

Notice of Decision of the Northern Ireland Social Care Council's Fitness to Practise Committee

Name: Jennifer Victoria Porter

SCR No: 2041834

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Fitness to Practise Committee of the Northern Ireland Social Care Council ('the Council'), at its meeting on **02 and 03 April 2019**, made the following decision about your registration with the Northern Ireland Social Care Council:

The Committee found the facts proved;

The Committee found that your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your misconduct.

The Committee decided to make an Order suspending your registration for a specified period of 6 months ('a Suspension Order').

Particulars of the Allegation:

That, being registered under the Health and Personal Social Services Act (Northern Ireland) 2001 (as amended), and whilst employed as a Social Worker in the Southern Health and Social Care Trust in the Looked After Children's Team

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | Sometime between 9 May 2013 and 16 March 2016 you used inappropriate and/or derogatory language in relation to Service User(s). |
| 2. | Sometime between 9 May 2013 and 16 March 2016 you used an inappropriate sexual gesture in relation to a kinship carer. |

And that by reason of the matters set out above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your misconduct.

Procedure:

The hearing was held under the fitness to practise procedure

The Registrant was not in attendance and was not represented. The Council was represented by Mr Conrad Dixon, Solicitor, Tughans Solicitors.

Preliminary Matters

Service

Mr Dixon advised the Committee that a Notice of Hearing dated 25 February 2019 was sent by Special Delivery post to the Registrant at her address as it appears on the Register, which notified her of the date, time and venue for this hearing. The Committee was advised that an attempt was made to deliver the Notice of Hearing on 26 February 2019 and a 'something for you' card was left. The package was not collected from the Delivery Office and was returned to the Council on 21 March 2019. The Notice was then sent to the Registrant on 21 March 2019 via first class post.

Accordingly, the Committee is satisfied that reasonable efforts have been made to notify the Registrant of this matter and that the Notice of Hearing has been served in accordance with Rule 3 and Paragraph 5 (2) of Schedule 2 of the Council Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (the Rules).

Proceeding in the Absence of the Registrant

Mr Dixon invited the Committee to proceed to deal with the fitness to practise hearing in the Registrant's absence. Mr Dixon submitted that there had been no engagement by the Registrant with the Council in relation to these proceedings. He outlined the occasions on which the Council had written to the Registrant since commencing its investigation. He advised the Committee that following consideration of the matter by the Preliminary Proceedings Committee, a Notice of Transfer was sent to the Registrant at her address as it appears on the register and signed for on 23 November 2018. Mr Dixon submitted that as the Registrant has not engaged at any stage, an adjournment would not secure her attendance on some future date.

The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser who reminded the Committee that the decision to proceed in the absence of the Registrant should be exercised with the utmost care and caution. The Committee was satisfied that the Registrant had been served with the Notice of Hearing which notified her of the date, time and venue for this hearing, details of the Allegation and her right to attend the hearing.

The Committee decided to proceed in the absence of the Registrant. In reaching this decision, the Committee had particular regard to the factors set out in the decision of R v Jones and to the overall interests of justice and fairness to all parties. It noted that:

- no application for an adjournment has been made by the Registrant;
- the Registrant has not engaged with the Council and has not responded to any of the letters sent to her by the Council about this matter;
- there is no reason to suppose that adjourning would secure her attendance at some future date;
- four witnesses have attended to give live evidence and not proceeding may inconvenience the witnesses and their employers;
- the Allegation relates to events that occurred between May 2013 and March 2016 and further delay may have an adverse effect on the ability of witnesses to accurately recall events;
- there is a strong public interest in the expeditious disposal of the case.

The Committee accepted that there is some disadvantage to the Registrant in proceeding in her absence. The Registrant will not be able to give evidence on her own behalf and will not have the opportunity to cross examine the witnesses or test the Council's case. However, the Committee determined that this disadvantage can be mitigated. The Committee can make allowance for the fact that the Council's evidence will not be tested by the Registrant and can of its own volition, explore any inconsistencies in the evidence which it identifies.

In these circumstances, the Committee decided that it is fair, appropriate and proportionate to proceed in the absence of the Registrant. The Committee will draw no adverse inference from the Registrant's absence in its findings of fact.

