

OFFICIAL



Australian Government
Sport Integrity Australia



SPORT INTEGRITY
AUSTRALIA

Procedure

Public Interest Disclosure

Procedure owner: Director, Governance & Risk

Endorsed by: Dr Sarah Benson PSM, Chief Executive Officer

Date endorsed: 4 December 2025

Next review date: December 2026

Sport Integrity Australia

Public Interest Disclosure Procedures

December 2025

I, Dr Sarah Benson PSM, Chief Executive Officer of Sport Integrity Australia, make the following procedures under section 59(3) of the *Public Interest Disclosure Act 2013 (PID Act)* for facilitating and dealing with public interest disclosures relating to Sport Integrity Australia.

These procedures commence on 4 December 2025.



Dr Sarah Benson PSM

Chief Executive Officer

Sport Integrity Australia

4 December 2025



Contents

Introduction 5
Purpose 5
What is a public interest disclosure? 5
What is an internal disclosure? 5
Who is a public official? 6
Deeming someone to be a public official 6
Who is an Authorised Officer? 6
What is disclosable conduct? 6
What is not disclosable conduct? 7
Personal work-related conduct 7
Time limits for making a disclosure 8
The Disclosure Process 8
How is a disclosure made and who is it made to? 8
What information should be included in a disclosure? 8
How are anonymous disclosures dealt with? 9
Reasons why a discloser may agree to identifying themselves 9
Can a disclosure be withdrawn? 10
What are the discloser’s obligations when making a disclosure? 10
Support and protection 10
Support 10
Training and education 11
For disclosers and those assisting with a PID investigation 11
For subjects of a disclosure 11
Protection 12
Protecting the discloser’s identity 12
Immunity from liability 12
Protection against reprisal action 13
Procedures for supervisors and managers 13
Role of supervisors and managers 13
Procedures for Authorised Officers 14
Role of Authorised Officers 14
Advising disclosers and potential disclosers about the PID Act 15
Deciding whether to allocate a disclosure 15



Where to allocate a disclosure 16

Informing relevant persons of allocation..... 16

 Informing the Principal Officer 16

 Informing the discloser 16

Deciding not to allocate a disclosure 16

Requesting consent from discloser 17

 Giving notice to the Principal Officer 17

Record keeping for Authorised Officers 17

 Receiving a disclosure 17

 Allocation and non-allocation decisions 17

Reprisal risk assessment 18

 Conducting a reprisal risk assessment 18

 Monitoring and reviewing reprisal risks 19

Procedures for Investigators and Investigations 19

 Role of Principal Officers..... 19

 Discretion not to investigate..... 20

 Notification requirements 20

 Additional obligations of Principal Officers 21

 Conducting the investigation 21

 General principles 21

 Time limit for investigations 22

 Report of investigation 22

 Matters to be included in a report..... 22

 Written notice of the report 23

Record keeping, monitoring and evaluation..... 24

 Records management 24

Interaction with the National Anti-Corruption Commission 24

 Mandatory referral obligations..... 24

 What is ‘corrupt conduct’? 24

 What is ‘serious or systemic’ corrupt conduct?..... 25

 What information should be referred? 25

 How is a mandatory referral made? 25

 Notification requirements 25

 How does a mandatory referral affect other obligations? 26

 Protection 26



Investigation timeframes 26

Complaints 26

 Role of the Ombudsman 26

Schedule 1: Risk of reprisals assessment 27

Schedule 2: Indicators of a higher risk of reprisals or workplace conflict 28

Document History

Version	Date	Cleared by	Comments



Introduction

Purpose

The objects of the *Public Interest Disclosure Act 2013 (PID Act)* are to:

- promote the integrity and accountability of the Commonwealth public sector; and
- encourage and facilitate the making of public interest disclosures by public officials and former public officials; and
- ensure that public officials, and former public officials, who make public interest disclosures (**disclosures**) are supported and protected from adverse consequences relating to the disclosures; and
- ensure that disclosures by public officials, and former public officials, are properly investigated and dealt with.

These procedures are established in accordance with section 59(3) of the PID Act by the Principal Officer of Sport Integrity Australia (**SIA**). The procedures:

- outline how disclosures relating to SIA will be managed and handled;
- deal with the assessment of risks that reprisals may be taken in relation to those disclosures;
- provide for confidentiality of investigative processes; and
- comply with the *Public Interest Disclosure Standard 2013*.

What is a public interest disclosure?

A public interest disclosure is a disclosure of information (a report), made by a public official, of suspected wrongdoing in the Commonwealth public sector. Disclosures are about matters where investigation and correction are in the public interest.

There are 5 types of disclosures that constitute a ‘public interest disclosure’ under the PID Act:

1. internal disclosures (disclosed within an agency, such as SIA);
2. external disclosures (disclosed outside Government);
3. emergency disclosures;
4. legal practitioner disclosures; and
5. National Anti-Corruption Commission (**NACC**) disclosures.

Internal disclosures made about SIA and/or public officials that belong to SIA are the focus of these procedures.

What is an internal disclosure?

An internal disclosure is made when:

- a person who is, or has been, a public official (or they are deemed to be a public official);
- makes a disclosure to an Authorised Officer or their supervisor or manager;
- the information tends to show, or the discloser believes on reasonable grounds the information tends to show, one or more instances of disclosable conduct; and
- the disclosure is not made in the course of performing the discloser’s ordinary functions as a public official.



A disclosure is not an internal disclosure until an Authorised Officer has decided the applicable requirements of the PID Act have been met. It is only when the requirements above have been met will the discloser have the benefit of the protections conferred by the PID Act.

Who is a public official?

A person must be a current or former public official to make a disclosure. The term 'public official' is defined in section 69 of the PID Act and includes, for example:

- the Principal Officer of an agency;
- Australian Government public servants (including employees and former employees of SIA);
- statutory office holders;
- a director of a Commonwealth company;
- an individual who is a contracted service provider for a Commonwealth contract; and
- an officer or employee of a contracted service provider.

Deeming someone to be a public official

Section 70 of the PID Act provides that an Authorised Officer may decide to deem a person a public official if the Authorised Officer believes, on reasonable grounds, that an individual has information about disclosable conduct.

If a person is deemed to be a public official, this means that the PID Act is taken always to have had effect in relation to the disclosure of information, as if the individual had been a public official when they obtained the information.

