



Murray Irrigation

Managing Unreasonable Conduct by Complainants Procedure

December 2023

www.murrayirrigation.com.au
PO BOX 528 DENILIQUIN NSW 2710 | 1300 138 265

Document Revision Summary

Rev No.	Date	Description	Author	Checked by	Approved by
0	15/04/2023	First draft	Geoff Mann	Siobhan Barry Josh Bode	
1	20/06/2023	Final version	Geoff Mann	Josh Bode	
2	13/12/2023	Updated Section 5 – Roles & Responsibilities - following AFS recommendation	Geoff Mann	Josh Bode	

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
1 Purpose.....	3
2 Supporting Policies and documents.....	3
3 Principles	3
4 Defining unreasonable conduct by a complainant.....	4
4.1 Unreasonable conduct by a complainant	4
5 Roles and responsibilities	7
6 Responding to and managing UCC.....	9
6.1 Changing or restricting a complainant's access to services.....	9
7 Alternative dispute resolution	13
7.1 Using alternative dispute resolution strategies	13
8 Procedure for changing or restricting a complainant's access to services	14
8.1 Identify UCC.....	14
8.2 Review UCC	14
8.3 Determine action to be taken:.....	15
8.4 Provide a warning letter.....	16
8.5 Notification letter.....	16
8.6 Notify relevant staff about access changes/restrictions	17
8.7 Monitoring and oversight responsibilities	17
9 Appealing a decision to change or restrict access to services	17
10 Non-compliance with a change or restriction on access to services	18
10.1 Recording and reporting incidents of non-compliance	18
11 Periodic reviews of active cases	18
11.1 Period for review.....	18
11.2 Periodic review process	19
11.3 Criteria to be considered during a review	19
11.4 Notifying a complainant of the outcome of a review	19
11.5 Recording the outcome of a review and notifying relevant staff.....	20
12 Resources:.....	20

1 Purpose

Murray Irrigation is committed to being accessible and responsive to all complainants who approach our company regardless of ethnic identity, national origin, religion, linguistic background, sex, gender expression, sexual orientation, physical ability or other cultural or personal factors.

At the same time, the success of the company depends on:

- our ability to do our work in the most effective and efficient ways possible,
- the health, safety, and security of our staff
- our ability to allocate our resources fairly across all the complaints we receive.

When complainants behave unreasonably, it can significantly affect the successful conduct of our work. Murray Irrigation will act proactively and decisively to manage any complainant conduct that negatively and unreasonably affects us and will support our staff to do the same in accordance with this procedure.

2 Supporting Policies and documents

This procedure is compliant with and supported by the following documents:

- Murray Irrigation Work Health and Safety Policy
- Murray Irrigation Complaint Handling Policy
- Murray Irrigation Complaint Handling Procedure
- Murray Irrigation Zero Tolerance Policy
- Murray Irrigation Zero Tolerance Procedure
- Murray Irrigation Customer Service Charter.

3 Principles

This procedure aims to assist all staff members to better manage unreasonable conduct by complainants (UCC) by helping staff to:

- feel confident and supported in taking action to manage UCC,
- act fairly, consistently, honestly, and appropriately when responding to UCC,
- understand their roles and responsibilities in relation to the management of UCC, and how this procedure will be used,

- understand the types of circumstances when it may be appropriate to manage UCC
- understand the criteria to consider before deciding to change or restrict a complainant's access to services,
- be aware of the processes that will be followed to record and report UCC incidents, and the procedures for consulting and notifying complainants about any proposed action or decision to change or restrict their access to services, and
- understand how to review decisions made under this procedure, including specific timeframes for review.

4 Defining unreasonable conduct by a complainant

4.1 Unreasonable conduct by a complainant

Most complainants act reasonably and responsibly in their interactions with us, even when they are experiencing high levels of distress, frustration, and anger about their complaint. However, despite our best efforts to help them, in a very small number of cases complainants display inappropriate and unacceptable behaviour. They can be aggressive and verbally abusive towards staff, threaten harm and violence or bombard staff and offices with unnecessary and excessive phone calls, visits, and emails. They may make inappropriate demands on our time and resources or refuse to accept decisions and recommendations in relation to their complaints. When complainants behave in these ways (and where there are no cultural or other factors that could reasonably explain their behaviour) we consider their conduct to be 'unreasonable'.

