

QUEENSLAND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS COMMISSION

Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003 - s. 550 - appeal to commission

SPIRAL Inc. AND Q-COMP (WC/2009/76)

COMMISSIONER FISHER

22 February 2010

Appeal against decision of Q-COMP - Agreed facts - Whether reasonable management action taken in a reasonable way - Evidence - Inappropriate conduct by employee - Meeting arranged - Purpose of meeting - Inconsistent advice to employee - Employee's shift cancelled - Disciplinary process not enlivened - Determined management action not reasonable and not taken in a reasonable way - Absence of medical evidence - Appeal dismissed - Costs.

DECISION

- [1] SPIRAL Inc. (SPIRAL) has appealed against the decision of the Review Unit, Q-COMP made on 17 August 2009 to set aside the decision by the Insurer to reject the application for compensation from Amanda Bergin and to substitute another decision that the application for compensation is one for acceptance.
- [2] SPIRAL is an acronym for Supporting People in Respite and Lifestyle. It is an organisation providing respite services to adult persons with intellectual and physical disabilities, the clients of the service. Employees of SPIRAL include those performing administrative work and those providing support to the clients. Ms Bergin, the Claimant, was employed as a Support Worker at the time of claiming workers' compensation.
- [3] On 2 June 2009 Ms Bergin lodged a claim for workers' compensation to WorkCover on the basis that she suffered an injury described on her application as "Psychological symptoms in general, Anxiety/stress disorder". The parties do not dispute that:
 - Ms Bergin was at the material time a worker as defined;
 - Ms Bergin suffered a personal injury (psychological or psychiatric);
 - Ms Bergin's personal injury arose out of, or in the course of, her employment;
 - The employment was a significant contributing factor to the injury; and
 - Ms Bergin's personal injury arose out of, or in the course of, management action.
- [4] Medical certificates were tendered to support the above agreed facts. On the basis of the agreement reached between the parties and the medical evidence presented the Commission accepts that the above elements have been established.
- [5] Where the parties differ is whether the injury is withdrawn from s. 32(1) of the *Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003* (the Act) because of the operation of s. 32(5)(a) of the Act, that is, whether reasonable management action was taken in a reasonable way by the employer in connection with the worker's employment. SPIRAL also raised an alternative argument that the injury was withdrawn because of the operation of s. 32(5)(b) of the Act, that is, the worker's expectation or perception of reasonable management action being taken against the worker.

Evidence

- [6] Evidence was given by the following witnesses:

For SPIRAL

Katherine Kalogerakis, Manager, SPIRAL;
Darren Martinelli, Disability Support Worker and Workplace Health and Safety Officer and Rehabilitation Co-ordinator, SPIRAL, from August 2001 until August 2009 and presently Workplace Health and Safety Officer and Program Development Officer, Maroochydore Day Respite Centre;
Danielle Pardon, Training Assessment and Development Officer, SPIRAL; and
Beverley Ritchings, Wellness Officer, SPIRAL.

For Q-COMP

Amanda Bergin, Claimant.

The circumstances of the injury

- [7] Many of the essential facts leading to the injury are not in dispute. The argument lies in the interpretation of the management action taken.

