

ORIGINAL EMAILS

Please treat this as Private.

From: Rawé, Noëlle
To: Dunworth, Jeanette
Cc: Hughes, Ceri
Subject: RE: Handling of my performance appraisal

Sent: Mon 15/10/2007 18:10

Thank you Jeanette. What I am looking for is honesty. What has taken place is totally unlike Ceri whom I have always perceived as highly professional. This includes following the KPMG policies on performance appraisals to 'the letter'.

Kind regards

Noëlle Rawé

Tel: +44 (0)20 7... (Internal: ?)

From: Dunworth, Jeanette
Sent: 15 October 2007 17:40
To: Rawé, Noëlle
Cc: Hughes, Ceri
Subject: RE: Handling of my performance appraisal
Sensitivity: Private

Noelle

Thank you for your email below setting out your concerns about your performance appraisal. You have raised a number of detailed points which I need to look in to and I will get back to you on these later this week.

You have also raised the issue of not being in a position to complete your dialogue form by the original deadline of Friday, 12th October. This note is confirmation from HR that the deadline for you and a number of other employees who have not been able to complete the process has been extended to Friday, 19th October.

Kind regards

Jeanette

Jeanette Dunworth
Lead HR Business Manager, Infrastructure

From: Rawé, Noëlle
Sent: 15 October 2007 10:05

From: Rawé, Noëlle
Sent: 15 October 2007 10:05
To: Dunworth, Jeanette
Cc: Hughes, Ceri
Subject: Handling of my performance appraisal

Jeanette

I am addressing this email to you on the assumption that you are still my HR contact. If not, please let me know who I should contact.

I wish to raise the manner in which my performance appraisal has so far been handled by my line manager, Ceri Hughes (copied on this email).

Events prior to the performance appraisal meeting

- On 22 June Ceri sent me and other team members a reminder that we should start thinking about our performance appraisal as all the performance appraisals needed to be completed by the end of August.
- Ceri sent me an email on 2 July stating that I should look at my goals for the purpose of addressing any outstanding goals before the year-end.
- I submitted my form on the Dialogue system on 1 August.
- My performance appraisal meeting was scheduled on 7 August. On 6 August Ceri told me she was cancelling the meeting as she had sent my appraisal form to HR due to what I wrote on the form.
- Conscious of the 31 August deadline for completion of the appraisal process, towards the end of August I asked Ceri when the meeting would take place. She replied that she had not heard from HR, but there was still plenty of time to do it as the deadline had been extended.
- During the second week of September I again reminded Ceri that my performance appraisal was still outstanding, and got the same reply i.e. that she had not heard back from HR.
- During the second week of September I again reminded Ceri that my performance appraisal was still outstanding, and got the same reply i.e. that she had not heard back from HR.
- In light of the policy emails we had received (29 June and 21 September) about 30 September being the final deadline for filing goals on the Dialogue system "to ensure eligibility for salary/bonus review consideration", in the last week I asked Ceri when my performance appraisal meeting would take place.
- On 3 October Ceri sent me a meeting request for 9 October, at 16h00. On 9 October she sent me an email that the meeting room had been changed from the 5th floor, to the ground floor in Dorset Rise. I looked on the meeting room booking system: the room was booked for 1.5 hrs i.e. until 17h30.

9 October performance appraisal meeting

Ceri started the meeting by explaining the areas that would be covered: my goals and performance against these; skills and behaviours; career development i.e. the areas included in the form – and hence the standard approach I am used to since joining KPMG.

I stated that my objective was to get clarity on my position at KPMG. Ceri replied that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss performance to date. I said that I would explain what I meant in the context of events during the course of the meeting.

Ceri then went on to say that, unlike previously, this year I had let events taking place in my personal life come into my work life. I pointed out what I wrote on the form, namely that, while, by the time of my mid-year appraisal I was suffering greatly from events taking place in my personal life, I had opted to leave this out. However, since then, the situation had changed as my personal problem had entered my work life and had impacted on me. I quoted my being denied access to the Intranet for the best part of April and the devastating effect it had on me.

Ceri said she would not discuss it. I kept raising it saying that it could not be ignored as it impacted on my ability to perform. Ceri kept repeating that she would not discuss it as it was outside the scope of the meeting. I asked who would discuss that. On 2-3 occasions Ceri said that if I insisted on raising it she would terminate the meeting.

I would like to know why events that have impacted on my ability to perform are being ignored – especially in light of the fact that the two months plus delay in holding my performance appraisal was due to HR looking at what I captured on my form

I would like to know why events that have impacted on my ability to perform are being ignored – especially in light of the fact that the two months plus delay in holding my performance appraisal was due to HR looking at what I captured on my form.

We then talked about the projects on which I worked and my performance against my goals. I have points to raise about these, but this can be done at 'the next stage'.

This brings me to my next point: a few minutes before 17h00 Ceri announced that she should have said this at the beginning, but she has another meeting she must go to. She said that she would ask a secretary to schedule the meeting before the end of the week. Also, as she was planning to be in Canary Wharf on Friday this could provide the opportunity.