In short, ***unreasonable conduct by a complainant is any behaviour by a current or former complainant which, because of its nature or frequency raises substantial health, safety, resource or equity issues for our organisation, our staff, other service users and complainants or the complainant themselves.***

UCC can be divided into 5 categories of conduct:

- unreasonable persistence
- unreasonable demands
- unreasonable lack of cooperation
- unreasonable arguments
- unreasonable behaviours.

4.1.1 Unreasonable persistence

Unreasonable persistence is continued, incessant and unrelenting conduct by a complainant that has a disproportionate and unreasonable impact on Murray Irrigation staff, services, time, or resources.

Some examples of unreasonably persistent behaviour include:

- An unwillingness or inability to accept reasonable and logical explanations, including final decisions that have been comprehensively considered and dealt with (even when it is evident the complainant does understand the information provided).
- Persistently demanding a review simply because it is available, and without arguing or presenting a case for one.
- Pursuing and exhausting all available review options, even after we have explained that a review is not warranted – and refusing to accept that we cannot or will not take further action on their complaint.
- Reframing a complaint in an effort to get it taken up again.
- Multiple and repeated phone calls, visits, letters, emails (including cc'd correspondence) after we have repeatedly asked them not to.
- Contacting different people within or outside Murray Irrigation to get a different outcome or a more sympathetic response to their complaint – this is known as internal and external 'forum shopping'.

4.1.2 Unreasonable demands

Unreasonable demands are any demands expressly made by a complainant that have a disproportionate and unreasonable impact on Murray Irrigation staff, services, time, or resources.

Some examples of unreasonable demands include:

- Issuing instructions and making demands about how to handle their complaint, the priority it should be given, or the outcome to be achieved.
- Insisting on talking to a senior manager or the CEO personally when the reasons that this is not appropriate or warranted have been carefully explained to the complainant.
- Emotional blackmail and manipulation resulting in intimidation, harassment, shaming, seduction or portraying themselves as being victimised when this is not the case.
- Insisting on outcomes that are not possible or appropriate in the circumstances, for example

asking for someone to be fired or prosecuted, or for an apology or compensation when there is no reasonable basis for this.

- Demanding services of a nature or scale that we cannot provide, even after we have explained this to them repeatedly.

4.1.3 Unreasonable lack of cooperation

Unreasonable lack of cooperation is when a complainant is unwilling or unable to cooperate with us, our staff, or our complaints process – resulting in a disproportionate and unreasonable use of our services, time, or resources. Some examples of unreasonable lack of cooperation include:

- Sending us a constant stream of complex or disorganised information without clearly defining the issue at hand or explaining how the material provided relates to their complaint (where the complainant is clearly capable of doing this).
- Providing little or no detail around their complaint or providing information in ‘drips and drabs’.
- Refusing to follow or accept our instructions, suggestions, or advice without a clear or justifiable reason for doing so.
- Arguing that a particular solution is the correct one in the face of valid contrary arguments and explanations.
- Unhelpful behaviour such as withholding information, acting dishonestly and misquoting others.

4.1.4 Unreasonable arguments

Unreasonable arguments include any arguments that are not based on any reason or logic, that are incomprehensible, false, or inflammatory, trivial, or delirious, and that disproportionately and unreasonably impact upon Murray Irrigation, staff, services, time, or resources.

Arguments are unreasonable when they:

- fail to follow a logical sequence that the complainant is able to explain to staff,
- are not supported by any evidence or are based on conspiracy theories,
- lead a complainant to reject all other valid and contrary arguments,
- are trivial when compared to the amount of time, resources, and attention that the complainant demands,
- are false, inflammatory, or defamatory.

