

on 10 April 2017 is factually wrong. By her own admission, she received the preliminary assessment on 7 October 2016.

112. Furthermore, the remaining duration of the reviews can be attributed to the Applicant's actions, i.e. allegations leading the Director of the Ethics Office to recuse herself, the continuous submission of voluminous documentation, the interference of GAP in the case and finally the Applicant's constant interferences with the review process. It was, however, not reflective of an enhanced or higher standard of review being applied in her case.

113. Finally, the Respondent also contests the allegation that the amount of delay has caused the Applicant detriment including to her health. It is noted that this allegation is not supported by any evidence.

*The decision of the Secretary-General not to afford the Applicant protection for retaliation is lawful*

114. The decision of the Secretary-General not to afford the Applicant protection for retaliation is lawful as the Applicant did not have a case. Knowing this, she nevertheless tries to argue that despite the fact the no *prima facie* case was established "*the procedural and substantive handling of her request for protection of retaliation were so deficient as to render the Secretary-General's failure to take protective measures manifestly unreasonable and therefore unlawful*".

115. After having made her case to three different and independent Ethics Offices which included the submission of numerous documents, the Applicant tries again to demonstrate that her reports which referred to a practice of OHCHR of confirming the participation of named individuals to sessions of the Human Rights Council with the Permanent Mission of China constitute protected activity under the 2005 retaliation policy. All Ethics Offices, after having diligently and professionally conducted their reviews, concluded that the information sharing did not constitute a protected activity under the retaliation policy.

116. Concerning the Applicant's allegations contained in paragraphs 87 to 91 of her submission, the Respondent refers to the report of Principal Ethics Adviser, UNICEF (Annex 43 of the Applicant's submission). Under paragraph 23 it is noted that "*the Complainant has raised a number of allegations as detrimental action, in particular (a) (...), (b) being undermined in external relations with NGO's and encouraging NGO's to file complaints against the Complainant, (c) (...), (d) failure to follow-up an alleged incident of physical assault by a member of the Cuban delegation in 2013, (e) having to work without terms of references, (f) ... (g) attempt at linking the Complainant's contract's renewal in December 2017 to a "forcible transfer" from Geneva to Mauretania*". Principal Ethics Adviser, UNICEF assessed all those allegations and stated that she encountered significant difficulties in establishing – even at the *prima facie* level – whether any of these allegations constituted a detrimental action, and if so whether there was a causal link between a protected activity