

**QUESTIONS**

If there was nothing wrong with the FIRST version of the PIP; why was a SECOND draft even needed? and: If a second one WAS required; does that not imply that there was some merit in some of the questions I had asked? So why was the PIP revised but the questions never answered?

Yes, this is my point: where are the EXAMPLES of what I am alleged to have done wrong?

**Mr. Peter Gallo's Performance Improvement Plan**

for the time period 1 April to 30 September 2013

As per Section 10.2 of the ST/AI/2010/5 when shortcomings in a staff member's performance have been identified, but not sufficiently rectified through the appropriate remedial actions, in order to assist the staff member in remedying his/her performance, a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) should be put in place.

Remind me; those "appropriate remedial actions" were WHAT, exactly?

The PIP should be developed in consultation with the Staff member and his First and Second Reporting Officers (FRO and SRO). The PIP shall have clear targets for improvement, provisions for coaching and supervision by the FRO in conjunction with performance discussions held on a regular basis. The PIP can cover up to a six month period and therefore, Mr. Gallo's PIP will take effect 1 April 2013 for a period of six months.

So, does that not mean that I get to as questions?

And does it not involve those questions being ANSWERED???

Target for Improvement	Tasks	Supervision
<p><b>Target 1:</b> Proper focus of investigations</p>	<p><b>The aim of Target 1 is to assist Mr. Gallo to properly focus his investigations so that the cases assigned to him can be investigated expeditiously in accordance with the OIOS Manual and SOPs.</b></p>	FRO
<p>Previous questions not answered.</p>	<p>1) Follow directions given by the Intake Committee, FRO and SRO and address issues within the scope of the case.</p>	<p>When did I ever fail to do this?</p>
<p>Previous questions not answered.</p>	<p>2) Prepare an Investigator's Work Plan for each assigned case. The plan must be prepared on the OIOS/ID standard Investigators Work Plan template and among other items, it must include the following items:</p>	<p>When did I ever fail to do this?</p>
<p>Previous questions not answered.</p>	<p>a) The reported misconduct; b) Scope of the investigation; c) List the rules and regulations used in investigating the case; d) Elements of each rule/regulation you need to prove (Make a chart where you actually divide the rule into elements and then under the element list how you plan to prove it. As you get the evidence list it on the chart.)</p>	
<p>Previous questions not answered.</p>	<p>e) List the witnesses and subject/s and identify why they need to be interviewed, what each witness might be able prove;</p>	<p>When did I ever fail to do this?</p>

<p>Previous questions not answered</p> <p>How about asking questions just to establish a baseline of honesty? No?</p> <p>And what about when an interviewee's answer indicates some OTHER act of misconduct or even a criminal offence?</p> <p>Does anyone know what is involved in : - "CONDUCTING AN INVESTIGATION" as opposed to just - "TAKING A STATEMENT"</p>	<p>3) Investigator's Work Plan must be reviewed by FRO prior to commencing case activities.</p> <p>4) Interview plans: a) wherever possible, each question should begin with: How; When; Where; What and/or Who; b) Always consider whether the sought information is going to prove an element of one of the rules believed to be contravened; c) Avoid questions aimed just to satisfy curiosity.</p> <p>5) Subject interviews are aimed to provide the subject with opportunity to comment on the evidence collected. Questions should be focused on the issues that are being investigated.</p> <p>6) Subject interview plans in Q&amp;A format are to be reviewed by FRO prior to commencing the interview. Peer review of the subject interview plans shall always be considered before submitting the plan for review by FRO.</p>	<p>Yes..... I've been doing this for quite a while now. I think I've learned a thing or two</p> <p>When did I ever actually do this?</p> <p>What about interviewing the subject so we can find out his side of the story? What is he is completely innocent of any wrongdoing? Am I still to confront him, and what with?</p>
<p>Previous questions not answered</p> <p>Previous questions not answered</p>	<p><b>Target 2: Judgment</b></p> <p><b>The aim of Target 2 is to assist Mr. Gallo to improve his overall judgement, particularly focusing on his interaction with peers and supervisors as well as with witnesses and subjects of investigations.</b></p> <p>In order to achieve the goal, Mr. Gallo shall:</p> <p>1) Modify language to meet the situation; 2) Be aware of culturally insensitive comments, those comments which are sexist, or those which are inappropriate in a multi-cultural, multi-political environment; 3) Avoid questions which ask for a witness to speculate; 4) Don't ask what the witness's opinion might be, only focus on establishing facts; 5) Do not interject personal opinion into documents, especially Q&amp;As, Note to Files, Reports or any other documents, which may be subject of disclosure to UNDT, ALS or OSLA.</p>	<p>FRO</p> <p><b>FIRST: Show me where I have exhibited "poor" judgement and</b> <b>SECOND: Tell me HOW anyone thinks "improved judgement" can be taught</b></p> <p>When did I ever NOT modify my language to suit the situation?</p> <p>When did I ever do this?</p> <p>When did I ever do this?</p> <p>And what about my earlier question about whether it is OIOS policy to withhold information from the Tribunal?</p>
<p><b>Target 3: Drafting</b></p>	<p><b>The aim of Target 3 is to improve Mr. Gallo's drafting skills, so that he can produce documents with the least number</b></p>	<p>Then tell me what is wrong with asking a witness to speculate as a means of getting them to open up and talk?</p> <p>Or to assess the truthfulness of the answers?</p>