4.1.5 Unreasonable behaviour

Unreasonable behaviour is conduct that is unreasonable in all circumstances (regardless of how stressed, angry, or frustrated a complainant is) because it unreasonably compromises the health, safety and security of staff, other service users or the complainant themselves. Some examples of unreasonable behaviours include:

- acts of aggression, verbal abuse, derogatory, racist, or grossly defamatory remarks
- harassment, intimidation, or physical violence
- rude, confronting, or threatening correspondence
- threats of harm to self or third parties, threats with a weapon or threats to damage property, including bomb threats
- stalking in person or online
- emotional manipulation.

All staff should note that Murray Irrigation has a Zero-Tolerance Policy towards any harm, abuse or threats directed towards them. Any conduct of this kind will be dealt with under this policy and the Zero Tolerance Procedure and in accordance with our duty of care and work health and safety responsibilities.

5 Roles and responsibilities

Role	Responsibility
Chief Executive Officer	• Ensuring the company maintains a Managing Unreasonable Conduct by Complainant Procedure. • Providing resources to ensure there is clear communication processes, monitoring of compliance and reporting. • Ensuring the company has resources and processes that enable all staff to be trained to deal with UCC, provided with the opportunity to debrief their concerns, either formally or informally, following a stressful interaction and have access to support and assistance through programs like an Employee Assistance Program. • Review of appeals regarding decisions to restrict contact or services to a complainant in the circumstances identified in this procedure.

Role	Responsibility
General Managers	- Ensuring the implementation, review, and compliance reporting of the Managing Unreasonable Conduct by Complainant Procedure within their area of control. - Approval of decisions to restrict contact or services to a complainant in the circumstances identified in this procedure. - Undertake periodic reviews of active cases. - Ensuring that all staff within their area of control are trained to deal with UCC, provided with the opportunity to debrief their concerns, either formally or informally, following a stressful interaction and have access to support including medical or police assistance and the Employee Assistance Program.
Managers	- Actively ensuring employees in their teams are implementing the Managing Unreasonable Conduct by Complainant Procedure. - Investigating and reviewing incidents. - Propose changes or restrictions to be applied to a complainant's access to services in the circumstances identified in this procedure. - Issuing of written warnings following relevant approval. - Ensuring their staff engage in the training provided to deal with UCC, are assisted to debrief their concerns, either formally or informally, following a stressful interaction and have access to support including medical or police assistance and the Employee Assistance Program.
All staff	- Day to day implementation of the Managing Unreasonable Conduct by Complainant Procedure including: - Identification of unacceptable behaviours and activity, - Recording and reporting of any situation where unacceptable behaviour or activity is identified, - Assisting in investigation or reviews as requested. - Participating in training provided to deal with UCC. - Staff are also encouraged to explain the contents of this document to all complainants, particularly those who engage in UCC or exhibit the early warning signs of UCC.

6 Responding to and managing UCC

6.1 Changing or restricting a complainant's access to services

UCC incidents will generally be managed by limiting or adapting the ways Murray Irrigation interacts with or deliver services to complainants by restricting:

- **Who they have contact with** – limiting a complainant to a sole contact person or staff member in Murray Irrigation.
- **What they can raise with us** – restricting the subject matter of communications that we will consider and respond to.
- **When they can have contact** – limiting a complainant's contact with Murray Irrigation to a particular time, day, or length of time, or curbing the frequency of their contact with us.
- **Where they can make contact** – limiting the locations where we will conduct face-to-face interviews to secured facilities or areas of the office.
- **How they can make contact** – limiting or modifying the forms of contact that the complainant can have with us. This can include modifying or limiting face-to-face interviews, telephone, and written communications, prohibiting access to our premises, contact through a representative only, taking no further action or terminating provision of services altogether.

When using the restrictions provided in this section, it is recognised that discretion will need to be used to adapt them to suit a complainant's personal circumstances such as level of competency, literacy skills, and cultural background. In this regard, more than one strategy may be needed in individual cases to ensure their appropriateness and efficacy.

