Gorodnichy v. CBSA (FPSLREB 566-02-48305)
Exhibit G-2

Exhibit sheet description:

Grievor's book of documents -Vol. -1 – emails – 2022 – 2023 pg. 46 – email Feb. 8, 2022

Source documents and page ranges:

566-02-48305_Grievor_Book-01-emails-2022-2023-redacted-blacked.pdf:

PDF pages 46-78

Redacted by IVIM

566-02-48305

Gorodnichy, Dmitry

From: Gorodnichy, Dmitry
Sent: February 8, 2022 05:57 PM
To: xxxxxxxxxxxxx,xxxxxx
Cc: Gorodnichy, Dmitry
Subject: RE: Decision

xxxxx

For health reasons, my doctor recommends that I work from home for some time.
Please consider temporally accommodate me to work from home.

At the moment, I still cannot make any decision…

As a reasonable person, looking at the recent data that was made available after the Policy was issued (October 6), I still cannot make the decision…

I've been waiting and searching for any additional official information , training, or report that would be help me to learn more about the subject so I could make the right choice.
But unfortunately, I still have not found/received anything - either from yourself or xxxxx or EAP.
It was recommended that I watch the COVID-19 Vaccine Fundamentals (W210) training, but I could not find it.
You said it will be made available after February 14, 2022. So I decided to wait until it becomes available, or until there's any other official report/tutorial made available on this very important subject.

Please let me know

Dmitry

From: xxxxxxxxxxxxx,xxxxxx <xxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxx@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca>
Sent: February 8, 2022 4:36 PM
To: Gorodnichy, Dmitry <Dmitry.Gorodnichy@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca>
Subject: Decision

Hi Dmitry,

I still have not heard re your decision on vaccination. Can you please communicate your decision? Thank you.

xxxxx

xxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxx
Director, Data Science
Chief Data Office, Strategic Policy Branch
Canada Border Services Agency, Government of Canada
613-608-2244

xxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxx
Directeur, science des données
Bureau principal des données, Direction générale des politiques stratégiques
Agence des services frontaliers du Canada, Gouvernement du Canada

Redacted by IVIM

566-02-48305

613-608-2244

Redacted by IVIM

Gorodnichy, Dmitry

From: Gorodnichy, Dmitry
Sent: February 8, 2022 01:15 AM
To: xxxxxxxxx;xxxxxx
Cc: xxxxxxxxxxxx;xxxxxx
Subject: RE: Vaccine Accommodation - decision - 2
Attachments: data analysis of GC deaths by vaccination-02.pdf

xxxxx (Cc. xxxxx)

Attached is the document that further elaborates on the concerns expressed in my earlier email (sent to you January 25, 2022 7:28 PM with attachment entitled "Summary of statistical analysis of official data sources related to vaccine efficacy and safety")

Since I have not received from you any feedback related to the expressed concerns, I have also shared it with colleagues in Academia and GC.
The Attached paper is the result of a very detailed and thorough analysis conducted with and validated by all of us.
By this email, I share it with you in hope that you will study the concerns presented there, and do whatever you can to address them.
I would also appreciate if you could follow up with me – once you have studied the evidence presented in the document - to discuss the ramifications of it and best ways to go forward, for all of us.

I'd like to thank you again for many kind words I've heard from you and xxxxx and for maintaining a culture of openness and engagement in your directorate .
But I did also prepare the Notice of Liability on your name, as recommended by the lawyer, which in the face of all the evidence that has been provided to you, will need to be submitted to you protect me and my family from damages that may incur as a result of your decision. I would feel very uncomfortable doing, if I need to do so

Thank you
PS
Not easy times we are living in. Not only in Canada. But I believe we all always have a chance to make it better. That's how my parents taught me.

Dmitry

From: Gorodnichy, Dmitry
Sent: January 25, 2022 7:28 PM
To: xxxxxxxxx;xxxxx <xxxxx.xxxxxxxxx@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca>
Cc: xxxxxxxxxxxx;xxxxx <xxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxx@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca>
Subject: RE: Vaccine Accommodation - decision

Hi xxxxx,

Would that be possible to meet to talk again, if possible? - I'm finding myself in rather difficult situation which I wanted to discuss with you. I talked about it with xxxxx and he suggested I talk to you.

