









































Over the last year, SLASTO continued its consultations and developed an implementation plan to ensure a smooth operationalization of the policy, including training of all staff and adjudicators – both those who are English-speaking and in designated bilingual positions.

Full implementation of the policy will take place in the summer of 2018. Until that time, all services will continue to be provided in compliance with the FLSA.

## **6. INDIGENOUS SERVICES POLICY**

In 2016, SLASTO identified an organizational lead for Indigenous Services, who undertook a review of the current services provided by the cluster. Following that review, as reported in last year's Annual Report, improvements were made to the way in which circle hearings are conducted with the Ontario Parole Board.

Building upon this progress, SLASTO identified the need to develop an Indigenous Services Policy that would reflect its commitment to the provision of Indigenous Services and to inform the public about the manner in which Indigenous Services are provided by all its tribunals.

Early work has begun and will continue over the next reporting period, with a target completion date of winter 2018.

## **7. TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

SLASTO's Training and Professional Development Plan aims to invest in the people within our organization to foster a strong culture of support and engagement, focusing on members and staff. Over the last year, the member training framework was completed, which clearly articulates the unique training needs of an adjudicator at SLASTO and the process by which an adjudicator receives initial and ongoing training support. Over the next year, the team will be developing a staff training framework, which will serve to complement and mirror the adjudicator plan. The completion of both frameworks will allow for an engaged and agile workforce as we develop and empower staff and members within the cluster. SLASTO aims to complete this initiative by fall 2018.

## **8. SELF-REPRESENTED PARTIES SERVICE STRATEGY**

For a self-represented party, appearing before a tribunal can often be a stressful and overwhelming experience, particularly when the other party may appear with legal representation. At SLASTO, many of those who appear before us are indeed self-

represented, which is why we try to ‘level the playing field’ wherever possible, while remaining impartial.

Case conferences are a key tool in this respect, which focus on early resolution and they are a confidential forum to educate the parties, particularly self-represented parties, on the tribunal’s jurisdiction, process, expectations and merits of a case. Furthermore, the cluster focuses on providing information in plain language, providing parties with a clear sense of a case lifecycle and what they can expect when they appear before a tribunal.

Building on these early initiatives, in 2017 SLASTO identified an organizational lead for self-represented services. As part of this SLASTO will be developing a comprehensive strategy that will guide the cluster in delivering an enhanced level of services to self-represented parties.

The strategy will include training for staff and members; developing practical and accessible materials for self-represented parties; and the development of standardized materials for adjudicators. Early work has begun and will continue over the next reporting period, with a target completion date of winter 2018.

## **9. ENHANCE CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS**

To improve client service, SLASTO has continued to document user feedback and prioritize upgrades to the existing Licence Appeal Tribunal-Automobile Accident Benefits Service (LAT-AABS) and Ontario Civilian Police Commission (OCPC) case management systems. These upgrade will streamline business processes for consistency/standardization. While some upgrades have been made over the last reporting period, the target completion date for this initiative is winter 2018.

## **10. E-FILE**

Since beginning to accept applications in 2016, LAT-AABS has continued to look for ways to refine our services and simplify our processes.

In November 2017, LAT-AABS piloted an e-File application that would allow accident claimants and insurance companies to file their disputes more conveniently online. LAT-AABS e-File has made it easier for parties by:

- Offering a more efficient and timely service to clients;
- Reducing mail, fax and hardcopy file handling and data entry; and
- Enabling system checks and validation for accurate processing.

A sample group of participants were selected to use e-File during the pilot to test and provide feedback prior to the full implementation to the general public. The full launch is anticipated for June 2018.

Over the next three years, SLASTO will seek opportunities to implement e-File across the cluster.

## **11. ORGANIZATIONAL DESIGN REVIEW**

Over the last year, SLASTO has continued to focus on implementing the recommendations made by the Organizational Design Review and put in place new structures that leverage the new co-located environment. Work will continue over the next year with a target implementation of spring 2019.

## **12. FIRE SAFETY COMMISSION EXPANSION**

Pursuant to the *Adjudicative Tribunals Accountability, Governance and Appointments Act 2009* and the Agency Accountability Directive, mandate reviews of SLASTO's constituent tribunals began in 2015. The purpose of mandate reviews is to allow the government to assess that agencies continue to be relevant to the goals and priorities of the government, whether the agency is carrying out the activities required in its statutory mandate and policy framework and whether all or part of its functions continue to be best performed by the agency or whether others might better perform the mandate.

Over the last year, the Fire Safety Commission (FSC) underwent its mandate review and the tribunal is now working with the Ministry to consider the recommendations.

Furthermore, the FSC continues to expect a significant caseload increase as a result of a pilot project being initiated by the Toronto Fire Service, in which the service is anticipated to significantly increase its number of inspectors thereby increasing the likelihood of more orders and appeals being issued.

FSC's expansion will include a process review and the development of a resource model to assess operational capacity, scheduled to be completed by winter 2018-2019.

## **13. ONTARIO CIVILIAN POLICE COMMISSION TRANSFORMATION**

The *Safer Ontario Act, 2018* has been proclaimed and the Ontario Civilian Police Commission (OCPC) has begun initial steps to prepare for the anticipated increase in caseload.

The Act overhauls police oversight in Ontario by repealing the current *Police Services Act* and replacing it with a number of individual acts.

Most notably, the *Ontario Policing Discipline Tribunal Act* (OPDTA) will see the OCPC renamed as the Ontario Policing Discipline Tribunal (OPDT), a new body dedicated solely to adjudicating police disciplinary matters- whereas these matters were previously determined internally to police services.

The OPDT is set to come into force in January 2020.

## 14. ONTARIO PAROLE BOARD TRANSFORMATION

Since the clustering of the Ontario Parole Board (OPB) into SLASTO, the OPB has been in a transition phase.

The early stages focused on the smooth transfer of OPB from the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services (MCSCS) to SLASTO, and simplifying processes and procedures. For instance, the Board's regional administrative structure was assessed to ensure that processes and procedures were consistent throughout the province. The Board also benefited from cluster resources, such as enhanced legal services, a centralized and consistent approach to professional development and training, and cross-appointing French speaking members, to support the Board and address caseload pressures.

The OPB also focused on strengthening key relationships with Indigenous partners and providing a process that is more inclusive and respectful of Indigenous applicants. For instance, if requested, the OPB holds a circle hearing, the purpose of which is to create an environment that facilitates a culturally appropriate hearing process, and one that will allow Board members to gain a better understanding of the applicant, the applicant's unique circumstances, and assess culturally appropriate plans, etc.

Over the last reporting period, and following the independent review of Ontario corrections, the OPB took steps to implement non-hearing parole considerations. Essentially, while a parole applicant may waive their right to an in-person hearing, the OPB is still required to consider if they should be released on parole. While the OPB is independent in its decision-making, the partnership of MCSCS and correctional staff was important in implementing this critical service line.