6.1.1 Who: limiting the complainant to a sole contact point

Where a complainant tries to forum-shop within Murray Irrigation, changes their issues of complaint repeatedly, constantly reframes their complaint, or raises an excessive number of complaints, it may be appropriate to restrict their access to a single staff member (a sole contact point) who will manage their complaint(s) and interactions. This may help ensure they are dealt with consistently and may minimise the incidence of misunderstandings, contradictions, and manipulation.

To avoid staff 'burnout', the sole contact's supervisor will provide regular support and guidance as needed. Their manager will also review the arrangement at least every 6 months to ensure that the sole contact is managing/coping with the arrangement.

Complainants who are restricted to a sole contact person will, however, be given the contact details of one additional staff member who they can contact if their primary contact is unavailable – for example if they go on leave or are otherwise unavailable for an extended period.

6.1.2 What: restricting the subject matter of communications that we will consider

Where complainants repeatedly send letters, emails, or online forms that raise trivial or insignificant issues, contain inappropriate or abusive content, or relate to an issue that has already been comprehensively considered or reviewed (at least once) by Murray Irrigation, we may restrict the issues the complainant can raise with us. For example, we may:

- Refuse to respond to correspondence that raises an issue that has already been dealt with, that raises a trivial issue, or is not supported by evidence. The complainant will be advised that future correspondence of this kind will be read and filed without acknowledgement unless we decide that we need to pursue it further – in which case, we may do so on our 'own motion'.
- Restrict the complainant to one complaint or issue per month. Any attempts to circumvent this restriction (for example by raising multiple complaints or issues in the one letter) may result in modifications or further restrictions being placed on their access.
- Return the correspondence to the complainant and require them to remove any inappropriate content before we agree to consider its contents. We will also keep a copy of the inappropriate correspondence for our records to help identify repeat UCC incidents.

6.1.3 When and how: limiting when and how a complainant can contact us

If a complainant's contact with Murray Irrigation places an unreasonable demand on our time or resources, or affects the health, safety, and security of our staff because it involves behaviour that is persistently rude, threatening, abusive or aggressive, we may limit when or how the complainant can interact with us. This may include:

- Limiting their telephone calls or face-to-face interviews to a particular time of the day or days of the week.
- Limiting the length or duration of telephone calls, written correspondence, or face-to-face

interviews. For example:

- Telephone calls may be limited to ten (10) minutes at a time and will be politely terminated at the end of that time period.
 - Lengthy written communications may be restricted to a maximum of 15 typed or written pages, single sided, font size 12 or it will be sent back to the complainant to be organised and summarised – This option is only appropriate in cases where the complainant can summarise the information and refuses to do so.
 - Limiting face-to-face interviews to a maximum of 45 minutes.
- Limiting the frequency of their telephone calls, written correspondence, or face-to-face interviews. Depending on the natures of the service(s) provided we may limit:
- Telephone calls to one (1) every two (2) weeks or month.
 - Written communications to one (1) every two (2) weeks or month.
 - Face-to-face interviews to one (1) every two (2) weeks or month.
- For irrelevant, overly lengthy, disorganised or very frequent written correspondence we may also:
- Require the complainant to clearly identify how the information or supporting materials they have sent to us relate to the central issues that we have identified in their complaint.
 - Restrict the frequency with which complainants can send emails or other written communications to our office.
 - Restrict a complainant to sending emails to a particular email account (e.g., Murray Irrigation's main email account) or block their email access altogether and require that any further correspondence be sent through Australia Post only.

6.1.4 'Writing only' restrictions

When a complainant is restricted to 'writing only' they may be restricted to written communications through:

- Australia Post only
- Email only to a specific staff email or general office email account
- Fax only to a specific fax number
- Some other relevant form of written contact, where applicable.

If a complainant's contact is restricted to writing only, the Manager will clearly identify the specific means that the complainant can use to contact the office (e.g., Australia Post only). If it is not appropriate for a complainant to enter the premises to hand deliver their written communication this must be communicated to them as well.