Redacted by IVIM

The new evidence, summarized in Supplement (most of which came after October, after the mandatory vaccination policy was put in place and after I prepared my Affidavit) unequivocally negates the previously made claims about COVID vaccine efficacy and the safety.

When we talked last time, I said that I would vaccinate or do (almost) anything to help you, community, the good cause.
In fact, this is what I did – back in Spring 2021 (as just attested), when together with my wife and my dad, we were one of the first Canadians to get the first dose of the new COVID vaccine, which many people thought, including ourselves, would save lives. Looking back, I remember we wanted so much to help our community "to stop the propagation of the virus and save lives" that we even went against our own may-years long antroposophic beliefs (that natural solutions should always prevail over medically induced ones). Recall that all of my four daughters were born medication free at home and were exempted from vaccination in all school (since 2002 till present). So what we did was a rather extraordinary step for both myself and my wife.

Now, with all accumulated since then official and scientific data, the more and more of which is coming every week, it has become evident to me, my wife, my dad, as to thousands of other people in Canada and worldwide, that this so called "vaccine" (which should not be even called "vaccine, according to the original definition of "vaccine" used prior to the invention of COVID "vaccines") neither helps to stop the propagation of virus, nor helps to save lives. In fact, statistically– i.e. based solely on the statistics of data of deaths and complications from vaccines alone – the opposite is most likely to be true (as shown in the Supplement).

Hence, In the light of this new evidence (summarized in the Supplement), I see that, instead of going against my religious believes again and now also against the overwhelming scientific evidence, in order to help the community I should help you/Agency to help improve our existing policies- so that they reflect the new evidence, and also help you/Agency to help other colleagues whose health has been already damaged by this vaccine (like that of my wife and my dad). I know several of such colleagues in CBSA and OGD. What I found most disturbing is that they are even afraid to talk about their vaccine-caused heath damages with anyone in the Agency. This is why I have proposed to our SPB Engagement team to create a confidential employee support space here, where CBSA employees would be able to discuss these delicate manners without a fear of being bullied or frowned upon, and also to receive assistance in such matters as helping them to file side effect reports with Health Canada portal and prepare proper documentation for their medical doctors who are unwilling to link their new heath problems to the vaccine.

Similarly, In the light of this new evidence, I request that you (and whoever is making the decision) reconsider your decision and allow me a choice of not doing the second shot - on the grounds of my Religious Believes or any other evidence that is now provided to you.
Alternatively (and I rrrrreally don't want to go this way…), I will need to ask you to provide me the names of the people who - despite all scientific and statistical evidence that has been provided to you - made this decision, and I will have to file a Notice of Liability on their names for the damages they are causing on my health and that of others.

I am looking forward to an opportunity to discuss this with you.
And … if you can provide me with any data that contradicts any of the statements of the statistical analysis presented in the Supplement, please do let me know. I could say that science (the true science , of course, the one that is based on real data, not on the data manipulated to fit a policy or vendor's agenda) is also a religion to me. As a scientist, I always try to remain open to those who challenge my scientific and religious opinions – using scientific methods, of course.

Redacted by IVIM

Thank you
Yours

Dmitry

Supplement:

- **Summary of statistical analysis of official data sources related to vaccine efficacy and safety**
- Adverse effect report of my dad (related to Moderna), and an sample of similar reports (over 10 K of which are filed in the USA. Very grim storied, I wont wish anyone to be one of those who reported them…
  (Note that Another Adverse effect report was also filed for my wife - related Pfizer vaccine that caused menstrual irregularities and heart pains. And again, there are dozens of thousands of reports in US of people who suffered from this vaccine just as my wife - suffered for nothing, from being entirely healthy, becoming sick; now also knowing that it is not even helping to fight COVID, as natural immunity is shown to be stronger than vaccine-induced immunity.)

From: xxxxxxxxxx xxxxx
Sent: January 11, 2022 12:05 PM
To: Gorodnichy, Dmitry <Dmitry.Gorodnichy@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca>
Cc: xxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxx (xxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxxx@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca) <xxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxxx@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca>
Subject: Vaccine Accommodation - decision

Hi Dmitry,

Hope you are well. Attached you will find the decision letter for your accommodation request regarding your vaccine. You will see that it was denied.

I will go ahead and proactively book a meeting this afternoon. Should you want to discuss just accept the meeting invitation.

Thank you,
xxxxx

xxxxx xxxxxxxxxx
(she/her/elle)

Chief Data Officer | Dirigeante principale des données
Canada Border Services Agency | Agence des services frontaliers du Canada
xxxxx.xxxxxxxxx@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca (Mobile) 343-551-2689

Redacted by IVIM

Gorodnichy, Dmitry

From: xxxxxxxxxxxxx,xxxxxx
Sent: February 10, 2022 02:14 PM
To: Gorodnichy, Dmitry
Cc: dmitry.gorodnichy@gmail.com
Subject: RE: Tier 2 - LWOP - Gorodnichy

Hi Dmitry,

Understood. Thanks. Talk soon.

xxxxx

xxxxx
613-608-2244

From: Gorodnichy, Dmitry <Dmitry.Gorodnichy@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca>
Sent: Wednesday, February 9, 2022 6:06 PM
To: xxxxxxxxxxxxx,xxxxxx < xxxxx. xxxxxxxxxxxxx@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca>
Cc: dmitry.gorodnichy@gmail.com
Subject: FW: Tier 2 - LWOP - Gorodnichy

Hi xxxxx,

Acknowledge receiving.

Whenever the new COVID-19 vaccine training (or any information session) becomes available anywhere, I would very much appreciate it, if you can let me know as soon as it becomes available. It critical for me to hear the updated information (not the one that was prepared before vaccination started)

I will hope that such training (or any information session) will become available soon and that you will let me know about it. You know my gmail

Thank you

PS. I'm also forwarding latest communications with clients, so you can follow up with them

Dmitry

From: xxxxxxxxxxxxx,xxxxxx < xxxxx. xxxxxxxxxxxxx@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca>
Sent: February 9, 2022 1:35 PM
To: Gorodnichy, Dmitry <Dmitry.Gorodnichy@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca>
Cc: HQ Compensation/Rémunération (CBSA/ASFC) <CBSA.HQ_Compensation-Remuneration.ASFC@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca>
Subject: Tier 2 - LWOP - Gorodnichy

Hi Dmitry,

Please find attached document.

Redacted by IVIM

xxxxx

xxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxx
Director, Data Science
Chief Data Office, Strategic Policy Branch
Canada Border Services Agency, Government of Canada
613-608-2244

xxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxx
Directeur, science des données
Bureau principal des données, Direction générale des politiques stratégiques
Agence des services frontaliers du Canada, Gouvernement du Canada
613-608-2244

Redacted by IVIM

Gorodnichy, Dmitry (Ph.D. / Dr.)

From: Gorodnichy, Dmitry
Sent: July 6, 2022 02:16 PM
To: xxxxxxx, xxxxxxx
Cc: xxxxxx, xxxx
Subject: RE: Code of conduct on social media

xxxxxxx xxxx

There was not nothing in that article related to what you called "disparaging comments about the government, specifically that the Government was/is deliberately hiding the true portrait of Covid-19. ". I can't find any.
If there was anything, according to your opinion, then please be specific and identify what exactly.

As per your request, I have removed the post from LinkedIn.
And I will submit COI form asap – in fact, I planned to do it since the first day I was reinstated on June 20th.

Please let me know if there anything else that, you think, is not correct in any of my social media communications.
I report and publicise the official data only.
When there are any problems (observations) with these data, such as erasing statistics showing excess deaths among young after vaccination, or other changes in reporting (such as that PHAC stopped reporting deaths by vaccination status last week), or use of algorithmic biases to skew the reported results, I – as responsible Canadian citizen – have right and obligation to report them – using the legal and democratic means that are available to me, don't I?

Because I do plan to continue to monitor and report open Canada data related to vaccines and covid, I would indeed appreciate the opportunity to discuss that with you and better with LR, to better understand where is the boundary between what I can report and what I cannot report and why.
I also have questions related to supporting the Opposition parties in my social fora.
If you can set such meeting, that would be very helpful. Please let me know.

I hope you all would agree with me that
We all as Canadian citizen - regardless of our political party and belief preferences - have the right and an obligation to help our Government to be accountable for all its actions and to maintain the highest level of public trust

Thank you
Dmitry

From: xxxxxxx, xxxxxxx <xxxxxxxxxxxxxx@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca>
Sent: July 6, 2022 1:28 PM
To: Gorodnichy, Dmitry <Dmitry.Gorodnichy@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca>
Cc: xxxxxx, xxxx <xxxx.xxxxxx@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca>
Subject: Code of conduct on social media

Hi Dmitry,

It was brought to my attention that you are continuing to post information / messages that are contrary to the employer's interest, despite xxxxx's, your previous manager, and your former DG's direction to take down all posts wherein messages/information is contrary to the GOC's message on Covid-19 vaccines, Covid related information and the GoC policy. You were also requested to provide/discuss the content of your posts/messages to management for their review if you were unsure if the content of the message could go against the CBSA Code of Conduct. You have

Redacted by IVIM

recently posted on your Linkedin account, which identifies you as an employee of the CBSA, a message titled *"The true portrait of COVID19 in Quebec" – the data that someone did not want you to know about"* wherein contains disparaging comments about the government, specifically that the Government was/is deliberately hiding the true portrait of Covid-19.

In accordance with the CBSA Code of Conduct, section 3. Social Media, it outlines clearly to employees the Agency's expectations with respect to using Social Media whether professionally or personally:

> *Our CBSA value of **Professionalism** involves our continued efforts to improve our programs and services and to consider the present and long-term effects our actions have on people and the environment. This consideration extends to using social media for enforcement, investigation, recruitment, services to the public, stakeholder education, raising the Agency's profile, outreach, and as a collaborative and consultative tool.*
>
> *While there are many benefits to using social media, there are also potential risks and challenges. **As professionals, we must bear in mind that social networks are public fora, and that comments and behaviour on these fora become a part of the public record.***
>
> *Our CBSA value of **Respect** encompasses our duty of loyalty to the Agency.*
>
> *Therefore, we use sound judgment to ensure that our personal and professional use of social media does not compromise the Agency's reputation, its protected information, or our working relationships with our colleagues, stakeholders and clients.*
>
> *When commenting in social media fora:*
>
> - *we are mindful of our duty of loyalty and remain non-partisan;*
> - *we refrain from disparaging the Agency, its employees (including managers) and the Government of Canada;*
> - *we refrain from discussing work-related issues, problems or matters; and*
> - *we recognize that only authorized spokespersons can issue statements or make comments about CBSA's position on a given subject.*
>
> ***We must exercise caution when posting pictures, videos and information in social media fora.** For example, we take into consideration the Agency's reputation, including its internal and external working relationships; the absolute confidentiality of customs, Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (IRPA), corporate or trade information and information on individuals collected in the course of our duties; and the possible risks to the safety of individuals and colleagues identified in social media fora.*

Furthermore, Chapter 2: Conflict of Interest and Post-Employment section 2. Outside Employment or Activities of the CBSA Code of Conduct also states that:

> *We may engage in employment outside the public service and take part in outside activities unless the employment or activities are likely to give rise to a real, apparent or potential conflict of interest or would undermine the impartiality of the public service or our objectivity.*
>
> *After consultation with our manager and if there is any doubt that our outside employment or activities might subject us to demands incompatible with our official duties, or cast doubt on our ability to perform our duties or responsibilities in a completely objective manner, we are required to complete and submit a Conflict of Interest Report (PDF, 2.7 MG) to our manager. In addition to reporting to our manager, we can explore our options with the CBSA's Office of Values and Ethics (E-mail). Our manager may require that*

Redacted by IVIM

the outside activities be modified or terminated if it is determined that a real, apparent or potential conflict of interest exists. The final decision rests with our Director General or Regional Director General.