Following these various operational changes, the OPB developed a new set of informational guides specifically targeted to applicants, victims and the public. These new resources take a plain language approach and provide more, and better, information about provincial parole and how to access OPB's services.

Over the next 18 months, the Board will be focusing on a series of additional actions that will ultimately help applicants, victims and the public better understand the parole process and how the Board makes its decisions. This will include, among other priorities, amending the Board's processes to include non-hearing parole considerations, enhanced decisions and greater decision-making transparency.

## Communications

SLASTO recognizes that its ability to deliver fair and transparent services and ensure consistent access to justice is contingent on establishing and maintaining strong communications with parties, the public and stakeholders. This is especially important as SLASTO's tribunals continue to undergo complex changes to their jurisdiction and processes.

Over the last year, SLASTO has developed a communications strategy that specifically aims to:

- Raise awareness of SLASTO's jurisdiction and ongoing changes;
- Promote a client/customer-service orientated approach in all SLASTO interactions and communications with the public;
- Promote consistency in communication processes and messaging to help parties/public/stakeholders get the information they need quickly and efficiently;
- Position SLASTO as a trusted adjudicative tribunal cluster with well-trained and expert adjudicators and consumer-friendly processes.

## OPEN DATA

In 2016-17, the Ontario government introduced its Open Data Initiative, which maximizes access to government data by requiring all data be made public, unless it is exempt for legal, privacy, security, confidentiality or commercially-sensitive reasons.

As a government agency, SLASTO is committed to this initiative. We recognize that it helps parties, public and stakeholders better understand the service being delivered; and what to expect about a case lifecycle.

It also supports public engagement and participation by allowing Ontarians to develop their own analysis, insights, and digital products.

Over the last fiscal year, SLASTO has continued to expand on its initial steps by making datasets available for download directly on our website. Over the next year, we will continue to re-examine these datasets to ensure greater consistency among all SLASTO tribunals. Ultimately, the objective is to provide the public with a better sense of a case lifecycle and what users can expect before one of our tribunals.

## FEEDBACK & INFORMATION CHANNELS

While SLASTO contains various business lines, ranging from appeals of animal care orders to considerations for provincial parole, it was important for us to establish a one-window approach for the public. This means that if you require general information, have open data requests, or wish to provide feedback about your experience before us, you can do so with one central email: [SLASTOinfo@ontario.ca](mailto:SLASTOinfo@ontario.ca). You will always receive a confirmation of receipt and a reply that is responsive to your needs.

## MEDIA INQUIRIES

The media plays an important role in our society and SLASTO is committed to providing media with information on its policies and operations in a timely and transparent manner.

Media may contact us by utilizing [SLASTOinfo@ontario.ca](mailto:SLASTOinfo@ontario.ca) as the same one-window approach.

## Professional Development

From its inception, SLASTO has been committed to providing ongoing professional development training for its members and staff in order to ensure that the cluster meets its legislated mandate.

Several training sessions have occurred this past reporting period, including additional tribunal specific training sessions regarding Tarion matters, the Statutory Accident Benefits Schedule (SABS), Dealing with Medical Evidence and Ontario Parole Board Risk Assessment training. SLASTO has also provided many adjudicative and client service excellence training sessions such as decision writing, working with self-represented litigants, mental health awareness, French Language Services, Indigenous Services and being an ambassador of service.

SLASTO's integrated professional development program provides members and staff with a level of legal and substantive knowledge required to analyze the facts and law, make timely and well-reasoned decisions, resolve cases consistent with the statutory mandate of the tribunal and provide practical knowledge to conduct fair proceedings.

The professional development program aligns with SLASTO's strategic directions by developing and empowering people, resulting in a highly skilled workforce which is accessible, accountable and responsive.



## French Language Services

### OUR COMMITMENT

The Safety, Licensing Appeals and Standards Tribunals Ontario (SLASTO) is committed to an active offer of French Language Services and to actively engaging with the Francophone community to ensure its services reflect and meet the needs of the population it serves.

### TRAINING

Over the last year, SLASTO continued its participation in a justice sector-wide training program that provided French language training to adjudicators and staff who have the responsibility of delivering services in French as required by the FLSA.

The training program included specific workshops and mock bilingual hearings commonly held by adjudicative tribunals; presentations and workshops on French Language Services and recent jurisprudence; and information sessions on tools and resources available for bilingual professionals such as legal terminology, diversity and inclusion, mental health, etc.

### RECRUITMENT

SLASTO continues to focus on increasing the geographic and cultural representation by recruiting more members from diverse groups, including an increased number of members with French language competencies.

## Indigenous Services

### OUR COMMITMENT

The Safety, Licensing Appeals and Standards Tribunals Ontario (SLASTO) is committed to ensuring that every Indigenous individual, who comes before any SLASTO tribunal, has access to culturally appropriate services.

SLASTO's Indigenous Services' objectives include:

- Increasing SLASTO's capacity to understand the unique circumstances of Indigenous peoples, and how these translate to meeting their unique legal needs.
- Improving relationships between SLASTO leadership and Indigenous communities.
- Identifying areas where SLASTO can create space for processes led by Indigenous peoples.

## Financial Summary

The budget allocation for 2017/2018 SLASTO non-LAT-AABS and LAT-AABS was \$21,568,200. A constraint of 1.6% and an internal Ministry constraint of 2.5% was also applied to the SLASTO non-LAT-AABS portion of the allocation. The revised allocation for the year was \$20,281,500.

SLASTO's Expense Category		
Operating Expenses	2017/18 Actuals (excluding LAT-AABS)	2017/18 Actuals (LAT-AABS only)
Salaries and Wages	\$3,836,159	\$10,132,482
Benefits	\$611,181	\$1,375,099
Transportation & Communications	\$605,746	\$286,511
Services	\$2,566,678	\$3,119,859
Supplies & Equipment	\$87,493	\$72,088
<b>Sub-total Operating Expenses</b>	<b>\$7,707,257</b>	<b>\$14,986,039</b>
Recoveries	\$(313,951)	-
Facilities and Capital Costs*		\$906,172
<b>Total Expenditures**</b>	<b>\$7,393,306</b>	<b>\$15,892,211</b>

Revenue	2017/18 Actuals Non-LAT-AABS	2017/18 Actuals LAT-AABS
Application Filing Fees***	\$52,510	\$962,801
Reimbursement of Expenditures**** – Automobile Accident Benefits Service	-	\$14,928,906
Recovery of Prior Year Expenditures*****	\$9,961	\$3,054
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>\$62,471</b>	<b>\$15,894,761</b>

**Notes:**

\* Includes \$381,940 facility and \$524,232 capital costs for AABS. The facility and capital costs for non-AABS are paid by the MAG's Capital Budget.