An Authorised Officer can decide to deem a person to be a public official on a request of a person or on their own initiative. If a person requests to be deemed a public official, the Authorised Officer must inform them of the determination and, if they decide not to deem them a public official, provide them with reasons for their decision.

Who is an Authorised Officer?

An Authorised Officer of SIA is:

- the Principal Officer; or
 - a public official who belongs to SIA; and
 - is appointed, in writing, by the Principal Officer as an Authorised Officer.

Generally, Authorised Officers at SIA are Senior Executive Service level staff members.

Please visit SIA's website ['Public Interest Disclosure'](#) for further information.

What is disclosable conduct?

'Disclosable conduct' is conduct engaged in by:

- an agency; or
- a public official, in connection with his or her position as a public official; or
- a contracted service provider for a Commonwealth contract, in connection with entering into, or giving effect to, that contract.

Kinds of disclosable conduct include conduct that:

- contravenes a law of the Commonwealth, a State or Territory;
- in a foreign country, contravenes a foreign law applicable to the agency or public official and corresponds to a law in force in the Australian Capital Territory (**ACT**);
- involves perverting the course of justice or corrupt conduct;
- is maladministration, including conduct that is based on improper motives or is unreasonable, unjust, oppressive or negligent;
- is an abuse of public trust;
- involves fabrication, falsification, plagiarism or deception relating to scientific research, or other misconduct in relation to scientific research, analysis or advice;
- results in wastage of public money (within the meaning of the *Public Governance, Performance and Accountability Act 2013*) or public property of a prescribed authority;
- unreasonably endangers, or increases risk of endangering, health and safety;
- endangers, or increases risk of endangering, the environment;
- involves or is engaged in for the purpose of the person abusing their position as a public official; and/ or
- could, if proved, give reasonable grounds for disciplinary action resulting in the termination of the public official.

The full definition of disclosable conduct is contained in section 29 of the PID Act.

What is not disclosable conduct?

The following kinds of conduct are generally not disclosable conduct under the PID Act:

- disagreement with a policy of the Commonwealth (or proposed policy) or expenditure or action relating to those policies;
- disagreement with the action taken by a Minister, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, or the President of the Senate;
- certain conduct connected with courts, Commonwealth tribunals or intelligence agencies; and
- personal work-related conduct (unless an exception applies).

Personal work-related conduct

For the purposes of the PID Act, 'personal work-related conduct' means:

- an act or omission engaged in by a public official (the first official) in relation to another public official (the second official) that occurs in relation to the second official's engagement or appointment and/or employment; and
- that has, or would tend to have, personal implications for the second public official.

Examples of personal work-related conduct that do not comprise disclosable conduct for the purposes of the PID Act include:

- interpersonal conflict, including bullying or harassment;
- decisions about a person's employment (for example, transfer or promotion, terms and conditions of engagement or appointment, disciplinary action, suspension or termination); or
- conduct in relation to which the public official has, or had, review rights under section 33 of the *Public Service Act 1999* or comparable review processes.

Time limits for making a disclosure

There are no time limits for making a disclosure. It does not matter whether:

- the alleged disclosable conduct occurred before or after 15 January 2014 (which is the date of the commencement of the PID Act); or
- the public official who carried out the alleged conduct has ceased to be a public official since the time the conduct is alleged to have occurred. However, it is necessary that they carried out the conduct in connection with their position as a public official.

The Disclosure Process

How is a disclosure made and who is it made to?

A person does not need to expressly state, or even intend, that a disclosure be made under the PID Act for the information to be captured as a disclosure under the PID Act, and for protections against reprisals to apply. Simply conveying information about disclosable conduct to a person who is entitled to receive a disclosure under the PID Act may be sufficient.

A disclosure may be made orally or in writing, anonymously or openly and may be made to an Authorised Officer, a supervisor or manager, or in certain circumstances, to the Ombudsman. If the disclosure is made orally, the person receiving it should make a record of what was said and confirm that their record is correct.

If the disclosure involves SIA or a public official belonging to SIA, a disclosure can be made to their supervisor or manager, or an Authorised Officer of SIA. The relevant contact details for Authorised Officers are:

- Email: publicinterestdisclosure@sportintegrity.gov.au; or
- (02) 6222 4200.

If a disclosure is made directly to an Authorised Officer of SIA, the Authorised Officer will carefully consider the most appropriate course of action. This may include:

- allocating the disclosure to an appropriate agency (not SIA) for possible investigation (if an Authorised Officer of the receiving agency consents to the allocation); or
- allocating the disclosure to SIA for investigation under the PID Act; or
- not allocating the disclosure.

What information should be included in a disclosure?

The information contained in a disclosure should be clear and factual, and avoid speculation, personal attacks and emotive language. It should contain supporting evidence where that is available to the discloser and where possible, identify any witnesses to the disclosable conduct.

A person making a disclosure should, to the extent reasonably possible, provide the following information:

- the discloser's name and contact details (although they may remain anonymous);
- information that will assist the Authorised Officer to assess whether the discloser is a 'public official';



- details of the following matters:
 - the nature of the conduct;
 - who was involved in the conduct;
 - when and where the conduct occurred;
 - any relevant background information and events, including whether the conduct has been investigated in another forum;
- whether the conduct has been reported to anyone else;
- whether any action has been taken in relation to the conduct and if so, details of the action to fix, stop or prevent it;
- whether anyone else is aware of the conduct;
- (if possible or practicable) the type of category of 'disclosable conduct' which the discloser considers applies; and
- whether the discloser is concerned about possible reprisal as a result of making a disclosure.

A potential discloser should not:

- investigate a matter themselves before making a disclosure as this may hinder a future investigation; or
- discuss the details of their disclosure with anyone, other than an Authorised Officer or their supervisor or manager.

If a discloser provides their name and contact details, SIA will take all reasonable steps to maintain the confidentiality of that information.

How are anonymous disclosures dealt with?

A person who is eligible to make a disclosure under the PID Act can choose to do so anonymously. A discloser will be anonymous if they do not wish to provide their name or contact details. A discloser can also remain anonymous but contactable if they do not disclose their name but provide de-identified contact details, such as a pseudonym email address.