Hearing Bundle

Mr Dixon confirmed to the Committee that the hearing bundle provided to them complied with the requirements of relevance and fairness and that the Registrant had made no objections to its contents. The Committee accepted the bundle into evidence and marked it Exhibit 1.

Background

The Council received a referral in relation to the Registrant on 01 April 2016. The Registrant was employed by the Southern Health & Social Care Trust ('the Trust') as a Child/Family Social Worker in the Looked After Children's team ('LAC'). She had started in post on a temporary contract on 09 May 2013 and became a permanent member of staff on 13 January 2014

The Registrant was suspended from her post on 16 March 2016 as a result of concerns arising from a whistle blowing complaint. The complaints related to the use of inappropriate/derogatory language, sexualised language regarding service users and use of derogatory references towards ethnic minority families. The Registrant resigned during the Trust investigation.

Evidence

The Committee received into evidence a bundle of documents and heard oral evidence from four witnesses tendered on behalf of the Council. The witnesses called on behalf of the Council were ex-colleagues of the Registrant. The Committee first considered the overall credibility and reliability of the witnesses it had heard from.

The Committee found Witness 1 to be a reliable and credible witness who tried to assist the Committee to the best of her knowledge and belief. The Committee noted that she was a very junior member of the team at the relevant period of time. The Committee found her oral evidence to be consistent with her written statement to the Council. Furthermore, the Committee was of the view that Witness 1 was straightforward and did not try to embellish her evidence.

The Committee found Witness 2 to be a reliable and credible witness. The Committee considered she gave clear, consistent and balanced evidence with no reason to exaggerate her evidence. The Committee determined that it was clear from her evidence that events had stuck out in her mind. If she was not able to recall something, she was candid in saying that she could not remember.

The Committee found Witness 3 to be a straightforward witness. Her oral evidence was largely consistent with her statement provided to the Council. She did provide the Committee with one account of events not referred to in her statement but accepted that her account was graphic and compelling. The Committee noted that when asked in oral evidence if she responded to the Registrant when inappropriate language was used, she told the Committee she did not. In her written statement she described the Registrant "scunching her face up" when she disagreed with her description of family A. The Committee considered she was measured and balanced when giving evidence and was not prone to exaggerate or guess when she did not know the answer.

The Committee also found Witness 4 to be reliable and credible. The Committee heard first hand evidence of her account of events. While she may not have been able to recollect particular dates, the Committee accepted that she provided a detailed account of events as she recollected them. The Committee determined from her

evidence that events at that time had stuck in her mind and noted that she became visibly upset when describing the wider culture in the office.

Finding of Facts

In reaching its decisions on the facts, the Committee considered all of the evidence adduced in this case together with the submissions made by Mr Dixon, on behalf of the Council. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Advisor. The Committee was aware that the burden of proof rests on the Council, and that the standard of proof is the civil standard, namely the balance of probabilities. This means that the facts will be proved if the Committee is satisfied that it was more likely than not that the incidents occurred as alleged.

The Committee then considered the Particulars of the Allegation:

Particular 1: Sometime between 09 May 2013 and 16 March 2016 you used inappropriate and/or derogatory language in relation to service users.

The Committee heard direct evidence from all four witnesses on this point. Witness 1 gave evidence about the way in which the Registrant had modified the name of a family of service users to make it a derogatory term and the Registrant often used foul language. Witness 2 told the Committee how the Registrant described the mother of a family of service users as "fat" and "big" and that these terms were used after a difficult phone call with the service user. Witness 3 gave very clear evidence that the Registrant described the appearance of the mother of family A in a derogatory way, using terms like "stinking", "smelly" and "greasy". Witness 3 told the Committee this occurred on a regular basis. The Committee heard from Witness 4 that the Registrant had used terms such as "fat", "grotesque" and "lazy" to describe a service user. Witness 4 explained that the Registrant used swear words in conjunction with these derogatory terms. Witness 4 gave evidence that the Registrant had used the term "pedo" to describe the father of a family, based on a photograph she had seen. In her statement to the Council, Witness 4 described how the Registrant did not like this client and made generalised derogatory comments about him and called him "pedo". The Committee found her oral evidence and statement to be consistent and credible.

