

Date: 20260112

File: 566-02-49503

Citation: 2026 FPSLREB 2

*Federal Public Sector
Labour Relations and
Employment Board Act and
Federal Public Sector
Labour Relations Act*



Before a panel of the
Federal Public Sector
Labour Relations and
Employment Board

BETWEEN

DANIEL GREENE

Grievor

and

**TREASURY BOARD
(Department of National Defence)**

Employer

Indexed as

Greene v. Treasury Board (Department of National Defence)

In the matter of an individual grievance referred to adjudication

Before: Christopher Rootham, a panel of the Federal Public Sector Labour Relations and Employment Board

For the Grievor: Stephanie Rochon Perras and Danielle Lafleur, counsel

For the Employer: Virginie Gagnon-Dubreuil, counsel

Heard by videoconference,
October 7 to 9, 2025.

REASONS FOR DECISION

I. Overview

[1] This is a job description grievance. I have decided to allow the grievance in part.

[2] Daniel Greene (“the grievor”) was a financial officer with the Department of National Defence (DND or “the employer”) from 2009 until his promotion in 2023. He received a job description when he was appointed and had no issues with it. In 2019, DND decided to create and apply a generic job description to the grievor’s position, along with those of other financial officers. The grievor argues that this generic job description does not accurately describe the duties of his position, and he asks me to order the employer to make six changes to it.

[3] I have decided to order the employer to make three changes to the generic job description.

[4] First, I order the employer to change the references to the grievor being subject to supervision to being subject to direction. While the terms “supervision” and “direction” are similar, the parties treat them differently, with supervision being more intense than direction. The grievor’s level of autonomy reflects that he is subject to direction, not supervision.

[5] Second, I order the employer to change the grievor’s duties from relating to “basic financial services” and “basic financial management services” to “financial services” and “financial management services” (i.e., to remove the word “basic”). The grievor’s evidence has convinced me that he was providing more than basic financial services but less than the advanced financial services that he claimed.

[6] Third, I order the employer to remove some of the references in the generic job description to “basic” or “general” knowledge and, instead, simply refer to knowledge. All financial officers in this occupation category, no matter how junior, must have more than basic or general knowledge of financial and accounting practices. The generic job description already refers to knowledge of financial practices in some places; referring to basic knowledge or general knowledge of financial practices in others is internally inconsistent and also inconsistent with the evidence in this grievance. I do not agree with the grievor that his position required extensive or

advanced knowledge, as he submitted, but the position required more than a basic knowledge of financial matters.

[7] I have decided not to grant the rest of the grievor's proposed changes to the job description. My detailed reasons for these orders follow, along with my reasons for rejecting the rest of the grievor's claim.

II. Procedural background

[8] This grievance was originally scheduled to be heard in person over a period of four days. After meeting with the parties' representatives at a case management conference, this hearing was changed to a videoconference, which ended up lasting three days.

[9] Each witness in this grievance prepared a will-say statement. The documents authenticated in their will-say statements were admitted into evidence, and the contents of their will-say statements were also treated as evidence. In addition, each witness testified to provide context to their will-say statements and to expand on certain points contained in their will-say statements. Each witness was cross-examined as well.

[10] The grievor had three witnesses, himself, Lieutenant-Colonel Krystal Turner, and Lieutenant-Colonel RaeAnn Howe. The employer called two witnesses, Major Troy Levernois and Major Monica Fournier.

III. Background to the grievance

[11] As I said at the outset, this grievance is about the job description for the grievor's financial officer position.

[12] The grievor was appointed to the position of Comptroller, Budget Manager, in 2009. He was provided a job description at that time and had no issues with it. His position was classified at the FI-01 group and level. The grievor worked at the 5th Canadian Division Support Base Gagetown ("Gagetown") in Gagetown, New Brunswick, which is the second-largest military base in Canada.

[13] The grievor's position was part of the Corporate Services Branch at Gagetown. The Corporate Services Branch was headed by a military officer with the rank of Major. Major Levernois was the commanding officer of the Corporate Services Branch from

2019 to 2021, and Major Fournier succeeded him in 2021. Both Majors were “double-hatted” (i.e., holding two positions) as the comptroller of Gagetown as well as the head of the Corporate Services Branch.

[14] While the grievor’s position was part of the Corporate Services Branch and he reported to it administratively, he did not work closely with that branch. Instead, he was embedded in the Signal Squadron at Gagetown and performed financial services for that unit. In the broadest sense, and at the risk of oversimplifying, the Signal Squadron was responsible for communications; namely, radios, computers, and telephones. In 2017, the grievor was given additional responsibility to perform financial services for the Operations Services unit at Gagetown. Operations Services was responsible for the administrative functions on the base, such as the fire station, forestry services, snow plowing, and the firing range. The grievor’s office was located in the building with Signal Squadron, roughly a kilometre from the corporate services offices. Lt.-Col. Howe was the commanding officer of Signal Squadron from June 2019 to June 2021 and then the deputy commanding officer of Operations Services from June 2021 to August 2023, holding the rank of Major at those times. Lt. Col. Turner was the commanding officer of Signal Squadron from July 2021 to July 2021, when she also held the rank of Major.