\*\* The variance between total expenditures and reimbursement of expenditures is due to a delay in posting of an inter-ministry expenditure to SLASTO at year-end.

\*\*\* Application Filing Fees deposited in the Consolidated Revenue Fund; fees include \$2,400 coding error, \$1,970 adjustment and \$10 for FOI requests.

\*\*\* Reimbursement of Expenditures from Insurance Companies for the Automobile Accident Benefits Service deposited in the Consolidated Revenue Fund. In 2017/18 interest accrued on past due accounts was \$1,725 and an adjustment was made of \$926 for a 2016/17 under accrual.

\*\*\*\* Recovery for an accrual reversal from fiscal 2016/17.

# Animal Care Review Board

## About the ACRB

The Animal Care Review Board (ACRB) resolves disputes and conducts hearings regarding animal welfare, including orders made by inspectors of the Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (Ontario SPCA).

## Powers of the ACRB

Under the authority of the *Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act*, the ACRB can:

- Confirm, revoke or modify a compliance order issued by the Ontario SPCA;
- Order that an animal that was removed by the Ontario SPCA be returned to the owner or custodian, and may make an accompanying order with the terms and conditions;
- Order the Ontario SPCA to pay the owner or custodian of an animal some or all of the costs of complying with an order; and
- Order the owner or custodian to pay to the Ontario SPCA some or all of the cost of providing food, care or treatment to an animal that was removed.

When reviewing appeals and applications, the welfare of any animal involved is the ACRB's main priority.

## The Ontario SPCA

The Ontario SPCA is an independent and charitable organization that provides animal protection services through a network of directly operated branches and independently operated affiliate humane societies located across the province.

## Operational Statistics

### ACRB PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Performance Measures	Target	2017-18 Actual	2016-17 Actual	2015-16 Actual
Hearing date will be scheduled within 5 business days of receipt of a completed appeal (statutory obligation)	100%	100%	100%	90%
First hearing event will take place no later than 10 business days after receipt of a completed appeal (statutory obligation).	100%	100%	100%	95%
Decisions of the Board will be released within 30 days of the hearing.	80%	N/A	75%	20%

### ACRB CASELOAD OVERVIEW

Caseload	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Appeals opened	13	11	21
Appeals closed	10	16	23
Active appeals at fiscal year end	3	0	5
Hearings held	0	2	7
Decisions rendered	0	4	5

## ANALYSIS AND TRENDS

The ACRB operates under tight legislated timelines set out under the *Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act* (OSPCA). The ACRB's performance measures are aligned with statutory requirements. Statistics show that the Board continues to meet its targets for scheduling appeals and holding proceedings and has complied with the timelines set out in the legislation.

The ACRB did not hold any hearings this fiscal year. This is largely a result of the Board's emphasis on conducting effective case conferences that lead to early resolution and withdrawal of appeals. ACRB appeals often involve self-represented applicants who may be under high stress or heightened emotional states as the appeals impact the well-being of their animals. Wherever possible, the Board focuses on resolving matters without the need for a hearing. This includes utilizing the case conference(s) to explain legislative requirements, clarify parties' positions, narrow the issues, and engage in discussions directed at resolving the matter without resorting to hearing.

A number of factors can influence the ACRB's caseload, including legislative changes and changes in enforcement practices on the part of the OSPCA. There are no anticipated changes in the near future; the ACRB expects its caseload to remain consistent with historical trends.

# Fire Safety Commission

## About the FSC

The Fire Safety Commission (FSC) resolves disputes and conducts hearings regarding fire safety matters, including orders made by inspectors or the Fire Marshal for repairs, alterations or installations to a building, structure or premises.

## Powers of the FSC

Under the *Fire Protection and Prevention Act* (FPPA), following a hearing the FSC has the power to:

- Confirm, amend or rescind an inspection order or review an order of the Fire Marshal, or make any other order the FSC deems appropriate;
- Authorize an inspector to have the work required under an order completed; rescind the order; or amend the order or make any other order the Commission deems should have been made under the relevant section and order the inspector to have the work completed.
- Confirm, amend (including explicit power to increase) or rescind an order to pay costs.

## Background

The Office of the Fire Marshal (OFM) is a branch of the Community Safety Division of the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services. The OFM is responsible for promoting fire protection, fire prevention and public safety in Ontario.

To learn more about the OFM, please visit their website.

## INSPECTION ORDERS

The *Fire Protection and Prevention Act, 1997* (FPPA) provides fire officials, fire inspectors and firefighters with various powers to enter and inspect properties or buildings.

Under section 21(1) of the FPPA, inspectors are authorized to order the owner or occupant of land or premises to take any measure necessary to ensure fire safety.



## **REVIEW OF INSPECTION ORDERS BY THE FIRE MARSHAL**

Under section 25(1) of the FPPA, if a person disagrees with an inspection order they can submit a written request to the Fire Marshal for a review of the order. The Fire Marshal (or a delegate) can refuse to consider the request and refer the matter directly to the FSC for a hearing, or the Fire Marshal can review the matter and confirm, amend or rescind the order and make any orders it determine are appropriate in the circumstances.

## Operational Statistics

### FSC PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Performance Measures	Target	2017-18 Actual	2016-17 Actual	2015-16 Actual
A hearing will be scheduled to take place within 45 days of receipt of a completed appeal	80%	96%	97%	72%
Decisions will be released within 60 days of the final hearing event	80%	22%	50%	60%

### FSC CASELOAD OVERVIEW

Caseload	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Appeals opened	30	37	39
Appeals closed	26	28	38
Active appeals at fiscal year end	26	22	13
Hearings held	4	10	5
Decisions rendered	9	6	6

## ANALYSIS AND TRENDS

Performance measures indicate that the Commission continues to meet and exceed its target for scheduling proceedings in 96% of its cases.

A high number of FSC cases are resolved prior to hearing. This is largely due to the effective use of case conferences, which often lead to early resolution and withdrawal of appeals.

The FSC met its target for releasing decisions within 60 days following the conclusion of a hearing in 22% of its cases. A number of factors contributed to this figure, including:

- Complexity of cases that involve technical interpretation and application of the Fire Code.
- A statutory requirement for a three-member panel lengthens the peer and legal review process.
- An inability to allocate full-time adjudicative resources to the operations with a part-time OIC membership.

The FSC has taken steps to track and expedite the decision-writing and approval process and will examine whether the current performance measure for decisions is achievable and appropriate.

# Licence Appeal Tribunal

## About the LAT

The Licence Appeal Tribunal (LAT) adjudicates applications and resolves disputes concerning compensation claims and licensing activities regulated by the provincial government, including those activities of delegated administrative authorities.