Any communications received by the office in a manner that contravenes a 'writing only' restriction will either be returned to the complainant or read and filed without acknowledgement.

6.1.5 Where: limiting face-to-face interviews to secure areas

If a complainant is violent or overtly aggressive, unreasonably disruptive, threatening or demanding or makes frequent unannounced visits to Murray Irrigation premises, we may consider restricting face-to-face contact with them.

These restrictions can include:

- Restricting access to only particular premises or areas of the office such as the reception area that are secure and safe.
- Restricting their ability to attend our premises to specified times of the day or days of the week only – for example, when additional security is available or to times or days that are less busy.
- Allowing them to attend the office on an 'appointment only' basis, and only with specified staff (for these meetings, staff should enlist the support and assistance of a colleague for added safety and security.)
- Banning the complainant from attending our premises altogether and allowing some other form of contact, e.g., 'writing only' or 'telephone only' contact.

6.1.6 Contact through a representative only

In cases where we cannot completely restrict our contact with a complainant and their conduct is particularly difficult to manage, we may require them to contact us through a support person or representative only. The support person may be someone nominated by the complainant, but they must be approved by the General Manager, or their delegate.

When assessing a representative or support person's suitability, the Manager should consider factors such as their level of competency and literacy skills, demeanour and behaviour, and relationship with

the complainant. If the Manager determines that the representative or support person may exacerbate the situation with the complainant, the complainant will be asked to nominate another person and we may assist them in this regard.

6.1.7 Completely terminating a complainant's access to services

In rare cases, and as a last resort when all other strategies have been considered, the General Manager may decide that it is necessary for Murray Irrigation to completely restrict a complainant's contact or access to services.

A decision to have no further contact with a complainant will only be made if it appears that the complainant is unlikely to modify their conduct, or their conduct poses a significant risk for staff or other parties because it involves one or more of the following:

- Acts of aggression, verbal or physical abuse, threats of harm, harassment, intimidation, stalking, assault.
- Damage to property while on our premises.
- Threats with a weapon or common office items that can be used to harm another person or themselves.
- Physically preventing a staff member from moving around freely either within their office or during an off-site visit – e.g., entrapping them in their home.
- Conduct that is otherwise unlawful.

In these cases, the complainant will be sent a letter notifying them that their access has been restricted as outlined below.

A complainant's access to Murray Irrigation services and premises may also be restricted (directly or indirectly) using legal mechanisms like trespass laws and other legislation or legal orders to protect members of staff from personal violence, intimidation or stalking by a complainant.

7 Alternative dispute resolution

7.1 Using alternative dispute resolution strategies

If the General Manager determines that Murray Irrigation cannot terminate services to a complainant in a particular case or that Murray Irrigation bears some responsibility for causing or exacerbating

their conduct, they may consider using alternative dispute resolution strategies such as mediation and conciliation to resolve the conflict with the complainant and attempt to rebuild a relationship with them. If an alternate dispute resolution is an appropriate option in a particular case, it will be conducted by an independent third party to ensure transparency and impartiality.

However, we recognise that in UCC situations an alternate dispute resolution may not be an appropriate or effective strategy – particularly if the complainant is uncooperative or resistant to compromise. Therefore, each case will be assessed on its own facts to determine the appropriateness of this approach.

8 Procedure for changing or restricting a complainant's access to services

8.1 Identify UCC

All staff are empowered to identify when a complainant's behaviour transitions to what has been defined as unreasonable complainant conduct above.

Following identification staff need to raise an incident regarding the situation and inform their line manager.

8.2 Review UCC

The Manager whose staff member lodged the UCC incident will review the situation, including:

- The circumstances that gave rise to the UCC incident, including the complainant's situation, personal and cultural background, and perspective.
- The impact of the complainant's conduct on Murray Irrigation, relevant staff, time, resources etc.
- The complainant's response to the staff member's warnings or requests to stop the unreasonable behaviour.
- What the staff member has done to manage the complainant's conduct (if applicable).
- Any suggestions made by relevant staff on ways that the situation could be managed.