As, by Thursday 11 October I had not been contacted about another meeting, I sent an email to Ceri to report it. I also wrote that the consequence of this was that I would now miss the final deadline of 12 October (policy email of 5 October).

Ceri replied that we had "until next week to complete my appraisal". My response was that I had "not seen any communication that the deadline has been further postponed". I tried to find this communication on the Intranet, and asked around – in vain.

When Ceri was in Canary Wharf on Friday morning, 12 October, I explained that I could not find the communication she was referring to. She said that it was a communication from HR. I asked for a copy. Until now I have not received it from Ceri.

I would like to have confirmation of this communication from HR.

Never in my ten years at KPMG have I had a performance appraisal handled in this manner. It certainly is not consistent with the 'KPMG guidelines on performance management 2007'.

Thank you in anticipation of your looking into this matter.

Kind regards
Noëlle Rawé

From: [Rawé, Noëlle](#)

Sent: 15 October 2007 18:10

To: [Dunworth, Jeanette](#)

Cc: [Hughes, Ceri](#)

Subject: RE: **Handling of my performance appraisal**

Sensitivity: Private [NB: **Dunworth added this when she replied (below) to my email**]

Thank you Jeanette. **What I am looking for is honesty.**

(NB: If the linked documents don't open, try with:



As very amply demonstrated by my experience e.g.

- [my Draft Notes](#) of the 13 Feb 07 meeting with Peter Bassett, partner, and Jeanette Dunworth (includes my Comments) (**sections 3.1 to 3.4** [KPMG page](#)) – and 'his' [07.03.07](#) reply (includes my Comments);
- my [17.01.08](#) Grievance, and KPMG's [22.05.08](#) 'response' (**section 11** [KPMG page](#));
- my [03.04.08](#) Claim against KPMG (**section 12** KPMG pg) in the [Employment Tribunal](#) (**section 16**), and [its PACK OF LIES Defence](#) (**section 14**);
- my [05.08.08](#) letter to [ACAS](#) (**section 16**)...

...- 'honesty' is NOT a quality that can be attributed to the people I had to deal with at KPMG from Oct 06 onwards...while [KPMG summarised its 'Values' as: "Above all, we act with integrity"](#).

What has taken place is totally unlike Ceri whom I have always perceived as highly professional. This includes following the [KPMG policies on performance appraisals](#) to 'the letter'.

What happened: Ceri Hughes (like Jeanette Dunworth) turned herself into a henchwoman to please her KPMG bosses (*) who decided that I should be 'punished'...

...- as 'RETRIBUTION' on behalf of their 'brothers' (Persecution # 6) who were incandescent with fury at being exposed: Andrew David Ladsky and his gang of racketeers, and those in the public sector: police, judiciary (Kangaroo court), local council and 'regulators' (Overview # 7) who very actively helped them in their criminal activities...

...- as the public sector is a source of millions of £s of income for KPMG; e.g. Media section, on the [KPMG page](#), Private Eye, quoting, that in 2012/13 KPMG won £95m worth of government contracts.

Note also that, at the time of the events, in Apr 07, KPMG had won, "[on a non-competitive basis, an assignment to help set it up the Ministry of \[In\]Justice](#) - replacing the then [Department for Constitutional Affairs](#). At the time, I had gone, yet into another battle with [West London County Court](#) over another fraudulent claim filed against me ([Overview # 11](#))

As I wrote under lines 249-252 (and 80-84) of my [05.08.08](#) letter to [ACAS](#) (section 16 [KPMG pg](#)):

"It provides further evidence in support of my position that the [victimisation and harassment](#) I have suffered at [KPMG](#) from February 2007 onwards is due to my exposing on [my website](#) malpractice / wrongdoings by parties with which KPMG has a working relationship e.g. the Ministry of Justice; the police; [the ICAEW](#) (points 1, 4) [of my [03.04.08 Claim against KPMG](#)]"

(In my [17.01.08](#) Grievance, referring in particular to [Ladsky](#), I reported this under lines 266-272, 280-284, 373-376 and lines 464-467).

(*) Note that [Dunworth](#), of course, CONTINUED to do this (with the others) e.g. the [14.12.07](#) highly threatening letter to me 'from' Ceri Hughes.

= Conduct that supports the findings of [the Stanley Milgram's 'obedience experiments'](#)...

...- and in particular, the conclusion, 50 years later, that:

"people follow leaders because they see them as representative of an identity that they share;

they don't inflict harm because they are unaware of doing wrong but because they believe what they are doing is right"

From: "[Stanley Milgram taught us we have more to fear from zealots than zombies](#)",
The Guardian, 1 Sep 11

From: [Dunworth, Jeanette](#)

Sent: 15 October 2007 17:40 [[COPY WITH MY COMMENTS](#)]

To: [Rawé, Noëlle](#)

Cc: [Hughes, Ceri](#)

Subject: RE: Handling of my performance appraisal

Sensitivity: Private

Noelle

Thank you for your email below setting out your concerns about your performance appraisal. You have raised a number of detailed points which I need to look in to and I will get back to you on these later this week.