- [8] On Friday 22 May 2009 at 5.18 p.m. Nadia Rabiller, the Activities Co-ordinator of SPIRAL, sent Ms Kalogerakis an email advising that "major codes of conduct are bridged (sic) during SPIRAL services from some SW on a day to day basis". The email went on to outline complaints about two Support Workers, one of whom was Ms Bergin. In relation to Ms Bergin, Ms Rabiller said that Trish Osborne, Manager, Mooloolaba Fitness at the Sunshine Coast Institute of TAFE had telephoned her in relation to general business matters and had then proceeded to make two complaints that Ms Bergin had made inappropriate comments about clients when she was performing duties at TAFE. Ms Kalogerakis said she had also been informed by Mr Martinelli at about the same time that concern had been expressed to him by staff at TAFE over the same conduct by Ms Bergin.
- [9] After receiving the information Ms Kalogerakis contacted Ms Pardon, who also assisted with human resources issues at SPIRAL, and Ms Ritchings to discuss the concerns that had been raised. Ms Ritchings had been appointed as the Wellness Officer in April 2009 after working for nearly three years as a Support Worker. The role of the Wellness Officer is to provide support to the Support Workers in their wellness by developing a holistic approach to their health and wellbeing.
- [10] Up to this point SPIRAL addressed concerns about an employee's conduct through a process whereby the Manager would issue a letter to the employee advising of the need for a disciplinary interview to be held within a minimum of 24 hours. During her employment Ms Ritchings had noticed employees became unduly concerned on receiving such a letter. In order to minimise this distress Ms Ritchings proposed that initially an informal meeting occur to outline to the employee the concerns or complaints and to give them the opportunity to provide their version of events. The facts would be brought back to Ms Kalogerakis who would then determine whether formal disciplinary action needed to be taken. The meetings proposed by Ms Ritchings were known as research meetings as their purpose was to research the facts.
- [11] Ms Kalogerakis authorised Ms Pardon and Ms Ritchings to conduct a research meeting with Ms Bergin. Ms Kalogerakis understood that Ms Ritchings would be present to provide support to Ms Bergin's vulnerability or stress and Ms Pardon's role was to gather information.
- [12] Ms Bergin was notified of the meeting by Ms Ritchings on 26 May 2009 while she was travelling in a vehicle with Mr Martinelli. Ms Ritchings denied that she told Ms Bergin her shift for the following day had been cancelled. Her evidence is that she said that a research meeting was to be held the following day and she explained to Ms Bergin that the purpose of the meeting was to check the facts, including Ms Bergin's side, about some issues that had come in. Ms Ritchings said that when she asked Ms Bergin whether she thought this was a good idea, she responded positively. They agreed to meet at the Starbucks Coffee Shop in Mooloolaba at 10.30 a.m.
- [13] Ms Bergin said she received two telephone calls from Ms Ritchings that day. In the first call Ms Ritchings told her that her shift for the following day had been cancelled and to come to a meeting to discuss some issues that had arisen. The second telephone call was to alter the time of the meeting. Ms Bergin said that the term "research meeting" was not used by Ms Ritchings and she was not told the specifics of the issues to be raised.
- [14] After the telephone call concluded Ms Bergin said she told Mr Martinelli that her shift for the next day had been cancelled and that she was to attend a meeting. Despite Mr Martinelli having conveyed a complaint about Ms Bergin to Ms Kalogerakis he did not inform Ms Bergin of this and responded by advising her to attend the meeting to find out what was disclosed.
- [15] On her return to the SPIRAL office Ms Bergin ran into Ms Pardon. When Ms Bergin told Ms Pardon her shift had been cancelled and she did not know why, Ms Pardon responded by saying "It's okay, just breathe". Ms Pardon said these comments were meant to reassure Ms Bergin who seemed concerned but not particularly upset.
- [16] Ms Bergin was concerned about her shift being cancelled as she had consistently been rostered on that particular shift and had not been given any reason for its cancellation. Ms Kalogerakis said she decided the shift should be cancelled in order to protect Ms Bergin from an uncomfortable situation, however, Ms Bergin said she had already attended the TAFE twice more before the allegations were raised with her.
- [17] Ms Bergin said she also asked both Ms Ritchings and Ms Pardon whether she was in trouble as a result of having her shift cancelled and being requested to attend a meeting to discuss issues that had arisen, however, neither Ms Ritchings nor Ms Pardon could recall being asked that question.
- [18] Both Ms Ritchings and Ms Pardon attended the meeting with Ms Bergin on 27 May 2009. It started by the three ordering coffee and cake and engaging in general, social conversation before the business of the meeting was raised. Ms Ritchings primarily conducted the meeting. Ordinarily, such a meeting would have been conducted by Ms Pardon but as she was feeling unwell that day it was left to Ms Ritchings. Ms Pardon took notes. The issues mentioned in Ms Rabiller's email of 22 May 2009 were raised. In addition other issues which had been raised in an email to Ms Kalogerakis by another employee of SPIRAL, Kellie Vora, were put to her. Ms

Kalogerakis said that it was her intention that only the issues from TAFE were to be raised with Ms Bergin because they were from an external source whereas the more recent issues were hearsay from another worker. However, for the issues raised by Ms Vora to have been put to Ms Bergin, Ms Kalogerakis must have provided a copy of the email to Ms Ritchings or Ms Pardon. In any event all issues were put to Ms Bergin and she explained her version of events.