The Committee determined that the evidence was broadly consistent in terms of the culture of the office and specifically the type of language used by the Registrant in relation to service users. The witnesses were clear in their recollection of the use of derogatory and inappropriate language by the Registrant. The Committee determined that the witnesses were able to give compelling detail in regard to the words used and that it was inappropriate. The Committee accepted the evidence of Witness 3 that there was quite a volume of inappropriate language. However, it was the things which shocked her most that came to mind in her evidence and statement.

The evidence of Witness 3 was supported by Witness 4, who stated that she had become desensitised to the inappropriate and derogatory language used in the office and by the Registrant in relation to service users.

The Committee noted that none of the witnesses had raised concerns at the time and therefore gave careful consideration to the impact which this has on the credibility of their evidence. The Committee did not find evidence that the witnesses had colluded in their evidence or had any motive to be untruthful. The Committee accepted the explanations given for failing to raise their concerns at an earlier stage. Witness 1 told the Committee that she was a junior member of the team and considered that she could not raise concerns as the Registrant was friends with the manager. Witness 2 was also a junior member of the team and she felt more senior members of the team would deal with it. Witness 3 gave a similar explanation that she considered her supervisor was aware of the Registrant's behaviour. Witness 4 gave evidence that she had raised other concerns which had not been dealt with so felt her concerns in relation to the Registrant would not be actioned. The Committee accepted these explanations and determined that the witnesses gave honest and genuine reasons why they did not raise their concerns sooner.

The Committee found all 4 witnesses to be credible, reliable and straightforward and accepted their evidence in respect of this Particular. Accordingly, the Committee finds the Particular proved.

Particular 2: Sometime between 09 May 2013 and 16 March 2016 you used an inappropriate sexual gesture in relation to a kinship carer

The Committee next considered whether the Registrant had between 9 May 2013 and 16 March 2016 used an inappropriate sexual gesture in relation to a kinship carer.

Having already found the evidence of Witness 1 to be credible, the Committee accepted her evidence in relation to Particular 2. The Committee heard from Witness 1 that after coming off a phone call with the kinship carer the Registrant made a masturbation gesture. Witness 1 explained that this happened right in front of her and that it made her feel very uncomfortable. In her statement to the Council Witness 1 said "if she was on the phone, she would make oral sex and masturbation gestures while talking to him". The Committee found her oral evidence to be consistent with her statement. The Committee noted that she described this occurring on more than one occasion.

Witness 2 in her statement to the Council stated that she remembered the Registrant talking to the kinship carer on the phone "after which she made a derogatory gesture about him in a sexual way to everyone in the office". In

response to questioning from the Committee, Witness 2 explained that the sexual gesture which she witnessed was thrusting, which the Committee determined to be a different gesture to that witnessed by Witness 1. She told the Committee that she found this gesture by the Registrant to be very inappropriate, it made her very uncomfortable and she only witnessed it on one occasion.

Witness 4 gave evidence that there was a kinship carer that the Registrant "fancied", and she would make different comments about his attractiveness. The Committee heard that if the Registrant was on the phone to him, she would make masturbation gestures while talking to him. The Committee found this evidence to be consistent with her statement to the Council where she stated that she remembered the Registrant making masturbation signals and signs whilst on the phone to this kinship carer.

The Committee considered that it was more likely than not that the Registrant on one or more occasions had used inappropriate sexual gestures in relation to a kinship carer. The Committee found that the evidence of Witness 1 and Witness 4 was very similar in relation to what they had witnessed. The evidence of these witnesses was reinforced as it was largely consistent. The evidence of Witness 2 was in relation to a different gesture but the Committee found the detail given by Witness 2 made her account credible and determined it was more likely than not that both gestures had been used by the Registrant.

The Committee considered the reasons given for not complaining earlier and found them to be entirely believable and genuine. Witness 4 told the Committee that she was intimidated by the Registrant and did not want to get on the wrong side of her. All witnesses gave evidence that other members of staff seemed to think that the Registrant's behaviour was acceptable. The Committee did not find any evidence of any malicious intent or collusion on the part of the witnesses.

The Committee accepted the evidence of all three witnesses and accordingly the Committee finds this Particular proved.