[15] In 2019, the DND decided to apply standardized job descriptions to all FI positions. It referred to this process as a mapping blitz. As a result of that process, the grievor received a new job description. This new job description was a standardized job description for the position of financial officer at the FI-01 group and level. The grievor disagreed with the content of this job description. He raised his disagreement with Maj. Levernois and eventually grieved. The department agreed to conduct a job validation review in an effort to resolve the grievance. The department did not change the job description after completing the job validation review, so the grievance continued. The grievance was denied at the final level and was referred to adjudication with the Federal Public Sector Labour Relations and Employment Board (“the Board”).

[16] On September 28, 2023, the FI occupation group was eliminated. It was rolled into the larger Comptrollership (CT) group through a conversion exercise and was renamed the Financial Management (CT-FIN) subgroup. This change has no bearing on this grievance, and I mention it just for context.

[17] The grievor left the position at issue in this grievance on December 1, 2023, and was promoted to a CT-FIN-02 position. Despite that, the employer did not argue that the grievance was moot, so I continued to hear it.

[18] The grievor dedicated a significant portion of his will-say to his concerns about the process followed in preparing the standardized job description (for example, that he was not consulted before it was shared with him) and conducting the job validation review (for example, that it lacked input from the commanding officers of Signal Squadron and Operations Services). I did not find these concerns relevant in this grievance. Adjudications before the Board are hearings *de novo* (from the beginning). Any unfairness in the process followed in creating the standardized job description or conducting the job validation review is remedied by a hearing *de novo* before the Board (see, for example, *Pelchat v. Deputy Head (Statistics Canada)*, 2019 FPSLREB 105 at paras. 74 and 75).

[19] A significant part of the dispute in this grievance stems from the fact that the grievor was embedded in these two units. The grievor reported to the commanding officer of the Corporate Services Branch for administrative purposes. Until 2017, the commanding officer of Signal Squadron took care of the grievor's leave and performance reviews; in 2017 or 2018, after the grievor took on the Operations Services unit as well, the commanding officer of Corporate Services began taking care of his leave and performance reviews instead. However, when it came to his actual work, the grievor worked with the commanding officers of Signal Squadron and Operations Services.

[20] As Lt. Col. Howe described it, the grievor reported to the commanding officer of Corporate Services for leave passes, performance reviews, this grievance, and other administrative matters. However, on a day-to-day basis, she worked with the grievor directly because he managed the budgets and finances for her units. She referred to this as a "dotted line" relationship, and she said that she assigned him the tasks that he performed. Lt. Col. Turner's evidence was similar, and she was also clear that she would "task" the grievor as her unit's finance officer.

[21] By contrast, Maj. Fournier testified that the commanding officers of Signal Squadron and Operations Services did not have the authority to assign the grievor tasks to perform and should not have been directing his work. Instead, Maj. Fournier

stated that the grievor was tasked through his performance agreements and standardized job description. The employer doubled down on this point in its closing submissions, arguing that only the commanding officers of Corporate Services could have assigned the grievor his duties through his annual performance agreements; therefore, the grievor could not have been assigned duties by the other commanding officers.

[22] In essence, Maj. Fournier and the employer argue that the grievor's job description is accurate because he should have done only the work set out in his job description. I reject this circular reasoning.

[23] As Maj. Fournier admitted during cross-examination, it is possible that she was not aware of all the duties that the grievor performed. She called this unfortunate. Unfortunate or not (and I am not convinced that it was unfortunate), that does not mean that it did not happen.

[24] There is a line of cases from the Board to the effect that when an employee performs duties without the approval or knowledge of management, those duties do not need to be included in a job description. For example, in *Parpia v. Treasury Board (Correctional Service of Canada)*, 2024 FPSLREB 54, an employee performed a number of tasks (such as organizing a phone system, distributing public transit tokens, and purchasing office stationery) without being asked because "... he enjoyed being a helpful and valued employee ..." (at paragraph 116). The Board concluded that those were not duties that needed to be included in his job description because "... there was nothing to suggest that the employer ordered the grievor to perform them as part of his normal responsibilities" (at paragraph 117). Similarly, in *Duffield v. Treasury Board (Department of Employment and Social Development)*, 2016 PSLREB 7, the former Board did not amend a job description because "... the grievor has been unable to prove that he was authorized to perform the duties he claims should be in his job description. The evidence from both his managers is that he was never asked or authorized to perform such tasks" (at paragraph 67).

