

Extracts relating exclusively to Case # 0496/11

This was case a case I completed on 27 February 2013.

It was handed over to Roberta Baldini on that date as she had (finally) declared herself satisfied with the draft.

We knew that the subject was retiring at the end of July 2013, which meant there was a deadline approaching if any disciplinary action was going to be taken.

The report was, however, delayed and not even sent to the appropriate program manager until 24 July 2014.

This inexplicable delay ensured that the staff member would never face any accountability for having defrauded the UN.

Delayed almost a year and a half!

Case 0496/11

On 25 September 2012 Peter submitted to Ms. Baldini a draft of Investigator's Work Plan related to case 0496/11. The Plan was poorly drafted with a number of issues that needed clarification. On 8 October 2012, Ms. Baldini met with Peter and discussed with him the way forward, clarifying a number of issues, which included focusing the investigation. Ms. Baldini provided Peter with her hand-written comments on the drafted Work Plan.

See separate explanation on the 'Insurance Fraud Working Group' exercise.

496/11 was an interesting case. It was, I believe, just about the only Insurance Fraud Working Group case which actually resulted in an investigation report.

Mr. Dzuro states that the Work Plan was "*poorly drafted with a number of issues that needed clarification.*"

I dispute this. Ms. Baldini made the following annotations to the Work Plan:

- 1) That the relevant ST/AI relating to the Insurance plan be mentioned under 'Applicable Legal Norms' (*This was accepted as a good point.*)

Confidential

- 2) That in addition to be Implicated Staff member being identified by name and Index number, that it be written that she was posted to UNMIL. *(If necessary at all, this is hardly a major improvement”.)*
- 3) Ms. Baldini queried why I should want the Staff member’s phone records. *These may have been useful in establishing that she had been in communication with the pharmacies or other parties in Jordan.)*
- 4) Ms. Baldini objected to my proposal that the investigation be conducted in two stages. *(This would have involved interviewing the subject twice rather than once, and was proposed to maximise the chances of an admission of wrongdoing.)*
- 5) Ms. Baldini’s annotations appear to suggest that questions designed to confront the Subject with her own contradictions should somehow be either a new case or the subject of an Advisory report. *(I simply fail to see the logic in this.)*
- 6) Ms. Baldini objected the Work Plan including the possibility of sending the Chief Resident Investigator from UNIFIL to Amman, Jordan to conduct interviews. *(Notwithstanding the fact that a large number of investigators from New York, Vienna and Nairobi were sent to Lebanon, at enormous cost to the Organisation.)*

Can Mr. Dzuro please explain how this can seriously be described as “poorly drafted with a number of issues that needed clarification”?

Moreover, if the Work Plan was so seriously wrong; can Mr. Dzuro explain:

- 1) what action he took – as a responsible supervisor - to ensure the situation was remedied, and
- 2) what bearing this allegedly “poorly drafted” Work Plan may have had on the conduct of the investigation?

Notwithstanding the discussion Peter had with Ms. Baldini on 8 October 2012, on 14 January 2013, Peter wrote me an e-mail regarding the scope of case 0496/11. The information Peter provided demonstrated not only his limited understanding of what OIOS does, but it also highlighted Peter’s inability to provide a focussed and factual investigation plan utilizing clear and precise language. I discussed the e-mail with Ms. Baldini and we subsequently had a meeting with Peter outlining the direction the case should take.

I take great offence at Mr. Dzuro’s insulting comment suggesting I have a “limited understanding of what OIOS does”.

Mr. Dzuro has been embarrassed over his inability to answer any of the questions in Annex A. To now make such a subjective remark in an End-of-Cycle Appraisal is, I believe, indicative of prejudice and malice, to say nothing of retaliation.

This became very relevant later when (after a ridiculous delay) DFS wanted to refer the case to national authorities for criminal prosecution.