You have also raised the issue of not being in a position to complete your dialogue form by the original deadline of Friday, 12th October.

This note is confirmation from HR that the deadline for you and a number of other employees who have not been able to complete the process has been extended to Friday, 19th October.

Kind regards

Jeanette

Jeanette Dunworth

Lead HR Business Manager, Infrastructure

From: [Rawé, Noëlle](#)
Sent: 15 October 2007 10:05 [[COPY WITH MY COMMENTS](#)]
To: [Dunworth, Jeanette](#)
Cc: [Hughes, Ceri](#)
Subject: **Handling of my performance appraisal**

Jeanette

I am addressing this email to you on the assumption that you are still my HR contact. If not, please let me know who I should contact.

I wish to raise the manner in which my performance appraisal has so far been handled by my line manager, Ceri Hughes (copied on this email).

Events prior to the performance appraisal meeting

- On 22 June Ceri sent me and other team members a reminder that we should start thinking about our performance appraisal as all the performance appraisals needed to be completed by the end of August.
- Ceri sent me an email on 2 July stating that I should look at my goals for the purpose of addressing any outstanding goals before the year-end.
- I submitted my form on the Dialogue system on 1 August.
- My performance appraisal meeting was scheduled on 7 August. On 6 August Ceri told me she was cancelling the meeting as she had sent my appraisal form to HR due to what I wrote on the form.
- Conscious of the 31 August deadline for completion of the appraisal process, towards the end of August I asked Ceri when the meeting would take place. She replied that she had not heard from HR, but there was still plenty of time to do it as the deadline had been extended.
- During the second week of September I again reminded Ceri that my performance appraisal was still outstanding, and got the same reply i.e. that she had not heard back from HR.
- In light of the policy emails we had received (29 June and 21 September) about 30 September being the final deadline for filing goals on the Dialogue system "to ensure eligibility for salary/bonus review consideration", in the last week I asked Ceri when my performance appraisal meeting would take place.

- On 3 October Ceri sent me a meeting request for 9 October, at 16h00. On 9 October she sent me an email that the meeting room had been changed from the 5th floor, to the ground floor in Dorset Rise. I looked on the meeting room booking system: the room was booked for 1.5 hrs i.e. until 17h30.

9 October performance appraisal meeting

Ceri started the meeting by explaining the areas that would be covered: my goals and performance against these; skills and behaviours; career development i.e. the areas included in the form – and hence the standard approach I am used to since joining KPMG.

I stated that my objective was to get clarity on my position at KPMG. Ceri replied that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss performance to date. I said that I would explain what I meant in the context of events during the course of the meeting.

Ceri then went on to say that, unlike previously, this year I had let events taking place in my personal life come into my work life. I pointed out what I wrote on the form, namely that, while, by the time of my mid-year appraisal I was suffering greatly from events taking place in my personal life, I had opted to leave this out. However, since then, the situation had changed as my personal problem had entered my work life and had impacted on me. I quoted my being denied access to the Intranet for the best part of April and the devastating effect it had on me.

Ceri said she would not discuss it. I kept raising it saying that it could not be ignored as it impacted on my ability to perform. Ceri kept repeating that she would not discuss it as it was outside the scope of the meeting. I asked who would discuss that. On 2-3 occasions Ceri said that if I insisted on raising it she would terminate the meeting.

I would like to know why events that have impacted on my ability to perform are being ignored – especially in light of the fact that the two months plus delay in holding my performance appraisal was due to HR looking at what I captured on my form.

We then talked about the projects on which I worked and my performance against my goals. I have points to raise about these, but this can be done at 'the next stage'.

This brings me to my next point: a few minutes before 17h00 Ceri announced that she should have said this at the beginning, but she has another meeting she must go to. She said that she would ask a secretary to schedule the meeting before the end of the week. Also, as she was planning to be in Canary Wharf on Friday this could provide the opportunity.

As, by Thursday 11 October I had not been contacted about another meeting, I sent an email to Ceri to report it. I also wrote that the consequence of this was that I would now miss the final deadline of 12 October (policy email of 5 October).

Ceri replied that we had *"until next week to complete my appraisal"*. My response was that I had *"not seen any communication that the deadline has been further postponed"*. I tried to find this communication on the Intranet, and asked around – in vain.

When Ceri was in Canary Wharf on Friday morning, 12 October, I explained that I could not find the communication she was referring to. She said that it was a communication from HR. I asked for a copy. Until now I have not received it from Ceri.

I would like to have confirmation of this communication from HR.

Never in my ten years at KPMG have I had a performance appraisal handled in this manner. It certainly is not consistent with the 'KPMG guidelines on performance management 2007'.

Thank you in anticipation of your looking into this matter.

Kind regards
Noëlle Rawé