[25] This case is different from those. The grievor was both embedded in the Signal Squadron and assigned to the Operations Services unit. He was physically moved to be in the Signal Squadron office. He worked with the commanding officer of Signal Squadron. Both commanding officers of Signal Squadron testified that they assigned

him duties; both also testified that they were told to assign him duties by their predecessor. The grievor did not go rogue or decide on his own to do certain tasks because he wanted to be helpful; he was doing what he was told by the Majors in charge of the units that he was embedded in.

[26] The employer relies in part on a memo prepared by Maj. Levernois on October 3, 2020, that he sent to the commanding officers of the units with financial officers embedded in them. This memo was prepared in large part to clarify the administrative reporting of embedded financial officers for leave and performance-review purposes. A different embedded financial officer was having their leave and performance reviews completed by the commanding officer of their embedded unit (like the situation for the grievor before 2018), and that needed to be corrected. This memo also listed the services being provided by financial officers. This memo did not clearly prohibit other commanding officers from assigning tasks or duties to their financial officers. It clearly set out the rules for administrative reporting, such as leaves and performance agreements, but did not clearly say anything about the assignment of duties. Lt. Col. Howe testified in her will-say and orally that the memo did not suggest that she and the grievor do anything differently. Having read the memo, I agree. Lt. Col. Howe also testified in her will-say and orally that nothing changed after that memo — in other words, she continued to assign work to the grievor.

[27] For these reasons, I reject the circular argument that the grievor's job description is accurate because he should perform only the duties set out in his job description.

IV. Legal framework to job description cases

[28] This grievance, like all job description grievances, is about the interpretation and application of the job description clause of the relevant collective agreement — in this case, the agreement between the Treasury Board and the Association of Canadian Financial Officers (Financial Management Group), which expired on November 6, 2022. Article 49 of that agreement reads:

49.01 Upon written request, an employee shall be provided with a complete and current statement of the duties and responsibilities of the employee's position, including the

49.01 Sur demande écrite, un employé-e reçoit un exposé complet et courant de ses fonctions et responsabilités, y compris le niveau de classification du poste et, le cas

classification level and, where applicable, the point rating allotted by factor to the employee's position, and an organization chart depicting the position's place in the organization

échéant, la cote numérique attribuée par facteur à son poste, ainsi qu'un organigramme décrivant le classement de son poste dans l'organisation.

[29] The Board provided a helpful summary of some principles in job description grievances in *Duffield* as follows (citations omitted):

...

(a) Job descriptions, including those intended to be applicable to a number of positions across the country, may be written in fairly broad language

(b) The statement of duties need not spell out in infinite detail every possible variation, combination, or permutation of how a function is performed

(c) A work description must contain enough information to accurately reflect what the employee does. It must not omit a "... reference to a particular duty or responsibility which the employee is otherwise required to perform"; ... A job description that contains broad and generic descriptions is acceptable as long as it satisfies that fundamental requirement

(d) The statement of duties and responsibilities may not omit information because it is performed only occasionally

(e) It is not the adjudicator's role to correct the wording or the expressions that are used, so long as they broadly describe the responsibilities and the duties being performed

...

[30] I also agree with the Board's decision in *Currie v. Treasury Board (Correctional Service of Canada)*, 2021 FPSLREB 102 at para. 167, when it stated:

[167] It is not the Board's function to write work descriptions; nor is it to wordsmith them to ensure that the best and most accurate wording is used to capture each and every task carried out by an employee in satisfying the requirements of a position at any given time. The question is not whether the wording in a different or draft work description better describes the grievors' work but whether the one that the grievors were provided met the requirements set out in the collective agreement and the jurisprudence. The Board also does not have a classification function, which is another process outside its jurisdiction.

V. The six things that the grievor wants changed in the job description

[31] The grievor wants these six things changed in his job description:

- 1) Replacing the terms “supervision” and “general supervision” with the term “general direction”.
- 2) Replacing the phrases “basic financial services” and “basic financial management services” with “advanced financial services” and “advanced financial management services”.
- 3) Adding the duty of “planning, coordinating, implementing, and making recommendations about accounting operations”.
- 4) Changing “initiative and judgment” to “high degree of initiative and judgment”.
- 5) Adding “financial expertise” to the job description under the headings of Client Service Results and Key Activities.
- 6) Replacing “basic knowledge of and skill” and “general knowledge of and skill” with “extensive knowledge of and skill”.

[32] I will address each of these items in turn.

A. Replacing the terms “supervision” and “general supervision” with the term “general direction”

[33] The generic job description states that the grievor works “under supervision” or “under general supervision” when providing financial services and performing assigned financial activities. The grievor states that he works under general direction, not under supervision.

[34] At first glance, the grievor’s position is difficult to understand because the words “supervision” and “direction” are synonyms. The *Merriam-Webster Online Thesaurus* defines “supervision” as “the duty or function of watching or guarding for the sake of proper **direction** or control” [emphasis added]. It goes on to provide a second definition of supervision as in management, and lists “direction” as one of the synonyms of supervision. It also lists supervision as the second synonym of direction. The *Cambridge Online Thesaurus* also lists direction as the first synonym of supervision. If the terms are the same, then there is no reason to chose between them.