Confidential

Confidential

The e-mail which Mr. Dzuro refers to, which I wrote on 14 January 2013 related to whether, within the scope of an administrative investigation, OIOS would be justified in reaching out to a witness (named by the subject) for the purpose of collecting information which would provide the Jordanian authorities with contact details for a witness they could interview in relation to a criminal offence that took place within their jurisdiction. To be doing this, OIOS would be acting in the knowledge that by the time the information was made available to the Jordanian authorities, the alleged perpetrator of the fraud was no longer likely to be resident in Jordan.

I am not aware of anything in the OIOS mandate which precludes OIOS/ID taking action where criminal activity or further misconduct is identified, and referring it to the appropriate local Law Enforcement Agencies or by investigating it ourselves, as appropriate.

And nobody has been willing to try to enlighten me...

It would be particularly interesting to hear an explanation of this bit.

Ms. Baldini objected to even referring the allegations of such wrongdoing back to the Intake Committee and insisted on that no action be taken. **This means that OIOS is complicit in concealing criminal offences from relevant law enforcement authorities in UN member states.**

I find it odd that this is now being presented as some sort of ignorance on my part.

Mr. Dzuro's replied to my email; to say that he would not reply in writing, and in any event, to refer the matter to Ms. Baldini. At no time did he record any concern over my (alleged) ignorance of international liaison in law enforcement matters or my understanding of the UN Convention on Privileges and Immunities.

Am the only person who thinks that is odd?

To now attempt to cite that email as evidence of any inability on my part to conduct a "*focussed and factual investigation plan utilizing clear and precise language*" is patent nonsense. It is unfounded, it is malicious and it is insulting.

Mr. Dzuro's comments are, however, indicative of a personal interest in somehow portraying me in a negative light in order to justify the PIP attached at Annex A, precisely as I suggested would happen in para 4 of my email to the Director OIOS/ID on 13 May 2013, and on which no action was taken.

Ms. Baldini has a history of refusal to act on the identification of criminal activity. When presented with evidence of a very significant money laundering activity, was more concerned with the punctuation in a Note to File and declined to even consider referring the underlying criminal activity to local law enforcement.

Interesting that nobody ever came back to me on that either....

I actually have no recollection of Mr. Dzuro having any significant involvement in the management of case 0496/11 but if he wishes to claim responsibility for it; it would be churlish of me to dispute it.

Confidential

Confidential

In this case, within the narrowly defined scope of case 0496/11, technically the organisation suffered no loss. When the staff member was challenged on US\$28,000 worth of suspicious claims, she made almost immediate restitution of the amount.

However, the case involved claims made by the staff member for medication for her husband who had allegedly had a kidney transplant. Information which she volunteered during the course of the interview, backed up by independent investigation of the levels of fees charged by that hospital, indicated that the operation the husband had undergone was not a kidney transplant at all.

This cast doubt on some of the documents from the hospital, one of whose staff then appeared to be a co-conspirator in a fraud.

Moreover, the risk is clearly that the organisation may have suffered other unquantified losses.

When I drew Ms. Baldini's attention to this information, she refused to even consider referring the matter back to the Intake Committee. She was not interested in expanding the remit of the case to investigate prior medical insurance claims that were not known to VBI.

She did, insist (in writing) that an investigator must never go asking questions "just to satisfy their curiosity".

Leave records from the Mission showed the staff member was absent on certified sick leave for a period of some 4 months. Information from the subject during her interview, combined with the known expense claims made on the MIP, indicated that the Staff Member was not sick herself but had taken leave in order to care for a family member. Quite apart from being a breach of the Staff Rules, there was information that case doubts on the veracity of the alleged sickness of the family member.

That's what I call "probable cause to investigate"..... but OIOS clearly does not agree

When I drew Ms. Baldini's attention to this information, she again refused to even consider referring the matter back to the Intake Committee to expand the remit of the case to include the investigation of abuse of the Sick Leave provisions.

Mr. Dzuro suggests I have a "*limited understanding of what OIOS does*" – inasmuch as OIOS manifestly fails to pursue wrongdoing by Staff Members and has no interest in recovering financial losses suffered by the Organisation; it is entirely possible he has a point.