The fact that a disclosure is made anonymously does not mean that it cannot be treated as a disclosure for the purposes of the PID Act. The obligations for Authorised Officers, supervisors or managers upon receiving an anonymous disclosure apply in the same way. For supervisors or managers, this means they must refer the disclosure to an Authorised Officer as soon as is reasonably practicable.

Reasons why a discloser may agree to identifying themselves

In deciding whether or not to make a disclosure anonymously, a potential discloser should consider the following matters:

- it can be difficult for SIA to protect a discloser from reprisals if SIA does not know the discloser's identity;
- it may be difficult for an Authorised Officer to assess whether the discloser believes on reasonable grounds that the information tends to show disclosable conduct without being able to contact and engage with them;
- if an Authorised Officer is satisfied, on reasonable grounds, that there is no reasonable basis on which the disclosure could be considered to be an internal disclosure, the Authorised Officer is not required to allocate the disclosure for handling under the PID Act. If the



Authorised Officer cannot contact the discloser to seek further information about the disclosure, the disclosure may not be allocated, nor investigated;

- if an Authorised Officer is satisfied that the discloser is not a public official, they may consider exercising their discretion under section 70 of the PID Act to determine that the PID Act has effect as if the individual were a public official. If the discloser does not provide their contact details, no determination may be able to be made because the Authorised Officer must be able to give written notice of the determination to the discloser;
- once a disclosure has been allocated for handling, the Principal Officer may decide not to investigate the disclosure if they consider it impracticable to do so because the discloser's name and contact details have not been disclosed; and
- if the discloser maintains anonymity, SIA will be unable to provide the discloser with progress updates, reprisal risk assessments, the investigation report or information about the outcome of the investigation.

A person who has made an anonymous disclosure may come forward at a later stage to disclose their identity and seek the protections of the PID Act.

Can a disclosure be withdrawn?

Once a disclosure has been made, it cannot be withdrawn. A discloser may state that they do not wish the disclosure to be investigated and they may refuse to consent to their name and contact details being provided to the Principal Officer and/or delegate. If the discloser requests that a matter not be investigated, this would be considered by the Principal Officer in deciding whether to exercise discretion not to investigate the disclosure, or not investigate the disclosure further. It should be noted, however, the Principal Officer can decide to investigate, or continue to investigate.

What are the discloser's obligations when making a disclosure?

A person who has made a disclosure under the PID Act should not discuss the details of their disclosure with anyone who does not have a need to know about it. Discussions with these people will not be protected by the PID Act (unless the discussion meets the criteria for an external disclosure, emergency disclosure or a legal practitioner disclosure).

When making a disclosure, it is important that disclosers try to remain factual and focus on the issues related to the suspected wrongdoing, putting aside emotions or unrelated events.

Support and protection

Support

SIA encourages and supports the reporting of wrongdoing by public officials in accordance with the PID Act. SIA will take active steps to support persons who have made disclosures under the PID Act, and to protect them from reprisal, or threats of reprisal, relating to the disclosure, as far as reasonably practicable.

SIA recognises the importance of an effective system for reporting and investigating disclosable conduct. Some of the potential benefits are reducing the work health and safety risks to employees, making processes more efficient and increasing confidence in employees in the way SIA is managed.



Training and education

SIA will provide training and education to staff about the PID Act, and any training necessary to support officials, such as Authorised Officers, to carry out their functions under the PID Act.

At a minimum, SIA will:

- ensure e-learning training and fact sheets about the PID Act are kept accessible and up to date;
- ensure these procedures are available for all current and former staff by publishing the procedures on SIA's intranet and external website; and
- ensure Authorised Officers attend an annual refresher training session and provide training and support for newly appointed Authorised Officers.

For disclosers and those assisting with a PID investigation

SIA recognises the PID process can sometimes be difficult and stressful for all parties in an investigation process. Sometimes, a person might not consider they are experiencing reprisal action within the meaning of the PID Act but may nonetheless have concerns about being treated differently in their work area. SIA encourages people to raise any such concerns with their manager or supervisor if comfortable doing so, and will provide an assurance that SIA will take all reasonable steps necessary to protect them including making the following supports available:

- the offer of a support person;
- providing disclosers and witnesses with information about their rights and responsibilities under the PID Act;
- providing disclosers and witnesses with information about these procedures;
- advising of the availability of the Employee Assistance Program;
- providing regular updates to the discloser on the progress of the investigation;
- if workplace stress and reprisal risks cannot be otherwise mitigated, consideration of alternative work arrangements or leave options should be discussed with the employee (with due consideration for compliance with the Commonwealth Ombudsman's (**the Ombudsman**) Guide to '[Assessing and Managing the Risk of Reprisal](#)'); and/ or
- at the end of the disclosure process, allowing for an opportunity for debriefing and discussion of questions or concerns.

For subjects of a disclosure

A person who is subject to an allegation of disclosable conduct will be informed of the allegation (or allegations) if an adverse finding against them is considered likely. This is consistent with the person's entitlement to be afforded procedural fairness where their interests may be affected by an administrative decision.

If a subject is aware of allegations having been made about their conduct, or is aware that a disclosure investigation is occurring, or if an adverse finding against them is considered likely, one or more of the following actions should occur:

- providing the employee with information about their rights and responsibilities under the PID Act;
- providing the person with information about these procedures;
- ensuring the identity of the person is kept confidential as much as reasonably practicable;
- advising them of the availability of SIA's Employee Assistance Program;



- liaising with officers responsible for work health and safety in SIA where there are concerns about the health and wellbeing of the employee;
- consideration of alternative work arrangements or leave options should be discussed with the employee; and/ or
- where the subject of a disclosure is aware that allegations have been made against them, or there has been an investigation, where appropriate, the subject of the disclosure should be formally advised as to the outcome of the investigation as it relates to them.

Protection

Protecting the discloser's identity

The PID Act provides protections for public officials from adverse consequences of disclosing information that, in the public interest, should be disclosed. A person commits an offence under the PID Act if they disclose or use information that is likely to enable the identification of the discloser as a person who has made a public interest disclosure unless the:

- the discloser consents to the disclosure of the information;
- the same information has already been lawfully published;
- the disclosure or use of the information is:
 - for the purposes of the PID Act;
 - required under another Commonwealth law, or a prescribed State or Territory law; or
 - in connection with the Ombudsman's functions or SIA's functions.