The reviewing Manager will utilise the criteria below to inform the course of action to be taken.

Criteria to be considered includes:

- A search of Murray Irrigation's Customer Management System for information about the complainant's prior conduct and history with Murray Irrigation.
- Whether the conduct in question involved overt anger, aggression, violence, or assault (which is unacceptable in all circumstances and would be managed in line with the Zero Tolerance Policy & Procedure).
- Whether the complainant's case has merit.
- The likelihood that the complainant will modify their unreasonable conduct if they are given a formal warning about their conduct.
- Whether changing or restricting access to services will be effective in managing the complainant's behaviour.
- Whether changing or restricting access to services will affect the complainant's ability to meet their obligations, such as reporting obligations.
- Whether changing or restricting access to services will have an undue impact on the complainant's welfare, livelihood, or dependents etc.
- Whether the complainant's personal circumstances have contributed to the behaviour – For example, the complainant's cultural background may mean their communication patterns differ from those of staff, or organisation's standards, or the complainant is a vulnerable person who is under significant stress as a result of one or more of the following:
 - physical disability
 - illiteracy or other language or communication barrier
 - mental or other illness
 - personal crises
 - substance or alcohol abuse.
- Whether the complainant's response or conduct was moderately disproportionate, grossly disproportionate, or not at all disproportionate in the circumstances.
- Whether there are any statutory provisions that would limit the types of limitations that can be applied to the complainant's contact with, or access to services.

8.3 Determine action to be taken:

Once the Manager has considered the above criteria, they will make a recommendation to the General Manager on the appropriate course of action. They may suggest formal or informal options for dealing

with the complainant's conduct which may include one or more of the strategies provided in the manual and this procedure.

8.4 Provide a warning letter

Unless a complainant's conduct poses a substantial risk to the health and safety of staff or other third parties the complainant will be provided with a written warning about their conduct in the first instance, following approval of the proposed action/s to be taken. If the complainant is unable to read the letter, it will be followed/accompanied by a telephone call, using an interpreter if necessary.

The warning letter will:

- Specify the date, time, and location of the UCC incident(s).
- Explain why the complainant's conduct/UCC incident is problematic.
- List the types of access changes and/or restrictions that may be imposed if the behaviour continues. (Note: not every possible restriction should be listed but only those that are most relevant).
- Provide clear and full reasons for the warning being given.
- Include access to Murray Irrigation's Customer Charter.
- Provide the name and contact details of the staff member who they can contact about the letter.

8.5 Notification letter

If a complainant's conduct continues after they have been given a written warning the Manager will seek approval to send a notification letter immediately restricting the complainant's access to services (without prior or further written warning).

If the complainant is unable to read the letter (due to literacy issues, non-English speaking, etc.) the letter will be followed or accompanied by a telephone call, using an interpreter if necessary.

This notification letter will:

- Specify the date, time, and location of the UCC incident(s).
- Explain why the complainant's conduct is problematic.
- Identify the change and/or restriction that will be imposed and what it means for the complainant.

- Provide clear and full reasons for this restriction.
- Specify the duration of the change or restriction imposed, which will not exceed 12 months.
- Indicate a time period for review.
- Provide the name and contact details of the staff member who they can contact about the letter and/or request a review of the decision.

8.6 Notify relevant staff about access changes/restrictions

The Manager will notify relevant staff about any decisions to change or restrict a complainant's access to services.

The Manager will ensure the Customer Management System is updated with a record outlining the nature of the restriction imposed and its duration.

8.7 Monitoring and oversight responsibilities

Once a complainant has been issued with a warning letter or notification letter the Manager will review the complainant's record/restriction every three months, on request by a staff member, or following any further incidents of UCC that involve the complainant, to ensure that they are complying with the restrictions and the arrangement is working.

If the Manager determines that the restrictions have been ineffective in managing the complainant's conduct or are otherwise inappropriate, they may decide to recommend modifying the restrictions, impose further restrictions, or terminate the complainant's access to services altogether.