Notwithstanding our efforts, Peter produced a draft investigation report and provided it to me on 8 February 2013, his last day before annual leave. Peter acknowledged that he did not give the draft report to his team member, Mr. Lee Moreton for peer review, even though I had instructed him to do it before he submitted it to me. Peter explained that he had forgotten to do it.

Confidential

Confidential

On 8 February 2013, I was in Edinburgh, Scotland. This date happens to be my father's birthday and I recall I was at home with him on that day.

Be that as it may, my recollection is that Lee Moreton's name did not even come up in connection with this case until after I returned from leave on 19 February. I do not believe I was asked to give it to him before I left. I can find no email to this effect and recall no such verbal instruction. The only involvement I believe I ever had with Lee Moreton on this case was on 20 February.

I have no recollection of being asked to submit the draft report to Lee Moreton prior to giving it to Mr. Dzuro. In any case, I am confident that I had earlier asked *another* investigator to review it anyway.

I still do not understand why Mr. Dzuro needed to have somebody else review it before he looked at it himself.

If Mr. Dzuro were to review a draft that had been prepared by me alone, he would at least know he was looking at something I had written. If he looks at something that he has insisted that someone else look at first, I am not entirely sure how he knows which aspects of it are mine and which can be attributed to somebody else.

This strikes me as an unusual way for any supervisor to actually supervise.

I read Peter's draft and found a number of issues that needed to be addressed particularly related to the factual content, but also to the presentation of evidence, lack of clarity and overall drafting.

Can Mr. Dzuro provide a copy of the draft he is referring to, and highlight what he considered questionable about:

- a) the factual content,
- b) the presentation of evidence,
- c) any lack of clarity and
- d) "overall drafting"? – *whatever that actually means.*

Moreover, if Mr. Dzuro did in fact have such concerns about the draft, can he explain why he passed it to Lee Moreton to correct rather than simply make the corrections himself?

I am still waiting.....

On 14 February 2013, I passed the draft to Lee for his peer review. I subsequently had discussion with Lee on what I expected from him with regard to the peer review. On 20 February 2013 I received feedback from Lee on the quality of Peter's draft. Lee reported that he had found the draft not to be factual in part and that it contained a lot of conjecture and supposition. Lee also indicated that the draft report needed to be shortened significantly and it was below standard for final submission to me.

I continue to be slightly confused as to:

- 1) what exactly Mr. Dzuro considers the "standard" of a DRAFT document,

Confidential

This remains an interesting question, and one which speaks volumes about how much Dzuro "supervised".

Confidential

- 2) how Mr. Dzuro can actually *supervise* anything if he fails to communicate the definition of the standard to be met,
- 3) how anyone is expected to get a draft report to this magical level of being “good enough” for Mr. Dzuro to actually spend time reading, if he will not actually take an interest in its progress, and
- 4) why Mr Dzuro should have failed to have let me know any of this before?

I strongly resent the implication that there was any “conjecture”. This is simply innuendo; which I consider particularly inappropriate coming from someone who holds himself out to be a Senior Investigator.

I had been absent from Wednesday 6 February, Mr. Dzuro is referring to the draft dated 1 February 2013. Mr. Dzuro has failed to point out that that draft was clearly marked, on the front page, with a bold notice which read: **“NOTE: This draft contains a lot of material which may not fall within the definition of what is considered strictly ‘fact’ but is included for reasons of showing Intent to Defraud and to assess the Credibility of the subject – hence requirement to edit.”**

The reason for this, curiously enough, was not so much that I was concerned about what might or might not constitute a “fact” as much as it is evidence of my going to extraordinary lengths in an attempt to comply with the directions to focus on “*nothing but facts*” given at the mid-term meeting with Ms. Baldini and Mr. Dzuro on 23 August 2012.

I am not entirely sure how if Mr. Dzuro considers something with the words **“hence requirement to edit”** emblazoned on the front to be a final version.