## Divisions

The LAT currently has two main divisions: the General Service (GS) and the Automobile Accident Benefits Service (LAT-AABS).

While the General Service oversees a wide range of legislation and case types, the Automobile Accident Benefits Service began receiving applications under the *Insurance Act*, and the *Statutory Accident Benefits Schedule* on April 1, 2016 as part of the Ontario government's automobile insurance Cost & Rate Reduction Strategy.

The Strategy transferred the jurisdiction for the Auto Insurance Dispute Resolution System (AIDRS) from the Financial Services Commission of Ontario to the LAT. LAT-AABS's mandate is to resolve disputes about an insured person's entitlement to, or amount of, a statutory motor vehicle accident benefit.

## Operational Statistics

### LAT PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The following are performance measures that are tracked for LAT-GS' main adjudicative functions, excluding LAT-AABS:

Performance Measures	Target	2017-18 Actual	2016-17 Actual	2015-16 Actual
A hearing will take place within 30 days of receipt of a completed appeal in medical appeals under the Highway Traffic Act (HTA), motor vehicle impoundments under the HTA, and in appeals of immediate suspension orders regarding businesses or business privileges.	80%	74%	100%	100%
If a statutory period regarding an order of immediate suspension will expire in less than 30 days, a hearing will be scheduled to commence within the statutory period.	100%	100%	100%	100%
In all other appeal types, the first hearing event will be scheduled to take place within 60 days of receipt of a completed appeal.	80%	68%	96%	99.7%
A final decision will be issued within 30 days of the final hearing event.	80%	63%	90%	90%

As a new program, LAT-AABS is in process of establishing performance measures and will introduce these in 2018-19.

## LAT CASELOAD OVERVIEW

The following are caseload statistics that are tracked for LAT-GS' main adjudicative functions, excluding LAT-AABS:

Caseload	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Appeals opened	501	540	599
Appeals closed	464	564	603
Active appeals at fiscal year end	189	152	176
Hearings held	204	238	204
Decisions rendered	155	197	178
Case conferences	373	372	268

## ANALYSIS AND TRENDS

Although the jurisdiction of LAT-GS has continued to expand in previous years to include matters such as licensing of condominium managers in 2017 and licensing of various participants in the horse racing sector in 2016, the overall intake of new appeals to the tribunal has been trending lower over the past four years.

Historically, over 80% of the appeals received involve individuals or businesses with disputes over liquor licences, new home warranties, suspension of driver's licences for medical reasons and vehicle impoundments.

Appeal intake related to these three case types is declining, with one exception. LAT-GS has experienced a 22% increase in application intake regarding decisions of the Ministry of Transportation to suspend a driver's licence for medical reasons and vehicle impoundments.

LAT-GS continues to focus upon early resolution of matters, and does so through facilitation of case conferences in the appeal process. Effective case conference facilitation often results in the parties either settling the matter without having to proceed to a hearing, or with the applicant withdrawing their appeal.

## LAT-AABS STATISTICAL OVERVIEW

The following are caseload statistics that are tracked for LAT-AABS' main adjudicative functions, excluding LAT-GS:

Caseload	2017-18	2016-17*
Applications received	10,125	6,594
Applications closed	7,967	4,511
Active appeals at fiscal year end	4,241	2,083
Case conferences	5,756	3,583
Hearings held	490	173
Decisions rendered	331	89
Applications settled/withdrawn	7,636	4,422

\*Figures from the year prior have been updated from previous publications due to changes and updates to the case management system.



## ANALYSIS AND TRENDS

LAT-AABS has now completed two full years of service delivery. In that time, application intake has continued to rise each quarter. This steady increase suggests that the new program has not yet reached a plateau that would indicate what the likely annual intake will be for the service in the years ahead. As the number of applications received is continuing to rise, it is anticipated that the number of case conferences and hearings convened will also increase proportionately.

When LAT-AABS was established, a significant strategy in service delivery was to facilitate an early resolution between the parties that would either result in an application being withdrawn (because an applicant gained a better understanding of the jurisdiction of the service and chose not to proceed with their appeal) or a settlement on consent being reached that would negate the need to proceed to a hearing. This saves parties the time and expense of participating in a hearing and ensures the matters in dispute are resolved to their mutual satisfaction without delay.

Early resolution of appeals in both the first and second year of service continues to be high. In fact, based on the number of applications that have been resolved since the program started on April 1, 2016, more than nine out of every ten applications to LAT-AABS have resulted in an early resolution.

The high early resolution rate is especially notable in matters in which there is a consideration of catastrophic impairment. These matters may require urgent attention and may be more complex in nature. Given the implications to the parties, the Tribunal put in place a series of measures to ensure proactive and efficient case management. The early resolution rate of cases involving catastrophic impairment is currently trending at 96%.

While preliminary data is certainly showing positive results, LAT-AABS is still assessing what the longer-term rate of early resolution will be for the broader AABS service line – with application intake still increasing, it is not yet possible to establish a reliable rate given that the active appeal base has not yet plateaued. That being said, early signs are positive and the Tribunal will continue to focus on this key metric.

# Ontario Civilian Police Commission

## About the OCPC

The Ontario Civilian Police Commission (OCPC) hears appeals, adjudicates applications, conducts investigations and resolves disputes regarding the oversight and provision of policing services. The OCPC's powers and duties come from the [Police Services Act, R.S.O. 1990](#), c. P.15. ("PSA") and in particular section 22(1) of the PSA.

There are three civilian police oversight agencies in Ontario:

1. Special Investigations Unit (SIU)
2. Office of the Independent Police Review Director (OIPRD)
3. **Ontario Civilian Police Commission (OCPC)**

The SIU primarily investigates police-involved incidents of death, serious injury, and sexual assault; whereas, the OIPRD's primary role is to receive and manage public complaints about police in Ontario.

The OCPC adjudicates applications, conducts investigations and resolves disputes regarding the oversight and provision of policing services. This includes hearing appeals of police disciplinary decisions, conducting investigations and inquiries into the conduct of chiefs of police, police officers and members of police services boards, and reviewing applications of disbandment and amalgamation of police services, among other responsibilities.

## Divisions

OCPC has two divisions: Adjudicative and Investigative. The divisions operate independently under one Registrar.

**Adjudicative:** Led by the Associate Chair and primarily deals with appeals of disciplinary matters; proposals to amalgamate, reduce or abolish existing municipal police forces; budgetary disputes regarding police services; and other functions.

**Investigative:** Led by the Executive Chair and deals with investigations, inquiries and public complaints concerning the conduct of chiefs of police, police officers, special constables and police services boards.