Fitness to Practise

The Committee moved on to consider if the Registrant's fitness to practise is impaired. The Committee heard submissions from Mr Dixon. He submitted that the Registrant's fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct. Mr Dixon submitted that in the opinion of the Council the following standards have been breached: Standard 1: 1.1, 1.2, 1.8, 1.9 and 1.10, Standard 2: 2.2, Standard 3: 3.7, Standard 5: 5.8, Standard 6: 6.3, 6.12, 6.13.

The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. She referred the Committee to Paragraph 24 of Schedule 2 of the Rules and the requirements as set out in the case of GMC v Cohen. She directed the Committee to the findings of Dame Janet Smith in her 5th report to the Shipman Inquiry and her guidance on the causes of impairment. She also referred the Committee to the cases of GMC v Roylance and CHRE v Grant.

The Committee in considering the issue of impairment of fitness to practise took account of Paragraph 24 (3) of Schedule 2 of the Rules which states that the Committee shall have regard to:

- a) whether it is satisfied as to the reason for the alleged impairment of fitness to practise;
- b) the Standards of Conduct and Practice issued by the Council under Section 9 of the Act;
- c) whether the impairment is capable of remediation;
- d) whether the impairment has been remediated;
- e) the risk of repetition; and
- f) the public interest.

The Committee first considered whether the facts found proved amount to misconduct. The Committee determined that the facts found proved involved repeatedly using inappropriate and derogatory language about a range of very vulnerable service users and vulgar sexual gestures in relation to a kinship carer. This conduct occurred in the work place and the Committee determined that it was serious. In reaching this decision the Committee took into account the evidence that the use of derogatory language was deliberate and prolonged. It was not a mistake or error of judgement on one occasion. Although there was no evidence that the Registrant used this type of language or gestures in front of service users. The Committee was satisfied that behaving in this way in front of other members of the team, some of whom were more junior, was serious misconduct. The Committee heard evidence that the Registrant's use of inappropriate sexual gestures made other members of the team feel uncomfortable and the Committee was in no doubt that the general public would consider her actions deplorable.

The Committee had regard to the Standards of Conduct for Social Workers and found the Registrant's actions to be in breach of the following provisions:

Standard 1 As a social worker, you must protect the rights and promote the interests and wellbeing of service users and carers. This includes:

- 1.2 Treating people with consideration, respect and compassion;
- 1.8 Respecting and maintaining the dignity and privacy of service users;
- 1.9 Treating service users and carers fairly and promoting equal opportunities;

Standard 2 As a social worker, you must strive to establish and maintain the trust and confidence of service users and carers. This includes:

- 2.2 Communicating in an appropriate, open, accurate and straightforward way;

Standard 5 As a social worker, you must uphold public trust and confidence in social work services. In particular you must not:

- 5.8 Behave in a way, in work or outside work, which would call into question your suitability to work in social care services;

Standard 6 As a social worker, you must be accountable for the quality of your work and take responsibility for maintaining and improving your knowledge and skills. This includes:

- 6.3 Being personally accountable for your actions and able to explain and account for your actions and decisions;
- 6.12 Co-operating with any investigation or formal inquiry into your conduct, the conduct of others, or the care or services provided to a service user where appropriate;

The Committee determined that the facts found proved involved serious and repeated departures over a prolonged period of time, of the standards of conduct expected of a registered social worker.

The Committee next considered whether as a result of the misconduct found proved, the Registrant's fitness to practise is impaired. The Committee kept at the forefront of its mind when reaching this decision, the duty to protect the public, uphold proper standards of conduct and behaviour and maintain public confidence in the social work profession.

In the Committee's judgement, the Registrant's inappropriate use of sexual gestures and the derogatory language used about vulnerable service users would undoubtedly have brought the social work profession into disrepute. The Committee determined that respect and compassion are fundamental tenets of the social work profession and the Registrant has breached both of these.

With regard to future risk, the Committee concluded that the Registrant's misconduct is capable of remediation. The Committee considered that the Registrant's misconduct could be remediated if she demonstrated insight into her failings. However, the Committee determined that it has not yet been remedied. The Committee found there to be a concerning lack of insight on the part of the Registrant. The Registrant resigned before the Trust investigation concluded and did not engage with the Council investigation or hearing. As a result, there was no evidence before the Committee that the Registrant acknowledged her conduct was inappropriate or had taken any steps to remediate.