[35] However, it came out in the evidence that the employer does not use the two terms interchangeably. The employer uses “supervision” to mean a more careful or constrained watching of an employee than “direction”.

[36] On cross-examination, Maj. Fournier was asked specifically about the difference between supervision and direction, and she agreed that “direction” means being

constrained by policy, and “supervision” means being constrained directly by a manager. During re-examination, she was asked to explain further, and she said that “supervising” to her means watching more closely what an employee is doing and that “directing” means assigning tasks to be completed and then leaving the employee to complete them. Maj. Fournier also testified on cross-examination that the grievor was working under her direction, not her supervision. Lt. Col. Howe and Lt. Col. Turner also testified that they did not supervise the grievor but that they gave him direction.

[37] In addition, the grievor filed a copy of the Job Evaluation Standard for the FI group in force at the time of the grievance. This is not a classification grievance, and I am not going to decide whether the grievor’s position should be classified at the FI-01 or FI-02 (now CT-FIN-01 or CT-FIN-02) group and level. The Job Evaluation Standard for the FI group has also been replaced by a new, but similarly worded, Job Evaluation Standard for the new CT group. However, I still found it noteworthy that the Job Evaluation Standard distinguished between supervision and direction.

[38] To provide some context, the Job Evaluation Standard sets out several criteria used to classify a position. Those criteria generate points, and the classification of the position depends on the total points generated. One of the criteria is the nature of work. That criterion has 2 components: the requirement for independent action, and the intricacy of the work. The number of points is a product of those 2 components. For example, if the requirement for independent action is at degree A and the intricacy of the work is at degree 2, that generates 88 points; if the requirement for independent action is at degree C and the intricacy of the work is at degree 2, that generates 179 points.

[39] The Job Evaluation Standard for the FI group defines degree A of the requirement for independent action as, “Action is constrained by established procedures and/or **close supervision**” [emphasis added], and defines degree C as, “Action is constrained by departmental policy, regulations and **general direction** from the supervisor” [emphasis added]. In other words, supervision and direction are treated differently in the Job Evaluation Standard.

[40] The only evidence that the employer presented that supports using the term “supervision” is the memo prepared on October 3, 2020, that I discussed earlier in this decision. That memo says that the grievor’s work “... is performed under general

supervision with functional guidance from a [sic] corporate specialists.” Maj. Levernois, who wrote the memo, testified that the grievor worked under supervision, just not close supervision. However, she went on to say that “general supervision” meant being allowed to work autonomously and that the positions (including the grievor’s) did not need to be mentored in the financial realm. She also testified that she prepared the memo to clarify reporting lines (particularly for another FI-01 whose leave was being approved by the wrong person) and that it did not intend to be a list of all the grievor’s duties. She also admitted that it is possible that she did not know all the grievor’s duties. In light of that clarification of the memo, along with Maj. Levernois’ admission that she was not aware of all the grievor’s duties, I prefer the evidence of the employer’s other witness (Maj. Fournier), along with the grievor’s witnesses, on this point.

[41] Since the witnesses treat the terms differently, and since they are also different in the Job Evaluation Standard prepared by the employer, I will also treat the two terms differently. I will follow the definition provided by Maj. Fournier (the employer’s witness), which is consistent with the Job Evaluation Standard. Finally, I will accept Maj. Fournier’s evidence that the grievor worked under direction, not supervision, and order that the grievor’s job description be amended to replace “supervision” with “direction” and “general supervision” with “general direction”.

B. Replacing the phrases “basic financial services” and “basic financial management services” with “advanced financial services” and “advanced financial management services”

[42] The generic job description states, under the heading Client Service Results, that the grievor “... provides **basic** financial management services in on or more assigned financial activities” [emphasis added]. Under the heading Key Activities, it starts by stating that the grievor “... delivers **basic** financial services in one or more assigned financial activities ...” [emphasis added].

[43] The grievor initially asked me to replace the word “basic” with “advanced”. However, during the grievor’s closing submissions, I expressed some concern about the adjective “advanced”. The grievor then modified his position to ask that I remove the word “basic” from the job description in those places.

[44] I agree with the grievor’s modified position and will order the removal of the word “basic”.

[45] The parties do not disagree a great deal about the financial services that the grievor performed. The grievor was responsible for all the finances of the Signal Squadron and Operations Services units. This included some straightforward data entry; for example, the grievor was responsible for entering expenses and other financial information in the Defence Resource Management Information System (DRMIS). Despite the grievor's testimony to the contrary, I was left with the impression that this was just data entry and that it could fairly be called basic.