- [19] Both Ms Ritchings and Ms Pardon believed that Ms Bergin had responded positively to the meeting. Ms Bergin agreed in cross-examination that she did not make any complaints during or at the conclusion of the meeting and left the meeting in quite a positive mood.
- [20] At the conclusion of the meeting Ms Ritchings told Ms Bergin that Ms Kalogerakis would be contacting her later that afternoon about the outcomes of the meeting. Ms Pardon emailed a report to Ms Kalogerakis and Ms Ritchings about Ms Bergin's responses to the issues raised. In her covering note Ms Pardon commented that both she and Ms Ritchings believed Ms Bergin to have been upfront, open and honest and working hard on her development.
- [21] Ms Kalogerakis emailed Ms Bergin later that afternoon. The subject read "No need for a meeting at this stage" and the body of the email was in the following terms:

"Thanks for your cooperation in regards to addressing the issues raised.

Please continue to be very mindful of not only what you say but more importantly how you say it.

I really don't want to have to address another incident of this nature...

My recommendation will be that Nadia accompany you to TAFE next week & request if Trish & the other TAFE workers involved are willing to provide you the opportunity to clarify any misunderstanding they may have perceived from your comments...

I hope this is agreeable to you...

Warm Regards

Kathryn Kalogerakis
Manager
SPIRAL Inc."

- [22] The words "how you say it" were written in red typeface. Ms Kalogerakis said she used different colour types in an endeavour to be creative and to make parts of correspondence stand out.
- [23] Ms Bergin said she realised she was in trouble when she received the email from Ms Kalogerakis as it contained writing in red, commonly referred to by workers in SPIRAL as "the naughty writing". Ms Bergin was annoyed with the advice that she attend TAFE to clarify any misunderstandings because she believed that she had not said anything to cause concern and she had also provided to Ms Ritchings and Ms Pardon the names of witnesses who she believed could verify her position. She had believed that these people were going to be contacted and was concerned that her responses had now been disbelieved. Ms Bergin said that eight weeks after receiving the email from Ms Kalogerakis she acted on her advice to clarify any misunderstandings with TAFE.
- [24] Ms Bergin said she started to "get butterflies in her stomach" from the time of the telephone call from Ms Ritchings advising her of the meeting and became anxious and stressed on her way home from the meeting. She went to her doctor on 28 May 2009 because she became anxious that further shifts might be cancelled and other issues raised with her. On obtaining a medical certificate Ms Bergin applied for workers' compensation.

Conclusions

- [25] SPIRAL submitted that it was reasonable management action, taken through Ms Ritchings and Ms Pardon, to conduct a research meeting to ascertain Ms Bergin's version of alleged inappropriate comments she had made about clients while working at the Mooloolaba Institute of TAFE. Further, it was reasonable for Ms Kalogerakis, following receipt of the report from Ms Pardon to have sent the email to Ms Bergin and neither email nor its contents could be considered to be disciplinary action.
- [26] In contrast, Q-COMP submitted that the decision to embark on the research meeting was not reasonable management action because the concept was not fully developed, it was uncertain whether research meetings had been adopted as a policy of SPIRAL and employees had not been advised of the process.