In the absence of remediation, the Committee was very concerned about the risk of repetition. The Registrant has failed to explain to the Committee any steps she would take to ensure that she did not use similar inappropriate or derogatory language in relation to service users or inappropriate sexual gestures in the future. The Committee therefore determined that a risk of repetition remains.

The Committee considered the public interest and concluded that the public interest is engaged in this case. The Committee was of the view that a fully informed member of the public would be seriously concerned, in particular, by the way that the Registrant spoke about vulnerable service users. Social Workers are in a trusted position, which is a position of privilege. As a result, they are expected at all times to be professional, to maintain professional boundaries and refrain from making judgemental, derogatory, personal comments about vulnerable service users. The Committee also determined that public confidence in the profession and the Council as a regulator would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made. The Committee was concerned that if a finding of impairment were not made, other social workers may consider the Registrant's actions to be acceptable. The Committee received evidence that the Registrant's language and behaviour made her colleagues feel uncomfortable and the Committee was in no doubt that it was unacceptable. Therefore, the Committee determined that a finding of impairment on public interest grounds was also required.

Accordingly, the Committee determined that the Registrant's fitness to practise is currently impaired.

Sanction

In reaching its decision on sanction the Committee considered the submissions of Mr Dixon on behalf of the Council and had careful regard to all of the evidence in this case.

The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. She referred the Committee to the Indicative Sanctions and Use of Interim Orders: Guidance for Fitness to Practise Committees ("Indicative Sanctions Guidance").

In deciding which sanction to impose, the Committee took into account:

- a) the seriousness of the Particulars of the Allegation;
- b) the degree to which the Registrant has fallen short of any expected standards;
- c) the protection of the public;
- d) the public interest in maintaining confidence in social care services; and
- e) the issue of proportionality.

The Committee recognised that the purpose of sanction is not to be punitive, although sanction may have a punitive effect. The Committee first considered the mitigating and aggravating factors in this case and found the mitigating factors to be:

- the Registrant has a good work history and good character;
- there have been no previous concerns raised with the Council;
- the Committee has seen no evidence of repetition of these events since concerns were raised with the Council in 2016;
- the Registrant's actions did not cause direct or indirect harm to service users;
- her actions were confined to the office, not in front of service users;
- the Committee heard evidence that this type of behaviour was condoned and participated in by her line manager. The Committee determined there was a culture of this type of behaviour in some parts of the team at that time.

The Committee considered the aggravating factors to be:

- the actions of the Registrant demonstrated a serious lack of respect and compassion for service users;
- the Registrant demonstrated a lack of insight;
- the Registrant has not expressed any remorse or regret;
- the Registrant resigned before the Trust investigation concluded and did not participate in the Council investigation or attend the hearing;
- her actions were repeated on more than one occasion;
- she has demonstrated a serious disregard for NISCC's Standards of Conduct and Practice.

Having balanced the aggravating and mitigating factors, the Committee proceeded to consider the appropriate sanction to apply in this case.

No Sanction- the Committee had no hesitation in concluding that it would neither be appropriate or proportionate if no sanction were imposed in this case. In the view of the Committee, if no sanction were imposed this would not mark the seriousness of the misconduct or meet the public interest in this case.

Warning- the Committee considered a Warning. The Committee found that the Registrant had not caused any harm, either direct or indirect to service users. The Committee determined that a warning would send a clear message to the Registrant that this behaviour was not acceptable and must not happen again. The Committee was satisfied that a warning would be recorded against the Registrant's entry on the register and would ensure any future employer would be aware that the Committee found her actions to be unacceptable. However, without evidence of any insight or remediation the Committee remained very concerned about the risk of repetition.

Conditions of Practice Order- the Committee next considered a Conditions of Practice Order. The Committee had already determined that the Registrant's misconduct could be remediated. However, the Registrant has not engaged in the process and is not present today. The Committee has no evidence as to the Registrant's current employment circumstances, or whether she would agree to any conditions imposed. A Conditions of Practice Order in these circumstances, would therefore be unworkable and inappropriate.