[46] However, the grievor did much more than data entry. He testified (and the other witnesses agreed) that he was responsible for managing the budget of each unit, which could run between \$10 and \$15 million between the two units. He needed to make sure that the expenses of the units fell within their budgets. He gave examples of times when expenses were not within the budget; in those cases, he had to come up with solutions. To list one example, in 2022, the Operations Services unit needed to pay for the repair of a damaged forestry shelter toward the end of the 2021-2022 fiscal year. While the cost was not large (just over \$7000), this was not in the budget. The grievor was asked to solve the problem, and he did by getting another unit that was over budget to pay for it instead.

[47] Again, I was struck by the testimony of Maj. Fournier for the employer. She testified that calling something basic financial services is very subjective. I agree. Then, she went on to testify that as the Gagetown base's comptroller, she was providing only basic financial services and that things got complex only at the army level (i.e., the finances for the entire Canadian army).

[48] As the commanding officer of Corporate Services, Maj. Fournier had two civilian FI-01s and a civilian FI-02 reporting to her, in addition to other civilians and members of the armed forces. I was struck by the fact that the generic job description for the FI-02 position that reported to her did not include the qualifier "basic" when describing financial services. If Maj. Fournier is just performing basic financial services, her subordinate must be as well — yet the job description for her FI-02 subordinate does not contain that qualifier.

[49] The employer argued again that if the grievor was performing more than basic services, he was not authorized to do so. As I said earlier, the grievor was doing what he was assigned — there was no evidence that he was going rogue. I also find it

difficult to conceive of a situation in which the grievor could have been expected to refuse to perform an assignment on the basis that it was not basic enough.

[50] I remain unconvinced that the grievor was performing advanced financial services. However, the work that he described was more than basic. I cannot accept that financial services below the army level are all basic, as suggested by Maj. Fournier, particularly in light of the FI-02 job description. Therefore, I will order that the word “basic” be struck from these phrases in the job description. This means that the generic job description will be amended as follows (and these changes include the change from “supervision” to “direction” discussed earlier):

Generic job description	Revised wording
Under supervision provides basic financial management services in one or more assigned financial activities.	Under direction provides financial management services in one or more assigned financial activities.
Under general supervision, delivers basic financial services in one or more assigned financial activities, including providing advice, guidance, analysis or recommendations to the client for compliant financial management of the client organization.	Under general direction, delivers financial services in one or more assigned financial activities, including providing advice, guidance, analysis or recommendations to the client for compliant financial management of the client organization.

C. Adding the duty of “planning, coordinating, implementing, and making recommendations about accounting operations” under the heading of Key Activities

[51] The grievor originally asked for an order adding the duty of “... planned, coordinated, implemented, and made recommendations ...” under the heading of Key Activities. During closing argument, I asked the grievor’s representative for the subject matter of this duty (i.e., what he is supposed to have planned). She initially said all services; when I pointed out how broad that was, she said that the duty was accounting operations.

[52] There is no dispute that the grievor plans, coordinates, and implements accounting operations. The dispute is over how and where those duties are expressed in the job description.

[53] His generic job description already contains the following passage under the heading of Key Activities:

...

*Advises clients on the application of financial policies, directives, guidelines, processes, procedures, **planning, accounting or reporting requirements to ensure their understanding on one or more assigned financial activities.***

...

[Emphasis added]

[54] It contains the following passage under the heading of skill:

...

*Basic knowledge of and skill in the application of Financial Management principles, techniques, concepts and best practices; communications and problem-solving practices and related concepts; presentation techniques; feedback and follow-up; as well as research, analysis and writing **is required in order to plan, coordinate, make recommendations and deliver financial operational services and activities** and the provision of advice to the client; to deliver information sessions and training; and to develop reports consistent with departmental directions, policies, guidelines and directives for the client organization.*

...

[Emphasis added]

[55] It also contains the following passage under the heading of effort:

...

*Effort is required to independently, **plan, organize, prioritize, coordinate and execute the delivery of assigned financial activities** under general supervision... As well, the position is accountable for own decisions and courses of action taken.*

...

[Emphasis added]

[56] The employer correctly submits that the duties that the grievor is asking to include are already in the job description. The grievor eventually admitted that recommending is already in the job description. However, planning and coordinating are there as well. The only thing missing is implementing; however, the job description uses verbs like “deliver” instead. I see no material difference between implementing and delivering services.

[57] The grievor also submitted that these duties should be placed in the Key Activities heading instead of the skill and effort headings. The grievor relies on *Parker v. Treasury Board (Department of Human Resources and Skills Development)*, 2009 PSLRB 109, for the proposition that the location of duties in a job description is important, specifically paragraphs 77 to 79, when the former Board stated:

77 The grievors are right to point out that a work description is not a simple list of duties or responsibilities. The generic work description is divided into the following three main sections: "Client-Service Results," "Key Activities" and "Work Characteristics." The "Work Characteristics" section is divided into four subsections as follows: "Responsibility," "Skills," "Effort" and "Working Conditions." Although the subsection "Responsibility" is more or less a list of duties, the other three subsections are not. The subsection "Skills," as its name indicates, lists the skills required to perform the work. The subsection "Effort," as expected, describes the effort the employees must employ, and the subsection "Working Conditions" describes their working conditions.