Upon reviewing the recent post on your Linkedin account named above, management believes that it is contrary to the CBSA Code of Conduct as described above and management also has doubt that your outside activities/employment may give rise to a conflict of interest. Therefore, I am requesting that you **take down the above post and any other similar posts wherein the message is contrary to the employer's interest** and that **you seek management's guidance when in doubt prior to posting any new message/information on social media**. Lastly, I am **requesting that you complete and submit the COI Report (link above)** by outlining your outside activities including outside employment through your social media accounts and provide the COI report either directly to your management or to the Office of Values and Ethics in order for us to review and determine as to whether or not your outside activities give rise to a conflict of interest. Should it be determined that a real, apparent or potential conflict of interest exists, management may require you to modify or terminate these outside activities in order to resolve the COI.

I would also like to remind you that should you not comply with our directions above, this could lead to discipline.

I am available should you wish to discuss further.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

A/Director
Data Science Division, Chief Data Office
Strategic Policy Branch
Canada Border Services Agency, Government of Canada
xxxxxxxxxxxxxx@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca

Directeur intérimaire
Division des sciences des données, Bureau de la dirigeante principale des données
Direction générale de la politique stratégique
Agence des services frontalieres du Canada, Gouvernement du Canada
xxxxxxxxxxxxxx@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca

Redacted by IVIM

Pre-disciplinary Hearing

Dr. Dmitry Gorodnichy

- and -

Canada Border Services Agency

Presented on August 3, 2022

By Dmitry Gorodnichy

Related hearings and documents:

- Level 1 Grievance
- Discrimination complaint (submitted on Aug 4 and addressed to my satisfaction, thank you)

Allegations

General Allegations

"the cumulative nature of Dmitry's action highlight an **increasingly** deliberate, persistent, growing patterns of **questioning the vaccine safety and efficacy,** which **goes against** the messaging of the government of Canada covid-19 vaccine policy and messaging, which is that **vaccines are safe and efficient**.

> This I entirely wrong as explained in this document (using example of questioning PIK Biometrics efficacy)

"Although the employee says that he disputes the above assessment, that he is not posting information that goes against the GoC messaging, the evidence as outlined above (e.g., removal of his message on GC collab, complaints from staff) suggests otherwise:

> The very fact that TBS or GC Tools folks complained and remove my content, cannot be used as the reason to accuse me of going against any messaging. It only shows exactly that they did not look into language/problem of technology performance from data science perspective, like I did.

> In conclusion, I always follow any manager's instruction right away when they are specific and clear, even though I do not understand sometimes what was wrong there and will seek for the answers (why) later.
>
> Similarly, in the future to I will do the same, provided also that these instructions will not conflict with my fundamental rights for security, which includes finding true unbiased information about the effect and safety of vaccine on the health of myself , my chidren and other members of my family

See more details from page 3. below.

Redacted by IVIM

Specific Allegations:

On February 4, 2022 – big part of is missing:
(xxxxxx **Parker,** xxxxx **'s go a head, no established process ever provided)**

The major part of the story that it was done with Engagement Team (see email to xxxxxx Parker and Slido Poll image sent to you on 3 Aug 2022) and under the go ahead from xxxxx (DG) – to create safe space is entirely missing.

February 11, 2022 - paper was removed

I went right away (even though I did not what was wrong – See "questioning as way of improving", but it was already removed. I still do not know whats wrong with article - you can view it website: https://github.com/IVI-M/vitals/blob/main/docs/comment2.pdf . it described the Alg.Bias that we have just observed together. And offered the ways to improve reporting . Those who removed it went against the Code of Ethics in preventing timely dissemination and responsible use of resources (data)

March 18, 2022

This is the great learning opportunity on R and Shiny - with Data Scientist from UK who developed this Shiny App: https://vaccines.shinyapps.io/cave/

What was wrong with that?.