This COULD be a clue, reinforcing the word “draft” that was clearly printed all over it

Finally, given that this report was finalised just days before the 28 February draft of the PIP; can Mr Dzuro explain why he could not immediately cite this as an example of my alleged wrongdoing when first asked? This should have been fresh in his mind when he drafted the PIP. Why did it take him *four months* to raise this?

I instructed Lee to talk to Peter as a colleague and explain to him the problems he had identified and also to help Peter to finalize the draft to an acceptable standard. I also requested Lee to provide me with feedback on the discussion he had with Peter.

Lee informed me that Peter had explained that some of the aspects in the report were included to provide context to the allegations. Lee told Peter that the report has to be factual and the aspects included has to be relevant. Peter agreed that the report had to be re-drafted. Lee offered to go over the new draft when ready, but Peter never came back to Lee for further peer consultations and instead he submitted the report to me.

Lee Moreton was certainly given the report to revise, this may have been done when I was on leave but I have no recollection of Lee Moreton’s name coming up in connection with that report prior to my departure.

Confidential

Confidential

Mr. Dzuro does not explain why he gave the report to Lee Moreton rather than just review it himself.

Is this a new form of "supervision by delegation"?

Again Mr. Dzuro has put in writing that I "*had to be told*" that a report has to be factual and the aspects included has to be relevant. This is insulting, as well as being hearsay.

Would Mr. Dzuro care to offer a suggestion as to how it was possible that I could earn a living for 18 years as an investigator in the private sector – with absolutely no job security of any sort - and not actually know this?

I do not know how many times Mr. Dzuro expects a draft report to be revised and re-revised before he, in his role as 'supervisor' sees it himself.

In the end, I agreed to make whatever changes Lee Moreton suggested because it was not worth an argument and it was the only way to get the thing finished.

I had a subsequent discussion with Peter on the relevant issues including the accuracy and relevance of the text he included in his draft. As a result, on 22 February 2013 Peter provided me with his new draft. After my review I passed the draft to Ms. Baldini.

I have absolutely **no** recollection of any verbal communication about the accuracy of anything in this report. I am, however, prepared to defend what I consider the relevance of anything in the draft.

Can Mr. Dzuro actually highlight precisely what he is referring to?

On 25 February 2013 Ms. Baldini returned the draft to Peter so that he could re-address the issues she had identified. On 27 February 2013 Peter provided his new draft.

The changes made in the draft were returned by Ms. Baldini on 25 February 2013 (attached to email time-stamped 4:19 pm on that day) were **almost entirely matters of personal style.**

None of the changes made by Ms. Baldini made ANY factual or even grammatical difference whatsoever.

The suggestion that somehow Ms. Baldini corrected or even "improved" the report in any way is entirely subjective. It was an exercise in making minor and unnecessary changes that had no bearing on the content. None of those changes can be considered material, none indicated any vulnerability in the report and none affected the substance of the report.

What happens in this office is that I write "*There was a blue sky*" and Ms. Baldini thinks it should read "*The sky was blue.*" This is a cosmetic change. The only purpose of all these changes is to waste time and effort, before the report is sent to PPS - *who will then change it all anyway.*

Confidential

The alleged “issues” highlighted by Ms. Baldini deserve closer examination. These are addressed at **Annex C**.

Attached below



This is the report which Mr. Dzuro claims “*demonstrated not only his limited understanding of what OIOS does*” and “*highlighted (my) inability to provide a focussed and factual investigation plan utilizing clear and precise language.*”

- Mr. Dzuro refers to a draft, not just an ordinary draft but a draft marked **“NOTE: This draft contains a lot of material which may not fall within the definition of what is considered strictly ‘fact’ but is included for reasons of showing Intent to Defraud and to assess the Credibility of the subject – hence requirement to edit.”** Moreover, this marking was made specifically because of the August 23 meeting (see Annex B) and to avoid any chance of the draft being misconstrued as anything other than a draft to be reviewed.
- Mr. Dzuro conveniently fails to establish that he provided any actual contribution or supervision on the case. His major contributions were:
 - a) to avoid answering a question about interviewing a named witness, and
 - b) to ask Lee Moreton to review a draft that was clearly marked as a draft “to be reviewed.”
- The alleged “issues” which Ms. Baldini pointed out amount to an exercise in making minor and unnecessary cosmetic changes. Ms. Baldini had no comment of any substance on the actual investigation and did not even refer to the footnotes in the report.
- Ms. Baldini is on record as having refused to investigate further two further cases of misconduct by the same subject in this case.

