Re: Personal Attention

REILLY Emma

Fri 06/11/2020 10:18 Sent Items To:AL-NASHIF Nada Cc:AG OERTLY Paul OERTLY Paul POLLARD Catherine SANCHEZ Rick ARMSTRONG Elia

Dear Ms al-Nashif,

I remind you that OHCHR has taken no action to correct its false and defamatory press release, now on the record for three and a half years. Nor has OHCHR taken any action on my report that the OHCHR spokesperson blatantly lied to the press on 1 November 2019, explicitly stating that no names were ever handed over due to how dangerous this would be.

You explicitly stated in your attempt to intimidate me into publicly lying that the sole and unique reason I could not speak out was that I was not recognised as a whistleblower by UN Ethics mechanisms on the issue of OHCHR giving names to China. I have been so recognised since 28 July 2020.

OHCHR's latest statement in a long series of lies about this practice (I summarised the ten different versions for you when I asked which was OHCHR's latest story, given that you say I may only tell that version) amounts to a statement that OHCHR was secretly and knowingly complicit in international crimes for a full decade (2006-2015), but stopped for no reason more than two years after my first report. In court, your lawyers claimed the practice continued. I asked that you correct this, noting that deliberately misleading the Tribunal is a serious issue. You have not done so, preferring a court victory based on what you now claim to be lies.

Again, I have testimony from people whose names were handed over as to the danger of this practice. Some have reiterated that in public in recent days. You have an utterly unsupported claim that it was ok. The UN has refused to investigate the practice for seven years. You may be comfortable with complicity in international crimes as long as nobody ever finds out. I am not, and as the UN has taken no action on my reports for more than six months (in fact more than seven and a half years), I believe you will find that external reports are protected under the PaR policy. This is especially the case given that the Ethics mechanisms have confirmed that it is indeed possible for a UN Human Rights Officer to reasonably believe that the most basic principles of human rights are capable of taking priority over the possibility of a better relationship with China.

I will publicly correct the defamatory, public lies OHCHR has knowingly left on the record for three and a half years. I will also publicly correct any further public lies, with evidence.

Mr. Tistounet made very sure to include in the false statement he wrote for you to read that, after you allege it stopped, choosing whether or not to secretly hand names to China would be in his entire, individual discretion. Have you considered why he might have done that, given that I pointed out that China's lists since 2016 bear a remarkable resemblance to who applies for accreditation? Apart from assurances from the person who pretended when I discovered and objected to the practice in 2013 that it was the first such request received by China, do you have any evidence whatsoever that this stopped? If so, why did you not submit it to the Tribunal as I requested?

It is indeed embarrassing for OHCHR to have so many different on-the-record stories, and to have lied to Member States about this. Staff regulation 1.2(b) has guidance on honesty and integrity that could perhaps assist. I did my best to seek internal solutions, notably a verifiable end to the practice, since 2013. OHCHR managers refused every recommendation from every mechanism in favour of a strategy of intimidation best exemplified by your threatening phone call of 18 June, which confirmed without doubt that OHCHR management does not remotely care about the truth, but only about silencing me. I, on the other hand, do care about the endangerment of human rights defenders by an Organisation mandated to protect them. I'm sorry to tell you that your call had the precise opposite effect, and firmly convinced me that the only manner to fulfill my obligations as a staff member is through external reports, per the PaR policy. I would note that the number of people whose names were handed over publicly pointing to the danger, and confirming that OHCHR took no protective measures is increasing. That alone supports the urgent need for investigation.

As the PR victory is clearly all that concerns OHCHR, I reiterate that nobody would be more delighted than I if my reports led to this stopping. OHCHR admitted it continued in a February 2017 press release. The story of it having stopped more than a year earlier only emerged for the first time in August 2017. Announcing an independent, credible investigation may be a better strategy than a position that directly contradicts the position you took in every court filing and hearing.

I copy some of those who claim the UN has whistleblower protection in the hope that that may now be provided due to this latest attempt to intimidate me into lying for the sake of my employer's reputation.

Regards, Emma Reilly

From: AL-NASHIF Nada Sent: 05 November 2020 20:59:17 To: REILLY Emma Subject: Personal Attention Dear Ms. Reilly,

It has come to my attention that contrary to our conversation of 18 June 2020, you are actively engaging in public communications, including interviews with external media and several broadcast outlets, falsely alleging that the Organization is engaged in wrongdoing.

You are reminded that as a United Nations staff member, you are subject to the obligations set out in the Staff Regulations and Rules and applicable administrative issuances.

I therefore wish to recall that you are not authorized to engage in any and all public communications with regard to your claims and that you shall cease and desist from all such activities.

Regards,

Nada

Nada Al-Nashif Deputy High Commissioner Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

Web: www.ohchr.org

Stand up for someone's rights today: www.StandUp4HumanRights.org