April 1, 2022 –

Another great learning opportunity on combining R and Googlesheets – which my colleagues asked - so that to help colleaguse to better understand and visualize any official GC data themselves. **What was wrong with that?**

For details see Comments directly embedded INVESTIGATION REPORT

Redacted by IVIM

Points related to General allegations

Point #1: Data scientist treatment of “system efficiency” problem is different than that of layman or non-technical person

When a layman (general public) hears *“Solution X is Safe and Efficient”,* a professional like me hears *“Solution X has such and such acceptable range of True Positive Rate (TPR - equivalent for Efficacy) and such and such acceptable range of True Negative Rate (TNR - equivalent for Safety), which will very - naturally - over time, over different populations and conditions. And this is how by examining this variation - seeing where the performance is the best and worst - we improve the performance of Solution X, as we go forward.”*

Historical note: For over 15 past years of my professional life, my main responsibility, as research data scientist, was exactly evaluation of “safety and efficacy” performance of third party systems - various AI classifiers and predictors, multiple Biometric (Face / Iris / Voice recognition) systems and many Video analytics (object and activity recognition in surveillance video) systems - using the empirical data that were collected from the operation of those systems.

During the hearing, I showed many internal images from my latest biometrics performance evaluation work, which looked very similar to the ones I publish on performance of Vaccines from Official Canada data on ivim.ca. (I cannot show them here, but I show a few similar others from public domain in Appendix)

To say that 'questioning the vaccine safety and efficacy' is against the message that ‘vaccines are safe and efficient’ is the same as to say that by ‘questioning the performance of various Biometric systems’ goes against the message that ‘Biometric technology is safe and efficient’. It is exactly and only by “questioning” the system - whether it is Biometric or Vaccine or any other - over a large range of conditions, different populations, over time, that such system can be further improve it. Therefore , my work only further contributes to the development of better vaccines and their better use over large range of populations and conditions.

Point #2: Everything I do is in support of my employer’s Codes of Conduct - not to the contrary of it. People who prevent **responsible use of GC resources** (data) , who prevent **impartial advice** (based on these data) and dissemination of objective and factual information, advice and support **in a timely manner, and** who’s actions do not take into account **health, safety and security** of colleagues (such as those resulting from delayed dissemination of data related to their health) **- are the ones who violate GC rules of Conduct, not me.**

Quotes from Code of Conducts

- by providing ***providing impartial (***free from political and industry interference)*, objective and factual information, advice and support* ***in a timely manner.***
  Preventing me to share such impartial information in a timely manner is going violating the code
- ***use and care for public resources responsibly,*** *for both the short term and long term.* ***Employ public resources wisely and properly - by using the GC data, which is worth lot of money and time - to the best value possible***
- *taking into consideration o****ur own health, safety and security and that of our colleagues.***

Here, I showed a screenshot of three top Slido Questions asked during our directorate’s townhall in January 2022 , one of which (that received 40 votes) was “If the organization will provide support for employees who have adverse reactions from vaccination?” hall [[and then the email that I sent to our Branch Engagement Team (the fabulous folks there always willing to help anyone in the branch) with

Redacted by IVIM

agenda item for their next meeting - to address this top-voted Question by setting a safe space where people would able to seek for help/support in relation to adverse effects, the idea for which - very importantly - was welcomed by my senior management]]

I also reminded that, in fact, the “Reporting COVID-19 vaccines side effects” portal which I uploaded to https://open-canada.github.io/vitals/report-side-effect was built using the information that was provided to me by other Agency’s employees.

Also, I was, in fact, encouraged by my superior to create a safe place where employees could discuss their concerns and help each other, using existing support group, which I did.