Actually, YES, IT WAS - which is probably the reason nobody would answer this one....

Remind me again: why do newspapers employ EDITORS instead of just telling the journalists to write it "correctly" the first time?

<p>Previous questions not answered.</p>	<p><b>of errors or re-writes. The produced documents should be written in a crisp, clean and concise fashion.</b></p>	
<p>Previous questions not answered.</p>	<p>1) Reports are verified by a peer before submitting them to FRO.                  2) Reports should not contain:                  a) Opinions <i>Show me where I did this</i>                  b) Speculation/Assumptions <i>Show me where I did this</i>                  c) Conclusions of law <i>Show me where I did this</i>                  d) Run-on sentences                  e) Spelling errors - always use spell check                  f) Errors of grammar or punctuation.</p>	<p><i>Show me somebody who has never made a typo, please?</i></p>
<p>Previous questions not answered.</p>	<p>3) Reports should contain:                  a) Topic sentences for each new paragraph; and                  b) At each new topic a new paragraph</p>	
<p>Previous questions not answered.</p>	<p>4) Footnoting:                  a) All footnotes must be reflected accurately providing the source of the evidence to support the assertions of fact;                  b) All footnotes have to be written in format required in the OIOS/ID SOP for report writing</p> <p>5) When drafting, always ask yourself why the particular information should be in the document. The information that is not relevant should not be contained in the document.</p>	<p><i>Perish the thought that FOOTNOTES might be in the wrong format.</i></p>

**Training:** → that would be the same Mr. Gallo who has had numerous articles published, almost all of them obtainable online, and never had any complaints from (professional) publishers about his literary abilities.....

Mr. Gallo must take a writing class to better enable him to write in a way that is clear to a reader, such as a Programme Manager, who has little familiarity with the case. He shall inform his FRO when he has registered for this class and upon successful completion of the course.

→ WHAT writing class? The UN does not run one

Mr. Gallo must spend at least two working days with the staff of PPS working on a case review, so that he better understands what is required for a report to be cleared for issuance. Mr. Gallo should continue to seek assistance from Ms. Suzette Schultz, Chief of PPS to arrange it. He shall inform his FRO when he has undertaken this task.

The heroine of the "Quality Review" that was the basis of the retaliation in UNDT/2013/176

Mr. Gallo shall read issued investigations reports to see what is required to meet the standards of a legally sufficient investigation report. Ms. Schultz can provide good examples of reports that are well written and legally sufficient. He shall notify and discuss with his FRO these reports after he has completed this task.

That would be all the reports I had ALREADY read....

....but just never confirmed IN WRITING that I had done so...

Mr. Gallo will initiate work progress meetings with his FRO every two weeks. Before each of the progress meetings, Mr. Gallo shall provide his FRO a list of assigned cases and a description of the actual progress on those investigations since the last meeting with his FRO. **Hold on.... If the FRO was doing his job, would he not already KNOW what I was working on?**

Mr. Gallo's performance under this PIP shall be reviewed by his SRO and FRO every two months in order to assess and properly document his progress.

Staff Member:

Peter Gallo  
Date:

First Reporting Officer:

Vladimir Dzuro  
Date:

**Who a) was responsible for WRITING this document, and**

**b) was invited to sign it first (if he had confidence in its terms.... BUT DECLINED TO DO SO.**

Second Reporting Officer:

Roberta Baldini  
Date: