

Dropping an imaginary ball

On 3 October 2013, I had received an e-mail on a matter I was no longer working on, and had forwarded it to the people who WERE now working on it.

Forwarding an e-mail in that manner, however, was a major hanging offence, and somehow constituted a violation of a Protocol that contained absolutely nothing about e-mails, but never mind. Despite it being written in simple enough English, Dudley complained it was neither professional nor clear, and that it was clearly a sign of my being incapable of sending any e-mails – so he was of the opinion that all my e-mails should be sent by my immediate supervisor.

Not many people appreciate how forwarding an email to the appropriate recipient after it had incorrectly been sent to me was the sort of rebellious conduct that could bring about the complete collapse of western civilisation, or trigger the start of the Third World War, so we should all perhaps be grateful that OIOS management have nothing more important to do but to deal with these important matters.-

Anyway, ten days later I received another e-mail, on another case I was no longer working on.

From: Peter Faiz/NY/UNO
To: Peter Gallo/NY/UNO@UNHQ,
Cc: Mary Ann Chiulli/NY/UNO@UNHQ, Janett Beswick/NY/UNO@UNHQ, Kevin Waite/NY/UNO@UNHQ, Roberta Baldini/NY/UNO@UNHQ
Date: 08/10/2013 05:42 PM
Subject: Complaint by DGACM s/m Mr. [REDACTED]

Note that it WAS copied to Roberta Baldini.....

Dear Mr. Gallo,

Almost a year ago, the Ethics Office referred the above case to OIOS for review and we understand that an investigation was conducted, however, to this date, no outcome has been conveyed to DGACM nor to the parties concerned. This situation is impacting on the operational activities of the concerned office and DGACM is anxious to learn the outcome of the investigation.

Would be most grateful for an update/timeline as to when the investigation will be concluded and the findings revealed.

Thank you.

Regards, Peter

M. Peter Faiz, Administrative Officer
Executive Office
Department for General Assembly
and Conference Management
United Nations

This is important because there was 120 day time under ST/SGB/2005/21 for completing the investigation

.....and the OIOS "Professional Practices Section" had sat on it for a lot longer than that.

"Well well well", I said to myself "I know what THIS is. This is an e-mail on a case I am no longer working on." I said....

I can, after all, recognise an e-mail when I see one.

Now, regardless of the fact it would be easier, cheaper, quicker and a lot more efficient to just forward it to the appropriate person who could deal with it - oh no, perish the thought - that entailed the risk of offending someone's delicate sensitivities.

The proper procedure here was to forward it to Dan Wilson, so HE can forward it to the appropriate person who could deal with it, so nobody would be offended or upset.

So I forwarded it to Dan Wilson - explaining to him what it was about.

THAT should keep everybody happy.

So, exactly as directed the previous week, and specifically to avoid anyone getting so excited that might lay an egg or burst a blood vessel.....
I forward the damn thing to Dan Wilson
with a note explaining what it's all about



{In Archive} Fw: Complaint by DGACM s/m [REDACTED]
Peter Gallo to: Dan Wilson

09/10/2013 12:19 PM

Dear Dan.

I have received this enquiry from the Executive Office, DGACM. I have replied to Mr. Faiz explaining I am the wrong person to ask as my involvement with the case ended a long time ago, but that I will pass his enquiry along so someone can assist.

See Note to File on delays in 0291/12 (25 Mar 13)

And I tell him the case number...

The case is 291/12. I have always had concerns about this case because it was one of only a tiny number of retaliation cases where the Ethics Office found a prima facie case of retaliation and it was referred to us to investigate. I did the investigation and the result was a closure on a legal technicality. Moreover, ST/AI/2005/21 gives us a strict time-limit of 120 days to complete the investigation and PPS took ages to get the report out. The complainant has a reputation for being something of a serial litigant, so I remain mildly surprised he did not complain about the investigation as well.

I now sympathise. I know how he feels....

Just before I went on medical leave at the end of May, I started work on an almost identical case, also referred by Ethics into almost identical allegations against the same subject. That was handed off to Lee Moreton. I do not know what has happened on that case.

DGACM are now anxious to know what is happening.

All I have done is told the sender I am no longer dealing with it. The email was copied to RMB anyway but could you do what is diplomatically expedient to get an answer back to DGACM.

Thanx

P

Peter Gallo
Investigator
Investigations Division
Office of Internal Oversight Services
Ph: 1-917-367-4265

----- Forwarded by Peter Gallo/NY/UNO on 09/10/2013 11:03 AM -----

From: Peter Faiz/NY/UNO
To: Peter Gallo/NY/UNO@UNHQ,
Cc: Mary Ann Chiulli/NY/UNO@UNHQ, Janett Beswick/NY/UNO@UNHQ, Kevin Waite/NY/UNO@UNHQ, Roberta Baldini/NY/UNO@UNHQ
Date: 08/10/2013 05:42 PM
Subject: Complaint by DGACM s/m Mr. [REDACTED]

TWO retaliation cases, both alleging retaliation against the SAME individual, and the Ethics Office find enough to send BOTH to OIOS for investigation?

That does not sound good!

A conspiracy theorist might begin to suspect that OIOS had delayed the report in the first one deliberately.....

And (just 5 minutes later) Dan forwards it to Vlad Dzuro (who is in charge this week) and copies Roberta Baldini



{In Archive} Fw: Complaint by DGACM s/m Mr. [REDACTED]

Dan Wilson to: Vladimir Dzuro

09/10/2013 12:26 PM

Cc: Roberta Baldini

Bcc: Peter Gallo

Archive: This message is being viewed in an archive.

And he tells him the case number too...

Vlad, Peter has forwarded this to me. He responded to Mr. Faiz advising that his query would be forwarded to the appropriate office for response. Peter has advised that this matter was investigated and closed; 0291/12. If it was a retaliation matter it should have been at the hands of the Ethics Office to respond. At any rate, thought it best to forward to Unit V so that an appropriate response can be provided as deemed best yourself and/or Roberta.

Thanks Dan

Who already knows about it of course..

----- Forwarded by Peter Gallo/NY/UNO on 09/10/2013 11:03 AM -----

From: Peter Faiz/NY/UNO
To: Peter Gallo/NY/UNO@UNHQ,
Cc: Mary Ann Chiulli/NY/UNO@UNHQ, Janett Beswick/NY/UNO@UNHQ, Kevin Waite/NY/UNO@UNHQ, Roberta Baldini/NY/UNO@UNHQ
Date: 08/10/2013 05:42 PM
Subject: Complaint by DGACM s/m Mr. Ezzeldin ENAN

Dear Mr. Gallo,

Almost a year ago, the Ethics Office referred the above case to OIOS for review and we understand that an investigation was conducted, however, to this date, no outcome has been conveyed to DGACM nor to the parties concerned. This situation is impacting on the operational activities of the concerned office and DGACM is anxious to learn the outcome of the investigation.

Would be most grateful for an update/timeline as to when the investigation will be concluded and the findings revealed.

Thank you.

Regards, Peter

M. Peter Faiz, Administrative Officer
Executive Office
Department for General Assembly
and Conference Management
United Nations
New York, N.Y. 10017

Office: S-1238
Office Tel: +1-212-963-8324
Email: faiz@un.org
Fax: +1-212-963-2589

And Vlad says 'Thank You' (even if he doesn't want to have to answer it himself).

.....and he also copies Roberta Baldini



{In Archive} Re: Fw: Complaint by DGACM s/m Mr. [REDACTED]
Vladimir Dzuro to: Dan Wilson
Cc: Roberta Baldini

09/10/2013 12:52 PM

Thank you Dan,

I shall leave it for Roberta to address tomorrow.

Thank you and best regards

Vlad

Vladimir Dzuro (Mr.)
Investigations Division,
Office of Internal Oversight Services
730 Third Avenue - Teachers Insurance Bldg.
Room TB-07010C
New York, NY 10017, USA
Telephone: +1 (212) 963-2722
E-mail: dzuro@un.org

NOTICE: This e-mail message is intended for the use of the named recipient only. Information contained in this e-mail message and its attachments may be privileged, confidential and protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, copy, use or disclose this communication to others. Also please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system.