This could be a CLUE as to why it was given to Dzuro in the first place....

In summary, therefore, Mr. Dzuro did hardly anything and there were never any real “issues” addressed by Ms. Baldini.

Taking into consideration that 0496/11 was investigated in conjunction with a number of medical insurance fraud cases (investigations coordinated by Mr. Youssou Ndiaye) Peter’s final draft was passed to Youssou for his final review. Having completed the review Youssou informed Ms. Baldini and me that comments he provided in Peter’s draft report were aimed to clarify certain statements and to align Peter’s draft to the templates designed for all insurance fraud cases investigated in this group. Youssou also indicated that among other issues he brought up he found that the findings presented by Peter did not outline the facts on which they were based. I therefore returned the report to Peter so that he could finalize it.

To the best of my knowledge, no other investigation report had EVER been passed to someone else for an additional “review” AFTER the Unit Chief had declared it satisfactory but BEFORE it was sent to PPS.

Can Mr. Dzuro please explain why – if this report had to be passed to Youssou N’Diaye for him to edit, he bothered to give it to Lee Moreton in the first place?

Can Ms. Baldini explain why the report was not simply passed to Youssou N’Diaye before she wasted time reviewing it herself?

Can anyone explain why the only investigation which actually proved wrongdoing by a Staff Member report should have to be re-written so it “matches” over FIFTY closure reports which:

- a) were part of an entirely unrelated fraud syndicate, and**
- b) were written in the full knowledge that the chances of any individual one of them ever being read were, at best, negligible?**

See separate commentary no the Insurance Fraud Working Group.

For the record, Youssou N’Diaye did then go over the report, making more suggestions. The report was then passed back to me again, after two months, to make MORE subjective and stylistic changes.

The subject in this case retired from the UN in June 2013. The only thing that was achieved by all this spectacular time-wasting was to ensure that she had retired before ALS would even begin to consider taking action against her.

In summary:

- Information provided above demonstrates that Peter’s performance has not been satisfactory and that it requires development.

Note that reference to those reports having

.....relied on uncorroborated statements from a co-conspirator.....

of course we don’t KNOW that he was a co-conspirator because OIOS failed to have an medical expert on hand to dispute the evidence of that witness.

That is called reasonable analysis based on the evidence.

On the contrary, my summary is that this Office first wasted a very considerable amount of time and budget on the IFWG cases, relied on uncorroborated statements from a co-conspirator and – hardly surprisingly - failed to establish fraud against any of the subjects, then continued to waste even more time and money writing wholly unnecessary individual Closure Reports.

Then, instead of then embracing one of the only cases where a case of fraud could be established, and for reasons I cannot explain, Ms. Baldini refused to even consider investigating credible information to the effect that:

- a) the Organisation had suffered a greater financial loss than had been identified by VBI and
- b) that the subject of the investigation may also have fraudulently claimed Sick Leave to which she was not entitled.

To try to frame this as indicative of my being unable to conduct an investigation is farcical in the extreme.

That neither Mr. Dzuro nor Ms Baldini appear to be capable of differentiating between unnecessary cosmetic changes and fundamental flaws in the presentation of evidence (*always assuming that even ever existed*) is indicative of very serious management failings in this office.

Rebuttal Annex C: Summary of changes made by Ms. Baldini to Draft Report in Case 0496/11.

So, if we accept that Dzuro read it, and was not happy with it, but he did NOT actually make any changes himself.... and then Lee Moreton DID make some changes.....