- [27] The Commission accepts that it may be appropriate in certain circumstances for a degree of informality to be adopted by an employer in examining performance or conduct issues concerning an employee. In this case the Commission accepts that the approach adopted was meant to consider the interests of the employee. To that end the meeting was held in an informal environment, in a coffee shop, where coffee and cake were enjoyed together with social conversation before the business of the meeting was raised. Ms Bergin was told of the allegations that had been made against her and was given an opportunity to respond. She did not express any concerns during the meeting of how the meeting was progressing and felt quite positive at its conclusion. However, the management action is not limited to these matters. It extends to the employer's policy of dealing with conduct issues, other aspects of the conduct of the meeting and the action taken after the meeting.
- [28] As part of her induction into her employment at SPIRAL Ms Bergin was given a copy of an Employee Disciplinary Policy which sets out the process to be followed in the event disciplinary action was required to be taken against an employee. The first step in the process was notification in writing of the need for a disciplinary interview with the Manager.
- [29] Ms Ritchings, on her appointment as Wellness Officer, raised concerns about the effects on employees on being presented with a letter about the need for a disciplinary interview. She proposed as a preliminary step that the facts of the matter be researched by giving employees the opportunity to respond to issues, allegations or concerns in an informal way before any formal disciplinary action was taken. Ms Ritchings believed that this proposed approach would cause less stress to employees and convinced Ms Kalogerakis of the wisdom of this approach.
- [30] The evidence about whether research meetings were formally adopted as policy as at the time of the meeting with Ms Bergin is not entirely clear. Neither Ms Ritchings nor Mr Martinelli could indicate whether or when the policy was formally adopted however Ms Pardon said it had been adopted at a Service Team Delivery meeting on 26 May 2009. The evidence of Ms Kalogerakis did not clarify this point. What is clear, though, is that as at 26 May 2009, the employees generally, and Ms Bergin in particular, had not been advised by SPIRAL that research meetings had been introduced.
- [31] It was not reasonable in circumstances where a formal policy was in place for SPIRAL to implement a new process without advice to employees. The purpose of a research meeting should have been disclosed to employees together with an explanation of where this step fitted in the context of the disciplinary policy. The employer may consider it desirable to hold a research meeting in an informal setting in order to minimise an employee's feeling of discomfort or stress but the decision of the employer to call the employee to a meeting to raise and discuss issues of concern is still a step, albeit a preliminary one, in the disciplinary process. The fact that in this case Ms Bergin's shift was cancelled in order to allow the discussion to occur emphasises the seriousness of the employer's decision to implement the step of a research meeting.
- [32] Employees should have also been provided with information about how meetings were to be conducted; whether, where and for how long any records of the meeting or its outcome were to be kept; or whether these records could be used if any future disciplinary matters arose. The evidence shows that although Mr Martinelli had raised such concerns with Ms Ritchings no determination of these matters had been made by management and hence not conveyed to employees.
- [33] A written report of the meeting was provided by Ms Pardon to Ms Kalogerakis. A written report has connotations of formality and lends weight to the view that the step of research meetings is part of the disciplinary process. It also reinforces the issues, noted above, about the retention of employee records.
- [34] Management, in this case comprised of Ms Kalogerakis, Ms Ritchings and Ms Pardon, were not consistent on the information to be given to an employee about the purpose of the meeting. Ms Kalogerakis said she would have told an employee the purpose of the meeting whereas Ms Ritchings believed it was not her place to do so. It is clear that in advance of the research meeting Ms Bergin was not provided with any particulars of the issues to be raised.
- [35] The roles taken by Ms Ritchings and Ms Pardon were inconsistent with their positions held in SPIRAL. Ms Ritchings' position was designed to provide support to Support Workers, however, she took the lead role in the meeting. Admittedly, this was in part because Ms Pardon was feeling unwell but according to her evidence it was also because it was Ms Ritchings who had conceived the idea of research meetings. The roles adopted were contrary to the roles Ms Kalogerakis believed they would perform. By adopting the lead role Ms Ritchings might be able to be conscious of the manner in which she framed issues but she could not provide support for Ms Bergin as required by her role in SPIRAL.
- [36] The employer was attempting to gather information from an employee that may determine whether disciplinary action was to be taken but the employee was not given any protections such as notification about the purpose of the meeting and the opportunity to have a support person present. For the reason given above Ms Ritchings could not be considered to be a support person for Ms Bergin.