SIA will make every reasonable effort to protect a discloser's identity. Steps SIA may take to protect a discloser's identity may include:

- limiting the number of people who are aware of the discloser's identity or information that would tend to identify them;
- reminding each person who has information about the disclosure or discloser that they should keep it confidential and that an unauthorised disclosure may be a criminal offence;
- assessing whether anyone who is aware of the discloser's identity may have a motive to take reprisals or impede the progress of the investigation, and monitor accordingly; and/ or
- ensuring the discloser can communicate with a support person or the Authorised Officer without alerting other staff.

Immunity from liability

A person who makes a disclosure is not subject to any civil, criminal, or administrative liability (including disciplinary action) for making the disclosure and no contractual or other remedy may be enforced or exercised on the basis of the disclosure. However, a discloser is not protected from liability (including administrative action) for knowingly making a false or misleading statement, or knowingly making a disclosure that contravenes a designated publication restriction without reasonable excuse for doing so.

Making a disclosure does not entitle a discloser to protection from the liability of their own wrongdoing.



Protection against reprisal action

What is reprisal?

A reprisal occurs when someone causes, by act or omission, detriment to another person because they believe, or suspect, that person has made, may have made, or proposes to make, or could make, a disclosure. This could include an act or omission, or threat of an act or omission, or detriment that results in:

- dismissal or injury of an employee in their employment;
- discrimination between an employee and other employees of the same employer;
- alteration of an employee's position to their disadvantage, for example denying them a reference or a promotion without appropriate reason;
- intimidation, harassment, harm, physical injury, or psychological injury, including a stress-related injury; or
- any damage to a person (including property, reputation, business or financial position) in addition to the existing types of employment-related harm, including direct and indirect threats.

Witnesses who assist with investigations have comparable protections to disclosers, including protections from reprisals, and immunity from civil, criminal and administrative liability.

Every allegation of reprisal will be taken seriously and actioned as appropriate. All those involved in handling a disclosure and who are aware of the discloser's identity under the PID Act, must actively monitor the work environment for any signs of detriment and take timely and appropriate corrective action where necessary.

What is not a reprisal?

Reasonable administrative action to protect a discloser from detriment is not a reprisal.

Supervisors and managers are not prevented from taking legitimate disciplinary or management action to address unsatisfactory performance in the workplace, where that action is unrelated to the discloser having made a disclosure.

Managing the risk of reprisal

When a disclosure is received, the Authorised Officer must conduct a risk assessment that considers the risk of reprisal action against the discloser, if the identity of the discloser is readily ascertainable or is likely to become ascertainable during the conduct of an investigation. The reprisal risk assessment will assist in determining suitable strategies for controlling the risks and reasonable actions taken to protect public officials from detriment, or the threat of detriment, relating to the disclosure as far as reasonably practicable.

Further information is included in the '*Reprisal risk assessment*' section below.

Procedures for supervisors and managers

Role of supervisors and managers

Where:

- a public official in SIA discloses information to their supervisor or manager; and



- the supervisor or manager has reasonable grounds to believe that the information concerns, or could concern, one or more instances of disclosable conduct;

the supervisor or manager must:

- inform the discloser that the matter could be treated as an internal disclosure;
- explain to the discloser the next steps in the disclosure process (referring the disclosure to an Authorised Officer of SIA, the potential allocation of the disclosure to SIA or another agency, and the investigation of the disclosure by the Principal Officer of that agency);
- advise the discloser about the circumstances where a disclosure must be referred to an agency or other body under another law of the Commonwealth (for example, the NACC, if the disclosure involves suspected serious or systemic conduct);
- explain the civil and criminal protections the PID Act provides to disclosers and those providing assistance in relation to such disclosures, from reprisals;
- check the discloser's views on whether there is any reason why a particular Authorised Officer should, or should not, be provided the information;
- seek the discloser's consent to identify them as the source of information; and
- give the information to an Authorised Officer of SIA as soon as practicable after the disclosure is made.

Where a supervisor or manager receives a verbal disclosure, they should make a written record of:

- the name and contact details of the discloser (if known and consent is given);
- the substance of the disclosure;
- time and date of the disclosure; and
- where practicable, ask the discloser to sign the written record of the disclosure.

Procedures for Authorised Officers

Role of Authorised Officers

An Authorised Officer must:

- take reasonable steps to protect public officials within SIA from reprisal if the Authorised Officer suspects a disclosure has been, may have been, is proposed to be, or could be, made or given to the Authorised Officer;
- consider whether a disclosure includes information of suspected serious or systemic corrupt conduct;
- consider if a disclosure includes personal work-related conduct and whether one of the exceptions to the exclusion of personal work-related conduct applies;
- consider whether disclosable conduct should be referred for investigation under another more appropriate mechanism;
- refer suspected systemic or serious corrupt conduct to the NACC;
- explain to a discloser the circumstances in which a disclosure must be referred to another agency, person, or body under another law;
- notify the discloser and the Principal Officer of SIA, the Ombudsman and the discloser (if reasonably practicable) of an allocation of a disclosure to SIA;



- notify the discloser and the Ombudsman when a disclosure is not allocated under the PID Act; and
- notify the discloser when a stop action direction from the NACC prevents allocation of a disclosure.

An Authorised Officer may:

- obtain information and make enquiries as they see fit, for the purposes of deciding which agency a disclosure is to be allocated; and
- decide not to allocate a disclosure for investigation under the PID Act, if satisfied on reasonable grounds that the conduct disclosed would be more appropriately investigated under another law or power.

Advising disclosers and potential disclosers about the PID Act

Where:

- a person discloses, or is proposing to disclose, information to an Authorised Officer and the Authorised Officer has reasonable grounds to believe it may be disclosable conduct; and
- the Authorised Officer has reasonable grounds to believe the person does not know what the PID Act requires for the disclosure to be an internal disclosure; and
- the Authorised Officer has reasonable grounds to believe the person is unaware of the consequences of making the disclosure, or potential disclosure; and
- the identity and contact details of the discloser, or potential discloser, are known to the Authorised Officer;

the Authorised Officer must:

- inform the discloser, or potential discloser, that the disclosure may be treated as an internal disclosure under the PID Act;
- explain to the discloser, or potential discloser, what the requirements are for a disclosure to be an internal disclosure under the PID Act;
- explain to a discloser, or potential discloser, the circumstances in which a disclosure must be referred to another agency, person, or body under another law (for example, referring suspected systemic or serious corrupt conduct to the NACC);
- notify the discloser, or potential discloser of any orders or directions restricting publication that may affect public disclosure of the information.