Suspension- the Committee next considered a Suspension Order. Although the Committee considered that the Registrant's misconduct and impairment is serious, it does not consider it so serious as to justify removal from the Register. In particular, her actions did not cause harm to service users. The Committee did not accept the submission of Mr Dixon that there was evidence of deep seeded attitudinal problems on the part of the Registrant. The Committee heard evidence of a culture of this type of behaviour in certain parts of the Registrant's team, including her line manager. In the view of the Committee, this does not remove the Registrant's individual and professional responsibilities to exercise respect and compassion in relation to vulnerable service users, but it would make a removal order disproportionate. The Committee determined that the Registrant's behaviour is not fundamentally incompatible with continuing to be a registered social worker in the long term. Suspension will give a clear message to the Registrant, the public and the profession that the Registrant's conduct was not appropriate for a social worker. The Registrant has a good work history and no other complaints have been raised with the Council in respect of her professional practice. The Committee noted that a Suspension Order would be reviewed at the conclusion of the period of suspension and that the Registrant would have the opportunity to present evidence of the steps she had taken to remediate her misconduct. This would address the risk of repetition identified. A review committee may be assisted by engagement with the Council by the Registrant and in particular provision of evidence of remediation. The public would be sufficiently protected in the meantime by a period of suspension.

The Committee carefully considered the potential impact a Suspension Order could have on the Registrant. However, it concluded that any consequences for the Registrant are outweighed by the need to protect the public and maintain public confidence in the social work profession.

The Committee determined that suspension for a period of six months would be proportionate to the seriousness of the facts found and would provide an adequate opportunity for the Registrant to demonstrate remediation.

Removal- the Committee did consider a removal order. Whilst acknowledging that some of the factors listed in the Indicative Sanctions Guidance were engaged, the Committee concluded that a Removal Order would be disproportionate, in particular as the Registrant did not cause harm to service users. On balance the Committee was persuaded that a Removal Order at this stage would not be appropriate.

The Committee concluded that a Suspension Order for a period of six months was the most suitable, appropriate and proportionate sanction to be imposed on the Registrant's registration with immediate effect.

You should note that the Fitness to Practise Committee's decision takes effect from the date upon which it was made.

You have the right to appeal this decision to the Care Tribunal. Any appeal must be lodged in writing within 28 days from the date of this Notice of Decision.

You should note that the Fitness to Practise Committee's decision takes effect from the date upon which it was made.

The effect of this decision is that your entry in the Register has been suspended for a specified period of 6 months and you may not practise as a social worker during the period **03 April 2019 to 02 October 2019** inclusive.

It is compulsory for all qualified social workers to be registered with the Northern Ireland Social Care Council in order to work. If you practise as a qualified social worker while the Order is in place, you will be guilty of an offence pursuant to Article 8 of the Health and Personal Social Services Act (Northern Ireland) 2001. Article 8

states that if a person who is not registered as a social worker in any relevant Register takes or uses the title of social worker or any description implying that s/he is registered as a social worker, or in any way holds him/herself out as registered, s/he is guilty of an offence.

Early Review

The Fitness to Practise Committee may, at your request, review the Order before the end of the period for which the suspension has been imposed if there has been a material change of circumstances since the Order was imposed. The Committee may, after reviewing a Suspension Order, revoke that Order or replace that Order with a Conditions of Practice Order.

Review at Conclusion of Sanction

The Council will seek information from you towards the end of the period for which the suspension has been imposed, and may refer the matter for review by the Fitness to Practise Committee. If the Committee reviews the Order and it is satisfied that your fitness to practise remains impaired, it may impose a further Order to commence upon expiry of the existing Order, or it may impose a Conditions of Practice Order to commence upon expiry of the existing Order, or it may revoke the existing Order and impose a Removal Order. You will be contacted by the Council towards the end of your period of suspension.

EU Directive

EU Directive 2013 / 55 / EU requires regulatory bodies to provide notification to all EU counterparts regarding regulatory decisions about social work registrants. An alert containing this decision (i.e. Warning / Suspension Order / Conditions of Practise Order / Removal Order), as well as your name, date of birth, place of birth (if known) and registration number will therefore be sent out to all EU regulatory counterparts. No further details will be contained in the alert. More information about the IMI Alert system can be found on their website: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/imi-net/about/index_en.htm.

PP C Kennedy

Committee Manager

09.04.19.

Date