- [37] Regrettably, the concept of a research meeting was not fully developed at the time one was held with Ms Bergin and consequently was implemented prematurely and without proper consideration of the detail of the process. In the circumstances of this case it cannot be found the research meeting was reasonable management action.
- [38] The Commission accepts that it was reasonable for Ms Kalogerakis to advise Ms Bergin of her attitude to the issues following consideration of the reported outcomes of the meeting. It was also reasonable in the circumstances of this case for Ms Bergin to be notified at her home because she had an appointment earlier that afternoon and in order that she would not be left in an uncertain state overnight. However, for reasons given later in this decision, the Commission does not share the view of SPIRAL that the contents of the email sent by Ms Kalogerakis could not be considered to be disciplinary action or a reprimand. Importantly, too, after reading the email Ms Bergin considered she was in trouble.
- [39] SPIRAL submitted that the purpose of the meeting at the Mooloolaba Starbucks Coffee Shop was that it was neutral territory and was hoped that Ms Bergin would feel at ease in providing her version of events about issues raised against her. Moreover, even without prior notice of the issues, the seeking of her version was nonetheless reasonable management action taken in a reasonable way. The whole purpose of approaching the matter in this manner was to reduce Ms Bergin's anxiety. The process was deliberately conducted outside of the disciplinary policy because it did not constitute formal disciplinary action.
- [40] Q-COMP submitted that SPIRAL was unreasonable in the manner in which it implemented the decision to conduct a research meeting with Ms Bergin. The unreasonableness included the cancellation of Ms Bergin's shift; not informing Ms Bergin of the purpose of the meeting or the issues to be discussed with the result she had no opportunity to prepare her response and was not given an opportunity to have a support person present. Additionally, the email sent by Ms Kalogerakis was said to be unreasonable because it left open the potential for further action and it contained a warning.
- [41] Despite acknowledging the good intentions of SPIRAL management the Commission cannot conclude that the management action was taken in a reasonable way. In order to hold the meeting Ms Bergin's shift was cancelled. The evidence of Ms Kalogerakis was that Ms Bergin was a part-time employee and as such SPIRAL was only obligated to provide 15 hours per week. Hours for part-time employees are regularly reduced and shifts changed at SPIRAL. Ms Kalogerakis said that Ms Bergin was paid for attendance at the meeting and acknowledged that after intervention from her union the whole of her shift was paid, two months later.
- [42] It is unreasonable management action to cancel a long-standing shift with around 24 hours notice for the purpose of having an employer-initiated meeting without paying the employee for the entire rostered shift. This was a regular rostered shift for Ms Bergin and she would have had a reasonable expectation to have worked it.
- [43] Ms Bergin said she worked two shifts at TAFE after the alleged inappropriate comments had been made. If the purpose of cancelling the shift was to protect Ms Bergin from her accusers while the matter was considered by SPIRAL then it did not achieve that end.
- [44] I consider Ms Ritchings informed Ms Bergin that her shift was cancelled as Ms Bergin only spoke to Ms Ritchings on the telephone about a meeting. To advise that a shift has been cancelled in order to hold a meeting to address issues that had been raised has the hallmarks of being punitive action. For the Wellness Officer to convey this information confuses her role in the process and may contribute to the employee misunderstanding the purpose of the meeting.
- [45] By her statements to Mr Martinelli and Ms Pardon, Ms Bergin was clearly concerned that her shift had been cancelled without adequate explanation. In my view the response from Ms Pardon that "It's OK, just breathe" was inadequate. She was aware of the reason the shift was cancelled and was to be a participant in the meeting where issues of concern were to be raised. Ms Pardon also knew that a research meeting could be a prelude to the disciplinary process being instituted. Moreover, she was involved with human resources issues for the employer and accordingly should have been more informative in her response.
- [46] I do not accept the evidence of Ms Ritchings that she told Ms Bergin that the meeting was a research meeting. It was the only part of her evidence which was given with any certainty. The balance of her evidence was quite vague in many respects. Ms Bergin had no recollection of Ms Ritchings using that term and I consider that had she done so Ms Bergin would have sought to clarify it as it was not a term or process that had been made known to employees.
- [47] It was unreasonable not to have informed Ms Bergin of the subjects to be discussed at the meeting. Although I accept that Ms Ritchings told her that some issues need to be discussed it is clear that the issues to be raised were not disclosed in advance of the meeting. I also accept that it is sometimes difficult to determine the extent of the information to be provided to an employee at the preliminary stages of an employer's consideration of a complaint. It may be unnecessary in certain circumstances to detail the issues to be raised but in my view the

least Ms Bergin should have been told that the meeting was to discuss allegations that she had made inappropriate comments about clients whilst at the Sunshine Coast TAFE. According to the evidence of Ms Kalogerakis it was no secret what the meeting was about and Ms Bergin could have been told.

