

**An Post**

**Report under Section 22 of the Protected Disclosures Act 2014**

**Year Ended 31 December 2015**

## **Background**

The Protected Disclosures Act 2014 ('the Act') provides for the protection of employees from dismissal or other detriment suffered as a result of raising in good faith a concern regarding potential wrongdoing that has come to their attention in the workplace. The Act sets out a number of ways in which disclosures can be made. An Post has a detailed policy on Raising Matters of Concern which is available to all employees.

Each public body, including An Post, is required (under Section 22 of the Act) to publish an annual report setting out the number of protected disclosures received in the preceding year and the action taken (if any). This report must not result in persons making disclosures being identifiable. Reports are required to be issued no later than 30 June each year.

This report covers the period 1 January 2015 to 31 December 2015.

## **Progress on 2014 Issues Forward**

An Post noted in its first report for the period ended 31 December 2014 that it received three protected disclosures during that reporting period. Two of the matters reported led to disciplinary action following investigation of the reports. The third disclosure was deemed to be unfounded following an investigation of the issues raised as part of a scheduled Internal Audit review. All three cases are now closed.

## **Protected Disclosures Received in 2015**

Eight protected disclosures were received by An Post in the year ending 31 December 2015. A separate report made under the Act was considered not to be a protected disclosure following a detailed investigation of the allegations made. Investigations into each of the disclosures received was commenced promptly following receipt and the matters reported have been notified to the Board Audit and Risk Committee in accordance with An Post's Protected Disclosure Policy. Five of the matters raised were investigated and the cases closed. In four of the cases, the disclosure was considered unfounded or unable to be substantiated due to insufficient evidence being supplied anonymously. In the fifth case, the employees concerned resigned while the matter was under investigation and the case was therefore closed. The three remaining open reports were under active investigation as of date of publication of this report.

**Brian Fay**

**Company Secretary**

**16 June 2016**