So, by now everyone **must** be very happy.

Nobody's fragile ego has been slighted.

Nobody has been offended in any way.

Nobody has been left out of the information loop.

The message was conveyed in a manner that is clear and professional. Indeed, the whole affair has been handled with the utmost regard for the diplomatic niceties of everything and everyone, without so much as an imaginary office tradition being transgressed....

What could **possibly** go wrong?

What could anyone POSSIBLY find to complain about?

Don't worry.....



{In Archive} Fw: Complaint by DGACM s/m Mr [REDACTED]
Roberta Baldini to: Dan Wilson, Michael Dudley

14/10/2013 11:52 AM

History: This message has been replied to.

Archive: This message is being viewed in an archive.

Dan:

Believed to mean the original enquiry

I am sorry that I have to write to you again, regarding Pete Gallo. I received this from Peter Faiz.

Oh really?

Once again Peter Gallo drops the ball. Rather than asking me or if he did not wish to write to me directly he should have asked you to inform me that there was an inquiry regarding the case involving Mr. [REDACTED]. Peter Gallo did not even provide a case number or make inquiries into the status of the case., but simply abdicated any involvement. Therefore, I had to take time to determine which case it was that Mr. Faiz was asking about.

For your information. Case 291/12 investigation report was issued on 22 March 2013.

Regards
Roberta

She didn't bother to READ her e-mail or get her facts straight; she just launched straight into another groundless complaint.

Dan Wilson's office was no more than 15 yards away, she could easily have popped round to ask about it - but why bother asking when it's a lot less hassle to just shoot first and ask questions later.



{In Archive} Re: Fw: Complaint by DGACM s/m Mr. [REDACTED]

Dan Wilson to: Roberta Baldini

Cc: Michael Dudley

Bcc: Michael Stefanovic

14/10/2013 12:16 PM

Archive:

Roberta, please check your email from me dated 9 October. Peter raised this issue with me and I forwarded same to Vlad as your OIC. Even provided him the case number. I instructed Peter out of protocol to inform the addressee that his concern would be addressed by the appropriate office.

In light of the above I will be taking no further action on this matter.

Regards Dan

Reply in just 4 minutes -
so it was hardly difficult!



{In Archive} Re: Fw: Complaint by DGACM s/m Mr. [REDACTED]
Roberta Baldini to: Dan Wilson
Cc: Michael Dudley

14/10/2013 12:20 PM

Dan:

As per your e-mail, I did checked my later e-mails and found you are correct.

Regards
Roberta

Roberta Maria Baldini
Chief of Section
UN OIOS/ID
730 Third Avenue
RoomTB 07034
New York, NY 10017
+1212 963 3070
+646 884 1778 mobile

**AN
APOLOGY
WOULD NOT
HAVE COST
ANYTHING!**



{In Archive} Fw: Complaint by DGACM s/m Mr. [REDACTED]

Dan Wilson to: Carman Louise Lapointe

14/10/2013 12:21 PM

Cc: Michael Stefanovic

Archive: This message is being viewed in an archive.

Carman, I am forwarding you this in relation to Roberta's previous complaint regarding the conduct of Peter Gallo. It is my assessment that it is somewhat relevant to your current inquiry as I feel it again demonstrates a bias against my staff member.

Does the term "bad faith" mean anything to anyone?

I do not need a reply. Just thought it should be provided.

Regards Dan

So what does Lapointe do about it?.....**Nothing***No surprises there!*

And how about a little reminder of ST/SGB/2008/5, para3.2 which states::

"Managers and supervisors have the duty to take all appropriate measures to promote a harmonious work environment, free of intimidation, hostility, offence and any form of prohibited conduct. They must act as role models by upholding the highest standards of conduct. Managers and supervisors have the obligation to ensure that complaints of prohibited conduct are promptly addressed in a fair and impartial manner. Failure on the part of managers and supervisors to fulfil their obligations under the present bulletin may be considered a breach of duty, which, if established, shall be reflected in their annual performance appraisal, and they will be subject to administrative or disciplinary action, as appropriate."

That, clearly, does not apply to managers and supervisors in OIOS, and it most certainly does not apply to the Under-Secretary-General.