- [48] Although the meeting was, in Ms Kalogerakis' understanding, to be limited to the issues arising from the Sunshine Coast Institute of TAFE, the meeting also addressed concerns raised by Ms Vora. It was unreasonable to have raised these issues because even Ms Vora acknowledged that the information provided was scant. In the report provided to Ms Kalogerakis, Ms Pardon commented that one of the issues "was hard to fully interpret (as) it was not real clear".
- [49] It was also unreasonable not to have disclosed that her responses would determine whether the formal disciplinary policy would be activated. Although Ms Bergin's anxiety might have been heightened were she to have been told management withheld key information that would have ensured she was cognisant of the purpose of the meeting and may have affected her responses.
- [50] In respect of the submissions made by SPIRAL that the email could not be considered to be disciplinary action it is true that it does not state this or that Ms Bergin was being reprimanded. However, the contents make the email unreasonable management action taken in an unreasonable way. Firstly, the inclusion in the heading of the phrase "at this stage" and the comment contained in the body of the email, "I really don't want to have to address another incident of this nature" put Ms Bergin on notice that her conduct remained under scrutiny. By making these comments Ms Kalogerakis was alluding to the prospect of disciplinary action remaining open even though she apparently accepted Ms Bergin's version of events. Further, the highlighting in red typeface of the words "how you say it" adds emphasis and connotes that Ms Bergin is at best being counselled about her conduct. Finally, Ms Kalogerakis gave Ms Bergin a recommendation for remedial action. When an employer gives such a recommendation it is doubtful that the employee is in any position to decline it. In my view the contents of the email convey a message that Ms Bergin is being disciplined about her conduct, although such disciplinary action is at the lower end of the scale.
- [51] The email was written in the above terms in the context that the results of the research meeting made it unnecessary to enliven the formal disciplinary process from which disciplinary action could result. Yet, after receiving the email Ms Bergin was left with the understanding she was in trouble. For the reasons given about the inferences drawn from the contents of the email I can readily understand that view. It is unreasonable management action taken in an unreasonable way when an employer sets up a process ostensibly outside the formal disciplinary process and then in effect disciplines the employee.
- [52] For the foregoing reasons the Commission finds that in all of the circumstances of this case and when considered in its entirety the management action was not reasonable and was not taken in a reasonable way. Accordingly, Ms Bergin's injury is not withdrawn from s. 32(1) by the operation of s. 32(5)(a) of the Act.

S. 32(5)(b) of the Act

- [53] SPIRAL submitted that in the event the Commission found against it on the application of s. 32(5)(a) of the Act the Commission should still consider the application of s. 32(5)(b) which provides for the injury to be withdrawn from the operation of s. 32(1) because of the worker's expectation or perception of reasonable management action being taken against the worker. Q-COMP contended this argument was not open to SPIRAL because no medical evidence was called to attest to the impact of the various incidents on Ms Bergin's decompensation. The case had not been conducted on the basis that s. 32(5)(b) was being argued. In response SPIRAL said that medical evidence was not essential but could be determined on the basis of the evidence before the Commission. Counsel for SPIRAL also noted that reliance on s. 32(5)(b) had been foreshadowed in his opening address.
- [54] SPIRAL contended that it was Ms Bergin's perception that by attending the research meeting held in the Starbucks coffee shop and/or receiving the email from Ms Kalogerakis that she was subject to disciplinary action when she was not.
- [55] To the extent the Commission is able to form a view in the absence of medical evidence on the point I note Ms Bergin's evidence that she felt anxious from the time of being told of the meeting and that anxiety continued after the meeting such that she attended her doctor on 28 May 2009. That anxiety initially arose from not being aware of the issues to be discussed and the cancellation of her shift. The anxiety continued because of her concern that further shifts might be cancelled and other issues raised with her.
- [56] Based on my findings above as to the reasonableness of the management action taken in respect of the research meeting and the email sent by Ms Kalogerakis and in light of Ms Bergin's evidence, I cannot find that the injury is withdrawn from the operation of s. 32(1) of the Act because of the worker's expectation or perception of reasonable management action being taken against the worker.

Finding

[57] The Appeal is dismissed and the review decision of Q-COMP dated 17 August 2009 is confirmed.

Costs

[58] Both parties have sought an order for costs in the event of their success. The parties are directed to confer on costs and failing agreement Q-COMP is at liberty to apply to the Commission.

[59] Order accordingly.

G.K. FISHER, Commissioner.

Appearances:

Mr J. Merrell, Counsel instructed by Mr J. Redsell,
Employer Services for the Appellant.

Mr S. Gray, Counsel instructed by Ms L. Hedges, Q-COMP
for the Respondent.

Hearing Details:

2009 21 October
3 and 4 December

Released: 22 February 2010