78 The employer could have drafted the generic work description in the form of a simple list of duties. It decided, instead, to draft the generic work description in terms of duties, skills, effort required and working conditions. Having decided to draft the grievors' statement of duties and responsibilities in such a manner, the employer must respect that structure. However, that does not mean that each characteristic of the work performed by the grievors must be placed into every section of their work descriptions... It suffices, in my view, that a duty or aspect of a duty be captured in the most appropriate parts of a work description...

79 ... The only matter relevant to this decision is whether the duty in question is placed in the section to which it relates logically. For example, a responsibility related to the management of money would logically be placed under the title "Money."

[58] However, more recently, the Board came a different conclusion and said that it should not move duties to different headings. In *Cooke v. Treasury Board (Department of the Environment)*, 2025 FPSLRB 103, the grievor asked that the duty of knowledge of provincial wildlife legislation be moved from the skill to the Client Service Results heading. The Board refused, stating that:

...

[67] Elevating one of the many knowledge skills that the officers require to be included in this summary statement makes no sense. This particular skill is clearly included in the 2011 job description.

As such, it is not the Board's role to intervene, edit, and add repetition.

...

[59] I prefer the reasoning in *Cooke* to that in *Parker*. The reasoning in *Cooke* is more consistent with the Board's cases to the effect that its role is not to wordsmith a job description, such as *Duffield*. The grievor's collective agreement entitles him to a "... complete and current statement of the duties and responsibilities ..." of his position; it does not entitle him to organize the way that statement is provided.

[60] Even were I to follow *Parker*, I see nothing wrong with where planning, coordinating, implementing, and making recommendations are located. I see nothing illogical with considering those to be skills or related to the effort of the position instead of listing them as a key activity.

D. Changing "initiative and judgment" to "high degree of initiative and judgment"

[61] The grievor's generic job description states that "[i]nitiative and judgment are required" when doing certain things and that "[j]udgment and initiative are exercised" when doing some other things. He wants "high degree" added to those duties. The sole basis of this request is the fact that his 2009 job description said that the decisions made "... require a high degree of judgment initiative and discretion [*sic*]." The grievor says that his duties did not change in 2019, so their description should not change either.

[62] The grievor's evidence does not convince me that the use of stronger language is warranted. The grievor's will-say explains that he had delegated signing authority and that he was required to show initiative in providing solutions to problems that arose. With respect, that is not enough to convince me that the grievor was exercising a high degree of initiative and judgment, as opposed to a regular amount of initiative and judgment.

E. Adding "financial expertise" to the job description under the headings of Client Service Results and Key Activities

[63] The grievor wants "financial expertise" added to his job description in two places: under the headings Client Service Results and Key Activities.

[64] During closing argument, I asked the grievor how financial expertise is a duty or responsibility. The collective agreement requires the employer to provide an employee with a statement of the duties and responsibilities of the employee's position. Financial expertise appears to be more like an attribute or qualification than a duty or responsibility.

[65] The grievor argued that providing financial expertise is a responsibility of the position. Additionally, the generic job description has an entire heading dedicated to "skill", which lists six types of knowledge that the position requires. Skill and knowledge are not duties and responsibilities either, yet they are contained in the job description; further, the Board has made many decisions in job-content disputes about the "knowledge" required for a position without being concerned whether knowledge is a duty or responsibility caught by the relevant collective agreement clause (see, for example, *Labrecque v. Treasury Board (Royal Canadian Mounted Police)*, 2022 FPSLRB 66; *Wilcox v. Treasury Board (Department of Human Resources and Skills Development)*, 2013 PSLRB 145; and *Public Service Alliance of Canada v. Treasury Board (Department of Human Resources and Skills Development)*, 2012 PSLRB 86 ("PSAC 2012")). I agree with the grievor, and I am satisfied that whether a position requires financial expertise is an issue that can be determined in this grievance.

[66] However, I agree with the employer's main argument that financial expertise is already implied throughout the job description. All financial officers have financial expertise, in the same way that all lawyers have legal expertise, all medical doctors have medical expertise, and so on. I also reviewed the Job Evaluation Standard again, for this purpose. One of the criteria considered for classification purposes is the financial subject matter expertise of the position. Even the lowest possible point total for these criteria requires financial expertise. I am satisfied that it would be redundant to say that a particular FI (now CT-FIN) position has financial expertise because that is true of all of them.

[67] Therefore, the grievor has not convinced me that this change is warranted, because it would be redundant.

F. Replacing “basic knowledge of and skill” and “general knowledge of and skill” with “extensive knowledge of and skill”

[68] The grievor’s generic job description states that the position requires “[b]asic knowledge of and skill” of two things and “[g]eneral knowledge of and skill” of two others. It also states that the position requires “knowledge” of two things, without modifying or describing the level of knowledge. The grievor wants the words “basic” and “general” replaced with “extensive” or, in the alternative, “advanced”.