Deciding whether to allocate a disclosure

When an Authorised Officer receives a disclosure, they must consider the information and determine if further information is required prior to deciding if the disclosure is an internal disclosure that should be allocated. However, if the disclosure is subject to a stop action direction under the NACC Act, it cannot be allocated.

Where a disclosure has been given to or made to an Authorised Officer, the Authorised Officer must use their best endeavours to decide on the allocation within 14 days of receiving the disclosure. If a decision is unlikely to be made within this timeframe, the discloser should be informed.

An Authorised Officer who receives a disclosure must allocate it for handling unless they are satisfied, on reasonable grounds, that:



- there is no reasonable basis on which the disclosure could be considered an internal disclosure; or
- the conduct disclosed would be more appropriately investigated under another law or power.

If the Authorised Officer is satisfied that there is a reasonable basis on which the disclosure could be considered an internal disclosure under the PID Act, they must allocate the disclosure for handling by an agency.

The Authorised Officer must decide whether to allocate the disclosure to either SIA and/or another agency. Where the Authorised Officer wishes to allocate the disclosure to another agency, they must seek consent from an Authorised Officer of that other agency to the allocation.

Where to allocate a disclosure

The Authorised Officer will consider if there are specific reasons for another agency to conduct an investigation rather than allocating the disclosure to SIA. In most instances, it will be appropriate for the agency to which the conduct relates to conduct the investigation.

Informing relevant persons of allocation

Informing the Principal Officer

Where an Authorised Officer of SIA allocates a disclosure to SIA or another agency, they must inform the Principal Officer of the receiving agency about:

- the allocation to that agency;
- the information disclosed to the Authorised Officer;
- the nature of the conduct disclosed; and
- the name and contact details of the discloser, if known to the Authorised Officer and if the discloser has consented to the Principal Officer being informed of those details.

Where the Authorised Officer allocates the disclosure to more than one agency, they must provide the above information to the Principal Officer of each agency.

Informing the discloser

If reasonably practicable, the Authorised Officer must inform the discloser in writing of:

- the allocation of the disclosure to the relevant agency; and
- the information and conduct that was disclosed that has been provided to the Principal Officer of the relevant agency.

Deciding not to allocate a disclosure

The Authorised Officer may decide not to allocate a disclosure if they are satisfied on reasonable grounds, for example, that the:

- disclosure has not been made by a person who is, or was, a public official;
- disclosure was not made to an authorised internal recipient or the discloser's supervisor or manager;
- information disclosed does not tend to show, and the discloser does not have reasonable grounds to believe, that the information tends to show one or more instances of disclosable conduct; and/or

- disclosure would be more appropriately investigated under another Commonwealth law or power.

Where an Authorised Officer decides that a disclosure is not to be allocated, they must, as soon as reasonably practicable, advise the discloser (if reasonably practicable) in writing of:

- the decision not to allocate the disclosure and reasons for the decision;
- if the Authorised Officer has taken, or proposes to take action to refer the conduct for investigation under another law or power – the details of the action taken or proposed; and
- if the Authorised Officer does not propose to refer the conduct for investigation under another law or power – any other courses of action that might be available under other law or power.

Requesting consent from discloser

Giving notice to the Principal Officer

Where the contact details of the discloser are known to the Authorised Officer, they must ask the discloser whether the discloser consents to the Authorised Officer giving the discloser's name and contact details to the Principal Officer of SIA, or another receiving agency.

The Authorised Officer should provide the discloser a reasonable time to respond and must make a written record of the discloser's response, if any.

If no response is received within a reasonable time, or the discloser does not consent to their details being provided to the Principal Officer, the Authorised Officer should:

- advise the SIA Principal Officer or Principal Officer of the receiving agency that the discloser has not provided their consent; and
- treat the disclosure as an anonymous disclosure.

The Authorised Officer may ask the discloser whether they would like to provide an anonymous means of contact to be notified about the progression of the matter as required by the PID Act.

Record keeping for Authorised Officers

Receiving a disclosure

If an Authorised Officer receives a verbal disclosure, the Authorised Officer should make a written record of:

- the name and contact details of the discloser (if known and consent is given);
- the substance of the disclosure;
- the date and time of the disclosure; and
- where practicable, ask the discloser to sign the written record of the disclosure.

Allocation and non-allocation decisions

When an Authorised Officer makes a decision to allocate the handling of a disclosure to one or more agencies, including a decision to reallocate a disclosure, the Authorised Officer must keep a written record of:

- the decision (including the name of each agency to which the disclosure is to be allocated);
- the reasons for the decision; and

- if the disclosure is allocated to another agency for handling, the consent given by the Authorised Officer of the receiving agency to the allocation.

When the Authorised Officer makes a decision not to allocate a disclosure to an agency, the Authorised Officer must keep a written record of:

- the decision; and
- the reasons for the decision.

The Authorised Officer must also keep a written record of:

- whether the discloser was given a notice (or a copy of the notice) of the allocation (or non-allocation) decision, and if not, why not;
- if the notice was given:
 - the date and time the discloser was notified;
 - the means by which the discloser was notified; and
 - the matters included in the notice.

Reprisal risk assessment

Conducting a reprisal risk assessment

As soon as possible after SIA is notified that a disclosure has been received that relates to SIA, the Authorised Officer must assess the risk of reprisals being taken against the discloser.

The reprisal risk assessment will be undertaken based on consideration of a number of risk factors, and having regard to any assessment of risk provided under these procedures by the discloser's supervisor or manager, if appropriate. The assessment can include the risk of direct reprisal against the discloser as well as any risk of related workplace conflict or difficulties.

Relevant risk factors include:

- the likelihood of the discloser being identified;
- the number of people implicated in the disclosure;
- the subject matter of the disclosure;
- the number of people who are aware, or likely to become aware, of the disclosure;
- the culture of the workplace;
- the positions of the parties;
- the likely outcome if the conduct disclosed is substantiated;
- whether any specific threats against the disclosure have been made;
- whether there is a history of conflict between the parties;
- whether the disclosure can be investigated while maintaining confidentiality;
- whether the discloser is isolated; and/ or
- whether the discloser is employed on a full time, part time, or casual basis.