The original text, [written by me, reviewed by Mr. Dzuro and extensively edited by Mr. Moreton] stated in para 2 that the staff member “*was enrolled in the VBI program*”. Ms. Baldini changed this to read “*was enrolled in the VanBreda International [VBI] insurance programme.*”

The original text referred to US\$ 28,656.97 as being “*reimbursed by the staff member when challenged.*” Ms. Baldini changed this to read “*reimbursed by the staff member when her claims were challenged.*”

In para 8, Ms. Baldini added the explanatory words “*a self-funded health plan*” after ‘*The VBI programme*’.

In para 15, Ms. Baldini required to know the last date on which a website had been accessed. This was the website address from which staff members could obtain a claim form. Even if this were to change, it would not affect the case against the individual.

In para 10, Ms. Baldini required a footnote to explain the source of the statement that the subject was at the FS-4/13 level, wishing to know whether the information came from her Official Status File or from the iMIS system.

In para 18, it was stated that “*The VBI Report indicated that [the subject] had submitted a substantial claim for reimbursement of an invoice from Drugcorner Pharmacy in Jordan*”. Ms. Baldini asked for clarification of which city in Jordan it was.

From the context of the report, it is clear that the point of the sentence is not to indicate the specific pharmacy but to relay the information that this was what had been in the VBI report. If it was necessary to name the city; I am unable to explain why it is appropriate to stop at the city? Why not ask for the full street address?

Ms. Baldini then changed ‘*layout of the invoice*’ to ‘*form of the invoice.*’

PLEASE explain to me how these changes were really necessary.....

Para 20 Ms. Baldini made 11 changes to a list describing a set of supporting documents that VBI had provided. In every instance the original text read:

Claim Form signed by [the subject] and dated [claim date] with an invoice from [the pharmacy] for medication purporting to be supplied on [sale date]

Ms. Baldini changed these to read:

Claim Form signed and submitted by [the subject] and dated [claim date] supported by an alleged invoice from [the pharmacy] for medication purportedly supplied on [sale date].

In para 21, the original text read:

All of the disputed claims were in respect of medical treatments allegedly received by [the subject]’s husband; Mr. [Full Name], who was covered by

NOTE: All of this was BEFORE the (draft) report was sent to the “Professional Practices Section” - who would then make FURTHER changes

VBI as the dependant spouse of the staff member. The main part of the claim was for the cost of two drugs, Cellcept and Prograf. These are anti-rejection drugs required by patients who have received a kidney transplant.

Ms. Baldini changed this to read:

All of the disputed claims were with respect to medical treatment allegedly received by [the subject]'s husband; Mr. [Full Name], who was covered by VBI as the staff member's dependant spouse. The main part of the claim was for the cost of two drugs, Cellcept and Prograf, anti-rejection drugs, required by patients who have received a kidney transplant.

In para 24, Ms. Baldini added the name of the name of Pharmacy chain: "Pharmacy 1" to sub-para (i) so she changed the original:

Pharmacy 1 confirmed to VBI, in an e-mail from Mr. [Full Name] dated 4 May 2011, that: (i) the named patient was not known to the branch;

so instead it read:

Pharmacy 1 confirmed to VBI, in an e-mail from Mr. [Full Name] dated 4 May 2011, that: (i) the named patient was not known to the branch of Pharmacy1;

I fail to see how this unnecessary repetition is any sort of improvement.

In para 27, Ms. Baldini changed the original:

On 27 September 2008, he had required a kidney transplant, which was carried out in Jordan and because of this, requires medication daily.

In order for it to read:

On 27 September 2008, he required a kidney transplant, which was carried out in Jordan. As a result of the transplant, he requires daily medication.

Does this have any bearing on the validity or effectiveness of the report?

In Para 31, the original text read:

Having offered the excuse that she had to supply medication to her husband when it was not available locally to her husband in Baghdad, OIOS asked [the subject] what steps she had taken to solve the problem of supplying medication to a patient in Iraq.

Ms. Baldini deleted the two words "the excuse" from the first line. She also objected to this sentence being in the passive voice, wished it to be re-written as an active sentence, and asked. "Do you need to prove this?"

