

Via email
15 January 2021

Dear Mr Hand,

Further to my letter to you with reference to your (apparently illegal) authorization to act on an investigative panel, you would have been required, under ST/AI/2017/1 para 6.5, to sign a declaration claiming the absence of any conflict of interest. This is clearly a pre-requisite for any investigation carried out by an investigative panel to be "duly authorized."

I understand that you ceased to be a U.N. staff member in September 2011, and that since January 2012 you have described yourself as a Human Resources consultant, in which respect it appears you are self-employed.

What may be significant, however, is that of the nearly 40 people endorsing your work on your Linked-In page, almost all are former UN staff (list attached). There is, of course, nothing wrong with that, but it raises the presumption that all (or nearly all) of your work as an independent consultant comes from the UN system.

It therefore follows that you will have a financial interest in performing satisfactorily for your clients and, particularly where there are grounds to believe an investigation has been initiated for a patently retaliatory purpose, you would therefore be predisposed to find against the staff member rather than jeopardize your relationship with your main or only source of future income.

As you may imagine, this causes me significant concern. This concern is only increased by the finding of the Joint Appeals Board in Confidential Report No. 1875, case no. 2007-027. It is clear that you have no problem with placing staff members under investigations that have pre-determined outcomes, in violation of UN rules. I believe that to be the case here, given that the investigation was initiated by Ms Pollard, who is - if UN rules are being followed - currently herself under investigation by OIOS for retaliation against me as a recognized whistleblower.

Your apparent professional relationship with Mr. [REDACTED] is also of particular concern, as Mr. [REDACTED] was previously the investigator of harassment against me, and appeared as a witness in an ongoing court case relating, in part, to the defamatory press to which I responded in my contacts with member states and the press which you are now assigned to investigate, despite these being found to constitute protected whistleblowing activities. Could you kindly provide full particulars on the nature of your professional relationship with Mr. [REDACTED]? The UN is a large organization, and that he appears on such a limited list of people does raise suspicion.

Given the length of time since you left the UN, I am further compelled to ask when was the last time you undertook any formal training on how to conduct an investigation in the UN system? Were you subject to any disciplinary or other sanction for your previous role in the use of investigation for the purposes of retaliation? Did you receive further training on the rules following that finding? I would also be interested in your record of carrying out investigations on behalf of the UN, and the results thereof.

For the record, I would be obliged if you could provide me with a copy of the declaration you signed claiming the absence of any conflict of interest, and let me have your comments on how you can reconcile signing such a declaration when you rely on the UN for any future work, and what you feel you learned from your previous use of investigations for retaliatory purposes.

Sincerely,



Emma Reilly