In conducting the risk assessment, Authorised Officers will adopt the following risk identification and management framework:

- Identify – are reprisals or related workplace conflict problems in the workplace, or do they have the potential to be problems? A risk assessment matrix should be completed and the template can be found at **Schedule 1** of these procedures.



- Assess – what is the likelihood and consequences of reprisals or related workplace conflict? Considerations for the risk assessment (and indicators of a higher risk of reprisals) can be found at **Schedule 2** of these procedures.
- Control – what strategies should be put in place to prevent or contain reprisals or related workplace conflict? The discloser should be consulted about possible strategies.
- Monitor and review – have the strategies been implemented and were they effective?

When conducting a risk assessment, the Authorised Officer should be vigilant to the fact that discussions in relation to reprisal risks may result in the discloser feeling as though they are being discouraged from proceeding with their disclosure. The Authorised Officer should ensure the discloser is also informed of the protections afforded to them under the PID Act.

Monitoring and reviewing reprisal risks

The reprisal risk assessment should be monitored, reviewed and updated throughout the investigation process, even if the outcome of the assessment demonstrates a low risk of reprisal against the discloser.

Where the reprisal risk level is assessed as sufficiently high, a risk management plan must be developed for mitigating the risk of reprisals being taken against the discloser or other officials. The risk management strategy will generally be developed by the Authorised Officer who made the allocation decision.

Where there is a serious risk of reprisal action, it may be appropriate to adjust the working and supervision arrangements to protect the discloser or any other person who is at risk of reprisal action where this is reasonably practicable (for example, relocation, job transfer and/ or a leave of absence).

Procedures for Investigators and Investigations

Role of Principal Officers

The Principal Officer must:

- where it is reasonably practicable to do so, give the discloser information about their powers in relation to an investigation within 14 days after the disclosure is allocated to SIA;
- take steps as soon as reasonably practicable after a decision is made to not investigate the disclosure, to refer the conduct disclosed, or facilitate referral, for investigation under another law or power if appropriate;
- take reasonable steps to protect public officials who belong to SIA against reprisals in relation to disclosures that have been, may have been, are proposed to be, or could be, made to SIA (this is also an obligation of Authorised Officers);
- establish procedures for dealing with disclosures relating to SIA;
- take reasonable steps to encourage and support disclosers, including potential disclosers, and those who provide assistance in relation to disclosures;
- ensure SIA provides an effective means for potential disclosers to find out how to contact Authorised Officers;
- prepare an investigation report and take appropriate action in response to the recommendations in the report, as soon as reasonably practicable;
- notify the discloser and the Ombudsman of the completion of an investigation and provide them with a copy of the report; and



- take reasonable steps to provide ongoing training and education to public officials about the PID Act, and any training necessary to support officials to carry out their functions under the PID Act.

Discretion not to investigate

The Principal Officer may decide not to investigate a disclosure, or (if the investigation has started) not to investigate the disclosure further, if:

- the discloser is not a current or former public official;
- the information does not, to any extent, concern serious disclosable conduct;
- the disclosure is frivolous or vexatious;
- the information is the same, or substantially the same, as information previously disclosed under the PID Act and:
 - a decision was previously made not to investigate or not investigate further; or
 - the earlier disclosure has been, or is being, investigated under the PID Act.
- the information is the same, or substantially the same, as disclosable conduct that has already been investigated, or is currently being investigated, under another law or power and the Principal Officer is satisfied on reasonable grounds:
 - it would be inappropriate to conduct another investigation at the same time; or
 - there are no further matters that warrant investigation.
- the Principal Officer is satisfied, on reasonable grounds, that the conduct disclosed would be more appropriately investigated under another law or power;
- the discloser informed the Principal Officer that they do not wish for the investigation of the disclosure to be pursued, and the Principal Officer is satisfied on reasonable grounds that there are no further matters concerning the disclosure that warrant investigation;
- it is impracticable to investigate the disclosure because:
 - the discloser's name and contact details have not been disclosed; or
 - the discloser has refused, has failed, or is unable to provide the information or assistance requested for the purposes of the investigation; or
 - the age of the information.

If none of the above grounds apply, the Principal Officer must investigate the disclosure.

Notification requirements

Where the Principal Officer decides **not to investigate** a disclosure (or investigate the disclosure further) they must:

- as soon as reasonably practicable, inform the discloser and the Ombudsman:
 - that they have decided not to investigate the disclosure, or not to investigate further;
 - of the reasons for that decision (other than those reasons that may be deleted in accordance with section 50(3) of the PID Act); and
 - if the Principal Officer has taken action, or proposes to take action, to refer the conduct disclosed for investigation under another law or power – details of the following:
 - the other law or power;
 - the agency or other person to which the conduct has been referred; and
 - the steps taken, or proposed to be taken, for the conduct to be referred or to facilitate its referral.

Where a **disclosure is investigated**, the Principal Officer must:

- give written notice to the discloser, as soon as reasonably practicable, that they are required to investigate the disclosure and the estimated length of the investigation;
- give the discloser information about the Principal Officer's powers to decide not to investigate the disclosure (or not investigate further), to investigate the disclosure under a separate investigation power or to investigate under another law or power;
- prepare an investigation report and take appropriate action in response to recommendations in the report, as soon as reasonably practicable;
- inform the discloser whether action has been taken, or is proposed to be taken, to refer the conduct disclosed for investigation under another law or power;
- notify the discloser and the Ombudsman of the completion of an investigation under the PID Act and provide a copy of the report.

Additional obligations of Principal Officers

Under the PID Act, the Principal Officer must also take reasonable steps to:

- facilitate disclosures:
 - by ensuring there is a sufficient number of Authorised Officers who are readily accessible and can be identified by public officials who belong to SIA.
- provide training and education for public officials, including but not limited to:
 - integrity and accountability;
 - how to make a disclosure;
 - the protections available under the PID Act;
 - the performance and functions of officials under the PID Act; and
 - the circumstances where a disclosure must be allocated to an agency, or other person or body, under another law of the Commonwealth.
- protect public officials against reprisals that have been, or may be taken, in relation to any disclosure or potential disclosure.

Conducting the investigation

If the Principal Officer proceeds to investigate a disclosure, the Principal Officer will investigate whether disclosable conduct has occurred.