Given that para 31 is clearly just a statement of why a certain question had been put to the subject, I am not entirely sure what should be "proved."

The response is in the following sentence, para 32, where Ms. Baldini added a comment where the original text read:

"Ms. [name redacted] replied that she never raised the problem with VBI, nor did she seek advice from the Staff Welfare services in either of the Missions she was employed in, nor did she consider that the UN Mission in Iraq might have been able to assist her."

Do ANY of these changes have any bearing on either:
a) the factual content, or
b) the legal adequacy of the report?

Is "with respect to" any better or any clearer than "in respect of"?

What difference does it make?

This is a rare insight into OIOS "management" at its best...

Ms. Baldini added the following comments:

"Is she required to do this? Why is this relevant to the report? Is this a fact you are putting forward? If not, why is it here?"

Those points can be answered

- 1) The subject was not under any legal obligation to do so. The explanation she put forward in her own defence, however, was that she had had no alternative but to deal with an unidentified Third Party because she had to send to medications to her husband in Iraq.

Having offered this as an explanation for her action, the question was asked to find out what steps she might have taken to solve the [alleged] problem from the resources at her disposal.

The subject clearly could not show that she had taken any steps to find out how the problem might be resolved.

- 2) It is this relevant to the report because it shows how the subject was unable to substantiate the information she had earlier offered.
- 3) Ms. Baldini asks if this is a "fact". The facts here are that the explanation was offered by the subject, a question was asked by the investigator and the subject's reply indicated that the subject had not considered asking either VBI or the UN might help in the resolution of a problem involving the provision of medication to an individual covered by the UN medical insurance programme.

The statement was footnoted. Had Ms. Baldini actually read the footnote she would have realized that the report reflected what the subject said.

I am not entirely sure why the question of whether this was "a fact" even had to be asked.

In para 33, Ms. Baldini changed "*concerns as to the legitimacy of the invoices*" to read "*concerns regarding the invoices' legitimacy.*"

In para 35, Ms. Baldini changed "*VBI had not queried anything with the hospital*" to read "*VBI had not made inquiries with the hospital.*" **Actually, that one is an improvement to my original**

In para 38, Ms. Baldini changed the original:

"Following the explanation that she first offered them, VBI wrote to [the subject] on 5 August 2011 asking about the person who she had said obtained the medication on her behalf"

so it read:

"Following the explanation first offered by [the subject], VBI wrote to her on 5 August 2011 asking about the person who she had said obtained the medication on her behalf."

"the explanation that she first offered them" as opposed to "the explanation first offered by (her)"

In para 40, Ms. Baldini changed the original:

“However, upon learning from that VBI that they disputed the authenticity of the Pharmacy receipts, [the subject] said that she tried to find Achmed but was unable to do so. She said she only had a phone number for him; this was no longer in operation as he had left the country.”

She edited it to read:

“However, upon learning from VBI they disputed the authenticity of the Pharmacy receipts, [the subject] said that she tried to find Achmed, but was unable to do so. She said she only had a phone number for him. The number was no longer in operation, as he had left the country.”

With regard to ‘Achmed’ having left the country, Ms. Baldini added the annotation: *“How does she know this? Does she offer any evidence? If not do we want to remove this?”*

The original sentence was perfectly clear. Referring to what the subject had said, it began with the words “She said”. Any ambiguity could only arise from Ms. Baldini having split one sentence into two.

In any event, the statement is clearly footnoted. Ms. Baldini’s alleged “review” of the investigation clearly did not extend to reading the footnotes; had she done so she would have known her question was unnecessary.

In para 46, Ms. Baldini changed “Investigation Division” to OIOS.

So, in summary...

- **None of these changes can seriously be described as ‘material’.**
- **None has any bearing on the substance of the report.**
- **Nothing, in either the changes or the comments, indicates any inadequacy or failure in the investigation.**

... and there were some serious questions raised about the actions of both Baldini and Dzuro - which OIOS did **not** want to address.

See the **Report of the Rebuttal Panel** where they found no reason to change the “needs improvement” rating I was given.