## Adjudicative Division

### APPEALS

The OCPC hears appeals of decisions from police disciplinary hearings concerning complaints about police conduct made by members of the public or initiated by chiefs of police. The OCPC has the authority under the *PSA* to:

- Confirm, vary or revoke the decision of the hearing officer;
- Substitute its own decision; or
- Order that a new hearing take place.

### FIRST INSTANCE HEARINGS

The OCPC may hold different types of first instance hearings, with the authority to:

- Decide disputes between local police services boards and municipal councils about annual police budgets;
- Determine whether a disabled member of a police service has been accommodated;
- Adjudicate disputes about membership in municipal police bargaining units; and
- Determine whether prescribed standards of police services are being met.
- Hold hearings following investigations under section 25 of the *PSA*.

### APPROVALS

Consent is required from the OCPC where the municipal police services board, town or municipality seeks to terminate the employment of police officers for the purposes of abolishing or reducing the size of an existing municipal police force.

The OCPC approves the appointment of First Nations Constables to perform specified duties in designated geographical areas.

## Investigative Division

### INVESTIGATIONS AND INQUIRIES

The OCPC may investigate and inquire into the administration of a municipal police service, the manner in which policing services are being provided and the policing

needs of a municipality. In so doing, the OCPC may investigate and inquire into the conduct or work performance of:

- Police officers;
- Chiefs of police;
- Members of local police services boards;
- Auxiliary members of a police service;
- Special constables; and
- Municipal law enforcement officers.

## **PUBLIC COMPLAINTS**

For events occurring after October 19, 2009, the jurisdiction to oversee all public complaints about police officers are referred to the Office of the Independent Police Review Director.

The OCPC oversees public complaints about police conduct, policies and services provided by a police service where the complaints are related to events that occurred prior to October 19, 2009.

## Operational Statistics

### OCPC PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Performance Measures	Target	2017-18 Actual	2016-17 Actual	2015-16 Actual
Disciplinary appeals – a case conference will be scheduled within 60 days after all documents are filed in accordance with the Rules; following the final case conference, a hearing will be held within 90 days.	80%	29%	80%	50%
First Instance Proceedings – a hearing will be held within 90 days after all documents are filed in accordance with the Rules.	80%	100%	100%	N/A
Section 54(1) Approval Requests – will be processed within 5 business days of receipt of the request.	80%	100%	100%	100%
All decision types will be released within 90 days after the final event	80%	24%	11%	42%

## OCPC CASELOAD OVERVIEW

Caseload	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Appeals opened	13	18	17
Appeals closed	28	11*	14
Active appeals at fiscal year end	12	27	20
Hearings held	19	16	14
Decisions rendered	29	9	12
Investigation requests received	20	20	23
Investigation cases closed	23	16	20
Investigation cases pending	5	8	4

\*Adjustment to tracking and case management systems resulted in an updated figure for 2016-2017 appeals closed.

## ANALYSIS AND TRENDS

The OCPC met its target timeline for scheduling a case conference within 60 days and holding the hearing 90 days thereafter in only 29% of its cases. A case conference is a valuable tool used to attempt to resolve a matter without proceeding to a hearing, and to narrow issues in an appeal so that the hearing itself is more streamlined. The OCPC works to ensure that all parties participate in a case conference, and in order to do so, schedules these events in accordance with the availability of the parties, which is not always within 60 days of receipt of the application. Hearings are scheduled in consultation with the parties at the case conference, and similarly, parties are not always available within the 90 day target. In addition, where a party brings forward a motion at the case conference, the OCPC is required to deal with the motion prior to the hearing potentially causing further delays with holding the hearing.

The OCPC met its performance measure on releasing all decision types within 90 days after the final hearing event in only 24% of its cases. Appeals to the OCPC are often complex and involve a thorough review of many documents (including transcripts, factums and books of authorities), and an in-depth interpretation and application of the *Policies Services Act*. The OCPC prioritizes the quality of the decisions released, and this, combined with the complexity of the jurisdiction and a primarily part-time adjudicator resource pool all contribute to the length of time required to finalize decisions.

The OCPC may investigate and inquire into the administration of a municipal police service, the manner in which policing services are being provided and the policing needs of a municipality. Statistics show that the OCPC received the same volume of requests for investigations compared to last fiscal; however, it initiated a higher number of formal investigations for the 2018-2019 reporting period. This is mainly a result of a greater number of requests that involved substantial allegations and evidence of misconduct by members of police services boards and senior officers of police services. These investigations are often lengthy, very complex and politically sensitive.

# Ontario Parole Board

## About the OPB

The Ontario Parole Board (OPB) makes parole decisions for applicants serving a sentence of less than two years in a provincial correctional institution. The OPB also decides applications for temporary absences from a correctional institution for greater than 72 hours.

Under the authority of the *Ministry of Correctional Services Act*, the OPB can:

- Grant parole/temporary absence with conditions that are considered necessary;
- Deny parole/temporary absence;
- Suspend a parolee's parole and authorize the re-committal of the parolee to custody;
- Lift the suspension of the parole or revoke parole; and
- Cancel a temporary absence that it has granted.

When considering parole and temporary absence applications, public safety is the OPB's main priority.

## Background

### WHAT IS PAROLE?

Parole is the early release of an applicant from a correctional institution into the community under the supervision of a Probation and Parole Officer. Parole is an opportunity for an applicant to serve the remainder of their sentence in the community under conditions determined by the OPB.

### WHO IS AN APPLICANT?

An applicant is the person who committed an offence and for whom parole is being considered. In other settings, applicants may be referred to as "offenders" or "inmates".

### WHAT IS TEMPORARY ABSENCE?

The Temporary Absence program allows an applicant to be away from the institution, without escort, for a defined period of time (in most cases up to sixty days).



Temporary absence is an opportunity for an applicant to prepare themselves for release into the community and may be granted to help the applicant with their rehabilitation and successful reintegration into the community or for medical or humanitarian reasons. Temporary absence can be requested without having applied for parole or after parole has been denied.

## Corrections in Ontario

Ontario's Correctional Services is part of the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services (MCSCS), which:

- Establishes, maintains, operates and monitors Ontario's adult correctional institutions and probation and parole offices;
- Has jurisdiction over adult offenders under parole supervision, as granted by the OPB; and
- Provides programs and facilities designed to assist in offender rehabilitation.

## Parole in Canada

The Parole Board of Canada (PBC) is an administrative tribunal that makes parole and conditional release decisions for applicants serving sentences of more than two years in federal and territorial institutions.

The PBC also has the authority to make parole and conditional release decisions for applicants serving sentences of less than two years in provinces that do not have their own parole boards.

In Canada, there are only two provincial parole boards:

- Ontario Parole Board; and
- Commission québécoise des libérations conditionnelles.