[69] The employer argues that knowledge is neither a duty nor a responsibility and, therefore, disputes over how to characterize knowledge are not caught by the collective agreement. However, as I said earlier, the Board has addressed the description of knowledge in other cases without demur, and I agree with the grievor that I can do the same in this case.

[70] However, in those other cases, the issue before the Board was about whether knowledge of a specific subject needed to be included in the job description. In *Labrecque*, it was about whether the job description should include knowledge of specialized terminology, Saskatoon Police human resources procedures, and the procedure to become a supernumerary special constable (and the Board concluded that these knowledges were already covered under other broader descriptions); in *Wilcox*, whether knowledge should be moved to be under the key activity heading (and the Board said no); and in *PSAC 2012*, it was about whether the job description needed to include knowledge of medical conditions (and the Board said that it did). I am unaware of any case in which the Board has been asked to decide the depth of knowledge required to perform the duties of a position; namely, whether it requires basic, general, advanced, or extensive knowledge.

[71] The grievor testified about the knowledge required for this position. He testified that the position requires an employee to have knowledge of federal government financial policies, the Department of National Defence’s policies, the *Financial Administration Act* (R.S.C., 1985, c. F-11), and accounting knowledge, such as knowing the difference between capital assets and equipment costs. He said that an employee requires quite an advanced level of knowledge to step into the position on day one. I also reviewed the grievor’s will-say carefully.

[72] This issue is similar to the second issue I addressed earlier. However, unlike in that issue, the employer's witnesses did not testify about what makes knowledge basic, general, extensive, or advanced. Neither did the grievor or his witnesses.

[73] Lt. Col. Turner and Lt. Col. Howe both testified that the grievor has vast knowledge. However, that does not make that knowledge a requirement of the position. As the Board said in *Parpia*, at para. 97: "... the issue in these types of grievances is not whether the employee is hardworking, highly valued, or highly rated in terms of performance. Those qualities may be grounds for promotion, but they are not relevant to the accuracy of the employee's job description." Similarly, the grievor's personal level of knowledge does not mean that this knowledge was required to perform the duties of the position. His performance reviews from 2018 through 2022 rate him as "Succeeded Plus" (with the exception of one rating of "Succeeded"). He was a good and knowledgeable employee in that position, which is likely why he was promoted in 2023. That does not mean that his job description needs to be changed.

[74] The grievor raised only two objective reasons for changing the description of his knowledge, aside from the subjective view that he and others held of his personal knowledge. First, his original 2009 job description referred to extensive knowledge and never to basic knowledge. As the grievor pointed out (and the employer did not contest), the job has remained the same since 2009, so it is not clear why it now requires basic instead of extensive knowledge. However, that does not, by itself, mean that the new generic job description is wrong. Second, the grievor stated in his will-say that the 2008 job poster for the position required a university degree, while the qualification standards for an FI-01 position requires only two years of post-secondary education. However, the 2008 job poster required a university degree **or** the possession of a Government of Canada financial management certificate. Therefore, the 2008 job poster does not prove that the position requires extensive or advanced knowledge.

[75] I have decided that the grievor has not met his burden to prove that the job description should read "advanced" or "extensive" knowledge. I simply have no evidence to show me what basic, general, advanced, or extensive knowledge means in this context.

[76] With that said, I noted that the generic job description does not always refer to knowledge as basic or general. For example, the generic job description reads:

...
Basic knowledge of and skill in the application of Financial Management principles, techniques, concepts and best practices ... is required in order to plan, coordinate, make recommendations and deliver financial operational services and activities and the provision of advice to the client; to deliver information sessions and training; and to develop reports consistent with departmental directions, policies, guidelines and directives for the client organization.

...
[Emphasis added]

[77] Two paragraphs later, it reads:

...
Knowledge of and skill in the application of financial management principles and techniques to coordinate the delivery of one or more financial activities.

...
[78] I do not understand why the job description says that the position requires basic knowledge in financial management principles to coordinate financial activities and then, two paragraphs later, says that it requires knowledge of the same thing to coordinate the same thing. The Board's jurisprudence is clear that article 49 of this collective agreement (and other, similar agreements) requires an accurate statement of duties (see *Currie*, at para. 175, as one example). I do not see how a job description can be accurate when it contradicts itself like this.

[79] I also do not understand how any FI (or now, CT-FIN) job description could require only basic or general knowledge of financial principles. Again, I turned to the Job Evaluation Standard. As I mentioned earlier, one of the criteria that it considers for classification purposes is the degree of subject matter expertise. The lowest rating for that criterion (i.e., degree 1) requires "[f]undamental specialized financial knowledge: principles, practices, and techniques specific to accounting, financial control and/or financial analysis." I fail to see how any this FI job description can say that it requires only basic or general knowledge of financial principles when the lowest possible rating

in the Job Evaluation Standard is for fundamental specialized knowledge of financial principles, practices, and techniques.