The Principal Officer may conduct the investigation at their discretion. This may include appointing an external investigator to assist them with conducting the investigation.

General principles

An investigation under the PID Act is an administrative investigation. The following general principles apply to the conduct of investigations:

- the confidentiality of the identity of the discloser must be maintained when conducting the investigation;
- the Principal Officer must ensure that if a person is interviewed as part of the investigation, the interviewee is informed of the following:
 - the identity and function of each individual conducting the interview;
 - the process of conducting an investigation;
 - the authority of the Principal Officer to conduct the investigation;

- the protections provided under the PID Act.
- The Principal Officer must also ensure that:
 - a recording of the interview is not made without the interviewee's knowledge; and
 - when an interview ends, the interviewee is given an opportunity to make a final statement or comment or express a position and for it to be included in the record of the interview.
- a decision whether evidence is sufficient to prove a fact must be determined on the balance of probabilities;
- the Principal Officer must be independent and unbiased in investigating the matter and ensure they do not have an actual or perceived conflict of interest;
- the Principal Officer must ensure that a person against whom allegations are made is afforded procedural fairness;
- the Principal Officer must ensure that a finding of fact is based on logically probative evidence;
- the Principal Officer must ensure that the evidence relied on is relevant; and
- the Principal Officer may, for the purposes of the investigation, obtain information from such persons, and make such enquiries, as they think fit.

Time limit for investigations

An investigation must be completed within 90 days after:

- the day when the disclosure was initially allocated to SIA; or
- if relevant, the day when the disclosure was reallocated to SIA; or
- if relevant, the day when the Principal Officer of SIA decided to reinvestigate the relevant disclosure; or
- to the extent that a stop action direction under the NACC Act applies, the day the Principal Officer becomes aware the direction no longer applies.

The investigation is completed when the Principal Officer has prepared the report of the investigation.

Failure to complete the investigation within this timeframe does not affect the validity of the investigation. This timeframe may also be affected where the NACC issues a stop action direction.

An extension of time to complete an investigation can be sought and granted by the Ombudsman. The Principal Officer or Authorised Officer should let the discloser know before they apply for an extension and take the opportunity to seek their views, explain why it is required and the steps that need to be taken to complete the investigation.

Report of investigation

The Principal Officer of SIA must prepare a report of the investigation, which must comply with the PID Act, the *Public Interest Disclosure Standard 2013 (PID Standard)* and these procedures.

Matters to be included in a report

A report of an investigation conducted under the PID Act must set out the following:

- the matters considered in the course of the investigation, including:
 - the nature of the conduct alleged by the discloser; and
 - any other possible disclosable conduct subsequently identified.



- the duration of the investigation;
- the steps taken to gather evidence;
- a summary of the evidence, and how the evidence informed the findings and recommendations;
- the Principal Officer's findings, based on that evidence, including:
 - whether there was any disclosable conduct and if so, what kind of disclosable conduct; and
 - the regulations, rules, administrative requirements to which the disclosable conduct relates.
- the action (if any) that has been, is being, or is recommended to be taken, to address the Principal Officer's findings;
- any claims made about, and any evidence of, reprisal action taken against the discloser or any other person that relates to matters considered in the course of the investigation;
- SIA's response to any claims or evidence of reprisal;
- if the investigation was inconclusive in any respect, the report should state as such and explain why (for example, insufficient evidence to find on the balance of probabilities that any disclosable conduct occurred).

Written notice of the report

Where the Principal Officer has completed a report of an investigation under the PID Act, the Principal Officer must, within a reasonable time after preparing the report, give written notice of the completion of the investigation and a copy of the report to:

- the discloser, if reasonably practicable; and
- the Ombudsman.

The Principal Officer may redact the following types of information from the copy of the report given to the discloser:

- information that is likely to enable the identification of the discloser or another person, or
- information, the inclusion of which would:
 - result in the copy being a document that is exempt for the purposes of Part IV of the *Freedom of Information Act 1982* (Cth);
 - result in the copy being a document having, or being required to have, a national security or other protective security classification;
 - result in the copy being a document containing intelligence information; or
 - contravene a designated publication restriction, for example a court order that certain information must not be published.

The Principal Officer may redact the following types of information from the copy of the report given to the Ombudsman:

- information that is likely to enable the identification of the discloser or another person; or
- contravene a designated publication restriction.

Record keeping, monitoring and evaluation

Records management

Where an Authorised Officer is required to keep a record under these procedures, the record will be in an electronic form and stored in the appropriate storage container. All records made for the purposes of the PID Act in accordance with these procedures must be marked in accordance with the Protective Security Policy Framework (**PSPF**).

Access to these confidential records must be restricted to the Authorised Officer and other employees in SIA who require access in order to perform a function under the PID Act, or for the purposes of another law of the Commonwealth, for example the *Public Service Act 1999* (Cth), the *Work Health and Safety Act 2011* (Cth), the *Fair Work Act 2009* (Cth), or the NACC Act.

Where a form or notification is required to be sent under these procedures, a copy of the form or notification must be kept.

Where a person will cease being a Principal Officer, Authorised Officer or delegate in SIA (including because of resignation or movement to another area of the office or another agency), their access to these confidential records should be removed.

Interaction with the National Anti-Corruption Commission

Mandatory referral obligations

Under the NACC Act, Principal Officers and Authorised Officers have mandatory obligations to refer to the NACC disclosable conduct they become aware of, in the course of exercising their functions under the PID Act, that they suspect could involve serious or systemic corrupt conduct.

A mandatory referral must be made as soon as reasonably practicable after becoming aware of the issue. The threshold that an issue could involve serious or systemic corrupt conduct is intended to operate as a low threshold.

What is 'corrupt conduct'?

Each of the following is corrupt conduct:

- any conduct of any person (whether or not a public official) that adversely affects, or that could adversely affect, either directly or indirectly:
 - the honest or impartial exercise of any public official's powers as a public official; or
 - the honest or impartial performance of any public official's functions or duties as a public official;
- any conduct of a public official that constitutes or involves a breach of public trust;
- any conduct of a public official that constitutes, involves or is engaged in for the purpose of abuse of the person's office as a public official;
- any conduct of a public official, or former public official, that constitutes or involves the misuse of information or documents acquired in the person's capacity as a public official.



What is 'serious or systemic' corrupt conduct?

Serious corrupt conduct does not have to be severe or grave and can include a range of conduct that may be significant, more than negligible, or trivial. When deciding whether corrupt conduct is serious, regard may be had to the weight or importance or significance of the conduct, and the gravity of its actual or potential circumstances.

Systemic corrupt conduct is corrupt conduct that extends beyond an isolated incident; it involves a pattern of behaviour, or something that affects or is embedded in a system.

What information should be referred?

A mandatory referral must include all information relevant to the corruption issue that is in their possession or control. This may include, but is not limited to:

- the names of any public officials who the PID officer suspects has engaged in serious or systemic corrupt conduct;
- the names of any private individual or entities involved;
- a description of the conduct that raises a corruption issue;
- the dates and timeframes of when the alleged corrupt conduct occurred, or may occur;
- how and when the PID officer became aware of the issue;
- any supporting documents or evidence; and
- any other information that may be relevant to the corruption issue.

If the referring Principal Officer or Authorised Officer becomes aware of any additional relevant information that is in their possession or control, this information must be provided to the NACC as soon as reasonably practicable.

How is a mandatory referral made?

Mandatory referrals can be made using the NACC [webform](#).

Principal Officers or Authorised Officers may provide documentation or evidence to support the report. The NACC will make a direct request if they want some or all of that information.

However, SIA or other agency heads can also make mandatory referrals and provide supporting documentation by hardcopy correspondence to the NACC, by hand or by post.

Notification requirements

Where a Principal Officer or Authorised Officer becomes aware of the corruption issues as a result of an internal disclosure made under the PID Act, they must notify the discloser of the mandatory referral to the NACC as soon as reasonably practicable.

If a decision is made to refer the Disclosure to the NACC:

- the Discloser must be notified that this has occurred as soon as reasonably practicable after making the referral; and
- the Commonwealth Ombudsman may be notified.

If a decision is made not to refer the disclosure to the NACC, a written record should be kept which outlines the decision, the reasons for the decision and any information considered.



How does a mandatory referral affect other obligations?

Protection

Where an internal disclosure to SIA results in a mandatory referral to the NACC, the discloser will still be protected under the PID Act and the Principal Officer or Authorised Officer who makes the referral will be protected under the NACC Act.

Investigation timeframes

The Principal Officer will still be required to continue investigating the disclosure in accordance with the PID Act, unless the NACC issues a stop action direction.

If a stop action direction has prevented the allocation of investigation of a disclosure and the direction is then revoked, the timeframe to complete the investigation begins the day after the Principal Officer becomes aware the stop action direction no longer applies.

If the disclosable conduct being investigated has already been investigated, or is currently being investigated, under the NACC Act while the stop action direction was in force, the Principal Officer may exercise discretion not to investigate the disclosure.

Complaints

Role of the Ombudsman

The Ombudsman can receive complaints about the handling or investigation of a disclosure by an agency. The Ombudsman will undertake a review of the agency's handling of a disclosure and assess whether it was consistent with the obligations under the PID Act and PID Standard. The Ombudsman will inform the Principal Officer/Agency Head of such reviews via SIA's generic PID inbox, publicinterestdisclosure@sportintegrity.gov.au. SIA will ensure the Principal Officer/Agency Head is informed in a timely way.

The Ombudsman does not reinvestigate the allegations made in the disclosure nor make a determination on the original findings.

Schedule 1: Risk of reprisals assessment

In assessing the risk of reprisal, the following risk matrix can be used:¹

	Likely consequence of reprisal				
		Minor	Moderate	Major	Extreme
Likelihood of reprisal being taken against a discloser	Almost certain	Medium	High	High	High
	Likely	Medium	Medium	High	High
	Unlikely	Low	Low	Medium	Medium
	Highly unlikely	Low	Low	Low	Medium

¹ **Alignment with SIA’s Risk Management Framework**

The risk of reprisals assessment conducted under this procedures is aligned with Sport Integrity Australia’s Risk Management Policy and Framework. Reprisal risks are assessed using a structured matrix that considers both the likelihood and seriousness of potential detriment, consistent with SIA’s enterprise-wide approach to risk evaluation. Risk identification, control strategies, and monitoring processes outlined in these procedures reflect the principles of integrated, dynamic, and inclusive risk management as set out in the Risk Management Policy. Where reprisal risks exceed tolerance thresholds, escalation and mitigation strategies will be implemented in accordance with the SIA’s assurance and governance arrangements.

Schedule 2: Indicators of a higher risk of reprisals or workplace conflict²

Threats or past experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has a specific threat against the discloser been received? • Is there a history of conflict between the discloser and the subjects of the disclosure, management, supervisors or colleagues? • Is there a history of reprisals or other conflict in the workplace? • Is it likely that the disclosure will exacerbate this?
Confidentiality unlikely to be maintained	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who knows that the disclosure has been made or was going to be made? • Has the discloser already raised the substance of the disclosure or revealed their identity in the workplace? • Who in the workplace knows the discloser’s identity? • Is the discloser’s immediate work unit small? • Are there circumstances, such as the discloser’s stress level, that will make it difficult for them to not discuss the matter with people in their workplace?
Significant reported wrongdoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will the discloser become identified or suspected when the existence or substance of the disclosure is made known or investigated? • Can the disclosure be investigated while maintaining confidentiality? • Are there allegations about individuals in the disclosure? • Who are their close professional and social associates within the workplace? • Is there more than one wrongdoer involved in the matter? • Is the reported wrongdoing serious? • Is or was the reported wrongdoing occurring frequently? • Is the disclosure particularly sensitive or embarrassing for any subjects of the disclosure, senior management, the agency or government? • Do these people have the intent to take reprisals – for example, because they have a lot to lose? • Do these people have the opportunity to take reprisals – for example, because they have power over the discloser?
Vulnerable discloser	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is or was the reported wrongdoing directed at the discloser? • Are there multiple subjects of the disclosure? • Is the disclosure about a more senior officer? • Is the discloser employed part-time or on a casual basis? • Is the discloser isolated – for example, geographically or because of shift work? • Are the allegations unlikely to be substantiated – for example, because there is a lack of evidence? • Is the disclosure being investigated outside your organisation?

² Extract from the Commonwealth Ombudsman’s [Guide](#) to assessing and managing the risk of reprisal.