## Operational Statistics

### OPB PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Performance Measures	Target	2017-18 Actual	2016-17 Actual	2015-16 Actual	2014-15 Actual
Decisions will be rendered within 24 hours of the hearing event.	80%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### OPB CASELOAD OVERVIEW

Caseload	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Appeals received	5,409	4,377	1,377*	1,210*
Decisions rendered	4,015	3,038	1,277*	1,210*

\* Adjustments to the reporting methodology for the fiscal year 2016-2017 to be more inclusive of the various case events, such as parole and temporary absence considerations and requests for review resulted in an increase in reported applications and resulting decisions — the numbers for previous years are not directly comparable.

## ANALYSIS AND TRENDS

The number of applications received, and the related decisions rendered, has increased in the past two years for a couple of reasons:

- In 2016/17, the OPB began to report all of types of applications received within the jurisdiction of the tribunal.
- In December 2017, the OPB began to complete written hearings in circumstances where someone had waived their right to an oral hearing. This has resulted in an increase in applications processed by the OPB and decisions rendered.

The OPB is increasing its ability to independently track and record application and hearing related information. This will allow the OPB to better analyze information as well as provide more detailed statistical information to the public.

# Members

Member Name	Tribunal	Appointment Start Date	Appointment End Date
Basanta, Giselle	ACRB	2015/09/16	2017/09/15
Batty, Jonathan	ACRB	2017/10/04	2019/10/03
Boyce, Jesse	ACRB	2018/02/21	2020/02/20
Burgess, Helen-Nikoleta	ACRB	2017/09/20	2019/09/19
Clarke, Susan	ACRB	2017/09/20	2019/09/19
Foot, Joanne	ACRB	2017/08/31	2019/08/30
Friedland, Jennifer	ACRB	2016/05/30	2018/12/31
Goela, Anita	ACRB	2017/09/13	2019/09/12
Griffith, Lyndra	ACRB	2018/02/21	2020/02/20
Helt, Maureen	ACRB	2017/12/14	2019/12/13
Hicks, Barbara	ACRB	2016/11/02	2018/11/02
Jovanovic, Stephen	ACRB	2017/01/11	2022/01/10
Kepman, Stephanie	ACRB	2018/01/24	2020/01/23
Kershaw, Dawn	ACRB	2018/01/24	2020/01/23
Kromkamp, John	ACRB	2016/01/15	2021/01/14
Lamoureux, Linda	ACRB	2014/01/01	2018/12/31
Letourneau, Matthew	ACRB	2018/02/28	2020/02/27
Lewis, Harriet	ACRB	2017/04/05	2019/04/04
Maleki-Yazdi, Melody	ACRB	2018/01/18	2020/01/17
McGee, Theresa	ACRB	2018/02/28	2020/02/27
McQuaid, Patricia Eileen	ACRB	2016/11/23	2021/11/22
Moccio, Santina	ACRB	2016/02/17	2021/02/16
Montano, Nives	ACRB	2016/02/10	2021/02/09
Moten, Asad Ali	ACRB	2017/04/26	2019/04/25
Osborne, Katie	ACRB	2016/09/28	2021/09/27
Ramdayal, Raymond	ACRB	2015/09/08	2020/09/07
Reeve, Priscilla	ACRB	2017/09/20	2019/09/19
Restoule, Karen	ACRB	2017/04/05	2019/04/04
Ritacca, Luisa	ACRB	2016/02/24	2021/02/23

Member Name	Tribunal	Appointment Start Date	Appointment End Date
Sanford, M. Laurie	ACRB	2014/01/29	2018/12/31
Theoharis, Jeanie	ACRB	2017/08/31	2019/08/30
Treksler, Nicole Patricia	ACRB	2015/08/12	2017/08/11
Victor, Marisa	ACRB	2016/10/05	2018/10/04

Member Name	Tribunal	Appointment Start Date	Appointment End Date
Basanta, Giselle	FSC	2015/09/16	2017/09/15
Batty, Jonathan	FSC	2017/10/04	2019/10/03
Boyce, Jesse	FSC	2018/02/21	2020/02/20
Burgess, Helen-Nikoleta	FSC	2017/09/20	2019/09/19
Clarke, Susan	FSC	2017/09/20	2019/09/19
Foot, Joanne	FSC	2017/08/31	2019/08/30
Friedland, Jennifer	FSC	2016/05/30	2018/12/31
Goela, Anita	FSC	2017/09/13	2019/09/12
Griffith, Lyndra	FSC	2018/02/21	2020/02/20
Helt, Maureen	FSC	2017/12/14	2019/12/13
Hicks, Barbara	FSC	2016/11/02	2018/11/01
Jovanovic, Stephen	FSC	2017/01/11	2022/01/10
Kepman, Stephanie	FSC	2018/01/24	2020/01/23
Kershaw, Dawn	FSC	2018/01/24	2020/01/23
Kromkamp, John	FSC	2018/03/21	2020/03/20
Lallouz, Isaac	FSC	2005/02/03	2018/02/02
Lamoureux, Linda	FSC	2014/01/01	2018/12/31
Letourneau, Matthew	FSC	2018/02/28	2020/02/27
Lewis, Harriet	FSC	2017/04/05	2019/04/04
Louwers, Dr. Jeroen	FSC	2014/09/08	2019/09/07
Maleki-Yazdi, Melody	FSC	2018/01/18	2020/01/17
McGee, Theresa	FSC	2018/02/28	2020/02/27
McLean, Donald Edward	FSC	2000/10/18	2017/09/11
McQuaid, Patricia Eileen	FSC	2016/11/23	2021/11/22

Member Name	Tribunal	Appointment Start Date	Appointment End Date
Moccio, Santina	FSC	2017/05/18	2019/05/17
Montano, Nives	FSC	2016/02/10	2021/02/09
Moten, Asad Ali	FSC	2017/04/26	2019/04/25
Osborne, Katie	FSC	2016/09/28	2021/09/27
Ramdayal, Raymond	FSC	2015/09/08	2017/09/07
Reeve, Priscilla	FSC	2017/09/20	2019/09/19
Restoule, Karen	FSC	2017/04/05	2019/04/04
Ritacca, Luisa	FSC	2018/03/21	2020/03/20
Ritcey, Douglas James	FSC	2005/12/22	2017/12/21
Theoharis, Jeanie	FSC	2017/08/31	2019/08/30
Treksler, Nicole Patricia	FSC	2015/08/12	2017/08/11
Victor, Marisa	FSC	2018/03/21	2020/03/20