[80] I do not agree with the grievor that the job description must set out extensive or advanced knowledge. However, in some areas, it should not set out basic or general knowledge either. I am satisfied that the grievor's position — like all FI positions — requires more than basic or general knowledge of financial and accounting principles.

[81] As for the grievor's knowledge of other things, I did not have sufficient evidence to show that the position requires anything other than basic knowledge of other topics.

[82] Therefore, I am allowing the grievance in part on this point and am ordering the employer to revise the skill heading of the generic job description, to reflect my reasons as follows:

Generic job description	Revised wording
Basic knowledge of and skill in generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP); auditing standards, and International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) applicable to the private and public sector in order to provide financial advice and services in assigned financial activities.	Knowledge of and skill in generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP); auditing standards, and International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) applicable to the private and public sector in order to provide financial advice and services in assigned financial activities.
General knowledge of and skill in the application of legislation, regulations, policy frameworks, business processes and practices governing financial management is required in order to ensure compliance and provide advice and guidance to clients.	General knowledge of and skill in the application of legislation, regulations, policy frameworks, and business processes is required in order to ensure compliance and provide advice and guidance to clients. Knowledge of and skill in the practices governing financial management is required in order to ensure compliance and provide advice and guidance to clients.
General knowledge is required of departmental activities and objectives, culture, mandate, corporate priorities, client business and emerging issues and trends in order to provide client services in one or more assigned financial activities.	No change.

<p>Basic knowledge of and skill in the application of Financial Management principles, techniques, concepts and best practices; communications and problem-solving practices and related concepts; presentation techniques; feedback and follow-up; as well as research, analysis and writing is required in order to plan, coordinate, make recommendations and deliver financial operational services and activities and the provision of advice to the client; to deliver information sessions and training; and to develop reports consistent with departmental directions, policies, guidelines and directives for the client organization.</p>	<p>Basic knowledge of and skill in communications and problem-solving practices and related concepts; presentation techniques; feedback and follow-up; as well as research, analysis and writing is required in order to plan, coordinate, make recommendations and deliver financial operational services and activities and the provision of advice to the client; to deliver information sessions and training; and to develop reports consistent with departmental directions, policies, guidelines and directives for the client organization.</p>
<p>Knowledge is required of administrative principles, practices, methods and for interpersonal relations in order to participate on project teams and working groups, to consult with clients, to work with others and when supervising a small team providing financial services.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Knowledge of and skill in the application of financial management principles and techniques to coordinate the delivery of one or more financial activities.</p>	<p>Knowledge of and skill in the application of financial management principles, techniques, concepts and best practices is required in order to plan, coordinate, make recommendations and deliver one or more financial operational services and activities and the provision of advice to the client.</p>

[83] To explain the final paragraph, this change pulls some of the items out of the fourth paragraph that require more than basic knowledge and moves them into the paragraph requiring knowledge, to remove some redundancies.

[84] Finally, the concerns I have identified about basic knowledge strike me as a flaw inherent in the generic job description and not one unique to this position. I am seized with only this one grievance and cannot order the employer to change its generic job

description for other positions for which it is used. However, I recommend that the employer review this generic job description and consider changing it for all positions.

VI. Effective date of change

[85] The grievor presented his grievance on October 6, 2020. However, on February 11, 2020, the grievor asked the employer to suspend the timelines to file a grievance, and the employer agreed, on February 14, 2020.

[86] The deadline to file a grievance is 25 working days from the date of the event being grieved. The employer has not argued that this grievance is untimely. However, it submits that any remedy should go back only 25 working days from the date of the grievance. I agree. This is consistent with the Board's approach in another job description grievance in *Lacasse v. Treasury Board (Department of Agriculture and Agri-Food)*, 2021 FPSLRB 6 at para. 135, and the grievor acknowledged this in closing argument. However, I also agree with the grievor that since the deadline to grieve was suspended on February 14, 2020, the remedy ought to go back 25 working days from that date — i.e., to January 10, 2020.

[87] For all of the above reasons, the Board makes the following order:

(The Order appears on the next page)

VII. Order

[88] The grievance is allowed in part.

[89] The employer breached article 49 of the collective agreement when it provided the generic job description to the grievor, which did not accurately set out the duties and responsibilities of the grievor's position.

[90] The job description for the grievor's position shall be amended, effective January 10, 2020, by:

- 1) changing references to "acting under supervision" or "general supervision" to "direction" and "general direction";
- 2) changing "basic financial services" and "basic financial management services" to "financial services" and "financial management services", in the way set out earlier in this decision; and
- 3) changing some of the references to "basic or general knowledge" in the way set out earlier in this decision.

[91] The Board will remain seized with this grievance for 60 days, to address any issues that arise about the implementation of this order.

January 12, 2026.

**Christopher Rootham,
a panel of the Federal Public Sector
Labour Relations and Employment Board**