9 Appealing a decision to change or restrict access to services

Complainants who have their access changed or restricted are entitled to one appeal of a decision to change or restrict their access to services. Requests for appeals need to be lodged within ten (10) working days from the notification of the change or restriction.

Only arguments relating to the restriction and not to the original issue, will be considered in the appeal process.

Appeal requests need to be in writing and must explain why the complainant wishes to appeal the decision. The appeal request could include information regarding:

- the behaviours being wrongly identified,
- the restrictions are disproportionate,
- due to personal circumstances the restrictions will have a disproportionately negative impact.

Murray Irrigation management will consider the appeal and respond within ten (10) working days.

Murray Irrigation management has the sole discretion to overturn or change the restrictions based on what they determine to be fair and reasonable.

If a complainant is still dissatisfied after the appeal process, they may seek an external review from an oversight agency such as the Ombudsman or an Alternate Dispute Resolution practitioner.

The Ombudsman may accept the review (in accordance with its administrative jurisdiction) to ensure that Murray Irrigation has acted fairly, reasonably, and consistently and has observed the principles of good administrative practice, including procedural fairness.

10 Non-compliance with a change or restriction on access to services

10.1 Recording and reporting incidents of non-compliance

All staff members are responsible for recording and reporting incidents of non-compliance by complainants. This should be recorded in a file note in the Customer Management System and escalated to the Manager responsible for monitoring the UCC case. The Manager will need to assess and seek approval if any action needs to be taken to modify or further restrict the complainant's access to services.

11 Periodic reviews of active cases

11.1 Period for review

All cases where this procedure is used will be reviewed every 3 months for effectiveness from the date the service change or restriction was initially imposed or upheld, or another incident occurs.

At 12 months, or in the lead up to the expiry of the restriction/change in service period a full review of the case will be conducted by the General Manager, or their delegate.

11.2 Periodic review process

In preparation for the full review the General Manager, or their delegate, will ask the complainant if they would like to participate in the review process unless they determine that this invitation will provoke a negative response from the complainant (i.e. further UCC). The invitation will be given, and the review will be conducted in accordance with the complainant's access restrictions.

11.3 Criteria to be considered during a review

When conducting a review, the Manager will consider:

- Whether the complainant has had any contact with Murray Irrigation during the restriction period.
- The complainant's conduct during the restriction period.
- Any information or arguments put forward by the complainant for review.
- Any other information that may be relevant in the circumstances.

The Manager may also consult any staff members who have had contact with the complainant during the restriction period.

Sometimes a complainant may not have a reason to contact the office during their restriction period. As a result, a review decision that is based primarily on the fact that the complainant has not contacted Murray Irrigation during their restriction period may not be an accurate representation of their level of compliance/reformed behaviour. This should be taken into consideration, in relevant situations.

11.4 Notifying a complainant of the outcome of a review

The Manager will tell the complainant the outcome of their review using an appropriate method of communication, as well as a written letter explaining the outcome. The review letter will:

- Briefly explain the review process.
- Identify the factors that have been considered during the review.
- Explain the decision or outcome of the review and the reasons for it.

If the outcome of the review is to maintain or modify the restriction, the review letter will also:

- Indicate the nature of the new or continued restriction.
- State the duration of the new restriction period.
- Provide the name and contact details of the Manager who the complainant can contact to discuss the letter.
- Be signed by the General Manager.

11.5 Recording the outcome of a review and notifying relevant staff

The Manager is responsible for keeping a record of the outcome of the review, updating the Customer Management System accordingly, and notifying all relevant staff of the outcome of the review including if the restriction has been withdrawn.

12 Resources:

Staff are also encouraged and authorised to use the strategies and scripts provided on the NSW Ombudsman's website under *Guidance for Agencies - Managing unreasonable conduct by a complainant Manual* including:

- Strategies and scripts for managing unreasonable persistence
- Strategies and scripts for managing unreasonable demands
- Strategies and scripts for managing unreasonable lack of cooperation
- Strategies and scripts for managing unreasonable arguments
- Strategies and scripts for managing unreasonable behaviours