Member Name	Tribunal	Appointment Start Date	Appointment End Date
Anwar, Khizer	LAT	2016/10/18	2018/10/17
Awad, Dr, Katie	LAT	2018/02/08	2020/02/07
Baker, Blaine	LAT	2017/02/02	2019/02/01
Basanta, Giselle	LAT	2015/09/16	2017/09/15
Bass, Julia	LAT	2016/06/22	2018/06/21
Batty, Jonathan	LAT	2017/10/04	2019/10/03
Belanger-Hardy , Louise	LAT	2016/05/30	2017/09/27
Bickley, Catherine	LAT	2016/08/08	2018/01/18
Black, David	LAT	2016/06/22	2018/06/21
Blais, Geneviève	LAT	2008/05/07	2017/05/06
Borenstein, Dr. David	LAT	2010/11/03	2020/11/02
Boyce, Jesse	LAT	2018/02/21	2020/02/20
Caryll, David B.	LAT	2008/04/16	2018/04/15
Castel, Jacqueline	LAT	2011/04/01	2022/10/02
Cavdar, Jessica	LAT	2018/01/18	2020/01/17
Crljenica, Theodore	LAT	2016/03/23	2018/12/31

Member Name	Tribunal	Appointment Start Date	Appointment End Date
Daoud, Meray	LAT	2017/01/03	2019/01/02
Dhanani, Zahra	LAT	2017/04/12	2019/04/11
Diplas, George	LAT	2018/01/08	2020/01/07
Driesel, Sandra	LAT	2018/01/24	2020/01/23
Farlam, Avril	LAT	2016/06/30	2018/12/31
Ferguson, Christopher	LAT	2016/12/07	2018/12/06
Flude, D. Gregory	LAT	2016/02/08	2019/02/07
Flynn, Dr. Kevin	LAT	2003/05/28	2018/05/27
Foot, Joanne	LAT	2017/08/31	2019/08/30
Fricot, Amanda	LAT	2017/11/29	2019/11/28
Friedland, Jennifer	LAT	2016/05/30	2018/12/31
Gahir, Harinder	LAT	2006/11/15	2018/11/14
Go, Avvy	LAT	2016/02/24	2021/02/23
Goela, Anita	LAT	2017/09/13	2019/09/12
Gosio, Paul	LAT	2016/11/16	2018/11/15
Gottfried, Ruth	LAT	2016/03/23	2018/12/31
Grant, Derek	LAT	2016/07/20	2018/12/31
Grieves, Kathryn	LAT	2018/01/24	2020/01/23
Griffith, Lyndra	LAT	2018/02/21	2020/02/20
Hamud, Billeh	LAT	2016/11/30	2018/11/29
Hans, Rupinder	LAT	2016/06/22	2018/12/31
Harmison, Gemma	LAT	2017/02/06	2019/02/05
Harper, Jacqueline	LAT	2017/02/03	2019/02/02
Helt, Maureen	LAT	2017/12/14	2019/12/13
Hicks, Barbara	LAT	2016/11/02	2018/11/01
Hines, Rebecca	LAT	2016/11/16	2018/11/15
Hodgson, Laura	LAT	2018/03/12	2020/03/11
Hunter, Terry	LAT	2016/06/22	2018/12/31
Johal, Sandeep	LAT	2016/10/18	2018/10/17
John, Anita	LAT	2016/06/30	2018/12/31
Jovanovic, Stephen	LAT	2017/01/11	2022/01/10

Member Name	Tribunal	Appointment Start Date	Appointment End Date
Kepman, Stephanie	LAT	2018/01/24	2020/01/23
Kershaw, Dawn	LAT	2018/01/24	2020/01/23
Kowal, Karina	LAT	2016/10/17	2018/10/16
Kromkamp, John	LAT	2016/01/15	2021/01/14
Lallouz, Isaac	LAT	2016/02/24	2018/02/23
Lamoureux, Linda	LAT	2014/01/01	2018/12/31
Leslie, Claudette	LAT	2016/04/26	2018/12/31
Lester, Chloe	LAT	2017/08/31	2019/08/30
Letourneau, Matthew	LAT	2018/02/28	2020/02/27
Lewis, Harriet	LAT	2017/04/05	2019/04/04
Livingstone, Katherine	LAT	2017/01/11	2019/01/10
Louvish, Dr. Dimitri	LAT	2018/02/21	2020/02/20
Macklin, Richard	LAT	2008/10/05	2018/10/04
Maedel, Ian	LAT	2017/02/02	2019/02/01
Makhamra, Samia	LAT	2016/02/08	2019/02/07
Maleki-Yazdi, Melody	LAT	2018/01/18	2020/01/17
Markovits, Robert	LAT	2017/01/16	2017/10/13
Marzinotto, Lori	LAT	2017/11/29	2019/11/28
Mather, Susan	LAT	2016/10/05	2018/10/04
Mazerolle, Craig	LAT	2017/12/14	2019/12/13
McCauley, Alexander	LAT	2011/07/01	2017/10/11
McGee, Theresa	LAT	2018/02/28	2020/02/27
McQuaid, Patricia Eileen	LAT	2016/11/23	2021/11/22
Montano, Nives	LAT	2016/02/10	2021/02/09
Moten, Asad Ali	LAT	2018/01/08	2020/01/07
Msosa, Aggrey	LAT	2016/02/08	2021/02/07
Neilson, Deborah	LAT	2016/07/18	2018/12/31
Nemet, Joseph	LAT	2016/02/24	2017/10/07
Norris, Brian	LAT	2016/09/06	2018/09/05
Osborne, Katie	LAT	2018/01/08	2020/09/07
Paluch, Cezary	LAT	2016/12/12	2018/12/11



Member Name	Tribunal	Appointment Start Date	Appointment End Date
Parish, Kimberly	LAT	2018/02/21	2020/02/20
Pay, Cynthia	LAT	2016/03/23	2017/04/02
Petrou, Dr. Constantine	LAT	2018/02/08	2020/02/07
Punyarathi, Nidhi	LAT	2018/03/07	2020/03/06
Purdy, Monica	LAT	2016/11/16	2018/11/15
Ramdayal, Raymond	LAT	2015/09/08	2020/09/07
Reilly, Thérèse	LAT	2017/05/10	2019/05/09
Restoule, Karen	LAT	2017/04/05	2019/04/04
Ritacca, Luisa	LAT	2016/02/24	2021/02/23
Sanford, M. Laurie	LAT	2005/06/22	2018/06/21
Sapin, Susan	LAT	2016/01/15	2018/01/14
Savage, Dr. Peter	LAT	2017/03/22	2019/03/21
Scharbach, Stephen	LAT	2017/04/12	2019/04/11
Sewrattan, Christopher	LAT	2016/06/22	2018/12/31
Shapiro, Jeffrey	LAT	2017/11/29	2019/11/28
Sharda, Rajneesh	LAT	2018/02/28	2020/02/27
Sharma, Rakesh	LAT	2017/01/16	2019/01/15
Smuczek, Dr. Joseph	LAT	2018/02/08	2020/02/07
Spence, Evelyn	LAT	2016/10/05	2018/10/04
Spencer, Mary Ann	LAT	2006/05/30	2018/05/29
Theoharis, Jeanie	LAT	2017/08/31	2019/08/30
Treksler, Nicole Patricia	LAT	2016/03/23	2018/01/06
Trojek, Heather	LAT	2016/02/08	2019/02/07
Truong, Anna	LAT	2016/02/08	2019/02/07
Victor, Marisa	LAT	2016/10/05	2018/10/04
Watt, Robert	LAT	2017/01/11	2019/01/10
Weinberg, Dr. Erica	LAT	2018/02/08	2020/02/07
White, Dr. Eleanor	LAT	2016/02/08	2019/02/07
Whitehead, Dr. Katherine	LAT	2014/02/12	2019/02/11
Yee, Gary	LAT	2012/08/16	2017/08/15

