considers that a policy amendment should be made, the Commission member should ask the Chair to put the item on the next agenda.

3.3. The Commission as a whole then shall debate whether or not the policy should be amended, making the reported event explicitly unacceptable in the future.

Approved: 

Reviewed: _____

Date: 16/10/14

Date: _____