Member Name	Tribunal	Appointment Start Date	Appointment End Date
Batty, Jonathan	OCPC	2017/10/04	2019/10/03
Boyce, Jesse	OCPC	2018/02/21	2020/02/20
Castel, Jacqueline	OCPC	2012/10/03	2022/10/02
Conacher, Roy B.	OCPC	2014/04/30	2017/04/29
Crljenica, Theodore	OCPC	2016/03/23	2018/12/31
Helt, Maureen	OCPC	2017/12/14	2019/12/13
Hodgson, Laura	OCPC	2018/03/12	2020/03/11
Jovanovic, Stephen	OCPC	2017/01/11	2022/01/10
Kepman, Stephanie	OCPC	2018/01/24	2020/01/23
Kershaw, Dawn	OCPC	2018/01/24	2020/01/23
Kromkamp, John	OCPC	2016/01/15	2021/01/14
Lamoureux, Linda	OCPC	2014/01/01	2018/12/31
Letourneau, Matthew	OCPC	2018/02/28	2020/02/27
Morton, Emily	OCPC	2018/01/08	2020/01/07
Osborne, Katie	OCPC	2018/01/08	2020/09/07
Paivalainen, Seppo	OCPC	2014/09/08	2019/09/07
Prior, Robert	OCPC	2018/03/12	2020/03/11
Restoule, Karen	OCPC	2016/05/04	2019/05/03
Restoule-Mallozzi, Jenny	OCPC	2017/04/05	2019/04/04
Theoharis, Jeanie	OCPC	2017/08/31	2019/08/30
Thorsen, Andre	OCPC	2018/01/08	2018/02/03
Tinglin, Winston	OCPC	2014/10/22	2019/10/21
Victor, Marisa	OCPC	2017/05/18	2019/05/17

Member Name	Tribunal	Appointment Start Date	Appointment End Date
Anwar, Khizer	OPB	2017/05/18	2019/05/17
Batty, Jonathan	OPB	2017/10/04	2019/10/03
Bear, Daniel	OPB	2017/11/29	2019/11/28
Boyce, Jesse	OPB	2018/02/21	2020/02/20
Butler, Scott	OPB	2017/04/26	2019/04/25

Member Name	Tribunal	Appointment Start Date	Appointment End Date
Cavdar, Jessica	OPB	2018/01/18	2020/01/17
Della Fortuna, Sergio	OPB	2010/11/24	2020/11/23
Friedland, Jennifer	OPB	2016/05/30	2018/12/31
Gauci, Maureen Victoria	OPB	2009/02/04	2019/02/03
Goela, Anita	OPB	2017/09/13	2019/09/12
Gosio, Paul	OPB	2017/05/18	2019/05/17
Griffith, Lyndra	OPB	2018/02/21	2020/02/20
Hans, Rupinder	OPB	2017/07/11	2019/07/10
Helt, Maureen	OPB	2017/12/14	2019/12/13
Hodgson, Laura	OPB	2018/03/12	2020/03/11
Johal, Sandeep	OPB	2017/05/18	2019/05/17
Jovanovic, Stephen	OPB	2017/01/11	2022/01/10
Kepman, Stephanie	OPB	2018/01/24	2020/01/23
Kershaw, Dawn	OPB	2018/01/24	2020/01/23
Kromkamp, John	OPB	2016/01/15	2021/01/14
Labelle, Michelle	OPB	2011/02/09	2019/01/22
Lamoureux, Linda	OPB	2014/01/01	2018/12/31
Lamoureux, Sylvie	OPB	2017/10/31	2018/10/30
Lester, Chloe	OPB	2017/06/28	2019/06/27
Letourneau, Matthew	OPB	2018/02/28	2020/02/27
Lewis, Harriet	OPB	2017/04/05	2019/04/04
Livingstone, Katherine	OPB	2017/01/11	2019/01/10
Looknauth, Yugita	OPB	2018/01/18	2020/01/17
Maedel, Ian	OPB	2017/05/18	2019/05/17
Maleki-Yazdi, Melody	OPB	2018/01/18	2020/01/17
Mazerolle, Craig	OPB	2017/12/14	2019/12/13
McGee, Theresa	OPB	2018/02/28	2020/02/27
Moccio, Santina	OPB	2007/06/06	2018/12/31
Morton, Emily	OPB	2018/01/08	2020/01/07
Moten, Asad Ali	OPB	2017/04/26	2019/04/25
Nikota, Gary	OPB	2017/03/01	2019/02/28

Member Name	Tribunal	Appointment Start Date	Appointment End Date
Nother, Ashleigh	OPB	2018/02/08	2020/02/07
Osborne, Katie	OPB	2018/01/08	2020/09/07
Paivalainen, Seppo	OPB	2016/09/28	2019/09/07
Paluch, Cezary	OPB	2017/05/18	2019/05/17
Parent, Sylvie	OPB	2012/10/31	2022/10/24
Pierre, Richard	OPB	2018/02/08	2020/02/07
Prior, Robert	OPB	2018/03/12	2020/03/11
Punyarathi, Nidhi	OPB	2018/03/07	2020/03/06
Ramdayal, Raymond	OPB	2008/12/10	2019/02/11
Reynolds, Douglas	OPB	2007/04/11	2018/04/10
Riddell, Richard	OPB	2007/04/11	2017/04/10
Restoule, Karen	OPB	2017/04/05	2019/04/04
Restoule-Mallozzi, Jenny	OPB	2017/04/05	2019/04/04
Roedding, Blair	OPB	2017/03/08	2019/03/07
Ross, Gail	OPB	2011/04/18	2018/04/17
Sewrattan, Christopher	OPB	2017/06/14	2019/06/13
Stephenson, James	OPB	2011/04/18	2017/04/17
Sturgeon, Neil B.	OPB	2006/12/13	2018/02/28
Theoharis, Jeanie	OPB	2017/08/31	2019/08/30
Williams, Edward	OPB	2007/05/16	2017/05/15