Point 3: I asked multiple times for “updated and complete information about vaccine” (specifically the one based on post-marketing data, which has become available after October 2022). **I also asked multiple times for “established process to voice his concerns about COVID vaccines”** and was never provided the answer to either of this requests. This is why I had to do find this information myself, using the democratic and technical means that were available to me:

- With help from colleagues, I developed - on my own time - automated interactive Web Apps, which tracks and visualizes StatCan and PHAC data over time, thus facilitating significantly the analysis Vaccine data for everyone.
- I approached my colleagues from uOttawa and uDal (prominent reseachers in the field of Data Scientist - Prof. Matwin and Prof. Kulik) , with whom we jointly - on our own time - conducted analysis of StatCan and PHAC data and produced two research articles, that have been made publicly available at ivim.ca portal (here and here) and shared were we thought is appropriate - including on GCcollab - the platform where
- I wrote Open Letter to Chief Science Adviser - Dr. Mona Nemer, which can be found here.
- With recommendation from another GC colleague, I also submitted “Concern” to Office of Auditor General on the use of biases that skew the reported data

Point #4 : witnessing and proving the ongoing Assault on Democracy, on Canadians and GC employees happening today (since the launch of Mandatory Vaccination policies)

Many Canadian lawyers, politicians, epidemiologists, journalists are engaged to stop the ongoing Assault on Democracy, on Canadians (in legal definition “Assault”) , and specifically on GC workers, like myself.

All GC workers – including everyone in this meeting – presently live and work under Assault – threatened* to be tortured ((in legal definition f all these words) , if we do or say anything which can be seen as a critic of vaccines.

*Torture is to be stripped from your all means of income, for the rest of your life. – There’s nothing more horrifying for a human than this, except the horrors of war, such as the one happening right now in my homeland Ukraine. - I could even make parallels with between the Horrors and the Feeling of Helplessness of people in War-torn Ukraine (in the face of the much larger Russian military and propaganda machine), and what we are experiencing here in Canada.

The outcome of this tragic situation is the following:

On one side, We (Canadians, GC emploees n particular) have supreme laws and fundamental rights:

Redacted by IVIM

- Civil liberties, Criminal code, Constitution, Bill of Rights, and above all the Law of God / Karma

Additionally, as GC employees, We also have also responsibility for Canadian Public (Code of Value and Ethics, Scientific integrity):

- Insert Quotes here.

And yet, on the other side, we cannot exercise now our free will and judgement to do what is right (according to above listed laws and responsibilities), even simply to talk in public the facts that we observe with our own eyes , because of the fear of torture* (as described above)

You can proof it yourself right now in 3 minutes. Please go to https://health-infobase.canada.ca/covid-19/#a9, and look at Figure 5) and answer this question.:

> *Do you see that the statistics of Cases following Vaccination are published by PHAC in such a way as to significantly* ***minimize the percentage of Cases after additional 2+ doses*** *(the tiny dark green bars on the right of the Charts)* ***- compared to the percentage of other Cases?***
>
> *(In answering this question, remind yourself that 4-dose cases have started only two months ago as seen in https://health-infobase.canada.ca/covid-19/vaccination-coverage/, while the total number of cases that is used in the denominator started in December 14, 2020)*

If you feel uncomfortable verbalizing in public the observation you just made (which is the observation of algorithmic bias that is used to skew the results in favour of 4-doses) - you just proved it yourself that you are also afraid of torture that can be inflicted on you by your employer for simply saying the fact, the truth.

In other words, you are no longer free to do or to say what is right – about Vaccines, me, this investigation. **If that's the case, everything else I say here does not matter…**


PS.


Is that for the first time you realized that?


I also did not know until December 2021 – when one of my GC colleagues showed it to me and asked for my thoughts (very privately and under fear that this is could cause him troubles at his job)

So, why no one talk about that in GC – still even now, since December, Why? – **Because of fear of torture described above**

Redacted by IVIM







Redacted by IVIM

IN THE GRIEVANCE MATTER

B E T W E E N

DMITRY GORODNICHY

Grievor

-and-

CANADA BORDER SERVICES AGENCY

Employer

Second Level Grievance Presentation – March 1st, 2023

Lisa Dubé
Labour Relations Officer
The Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada
250 Tremblay Road
Ottawa (ON) K1G 3J8

Tel: 613-228-6310, ext. 4934
Fax: 613-228-9048
Email: ldube@pipsc.ca

Redacted by IVIM

1. Grievance

The present grievance was filed on November 10, 2022, in response to the Discipline Letter sent to Mr. Gorodnichy on October 12 of the same year in which he received 5-day suspension without pay. Simply put, the grievance was filed because the grievor believes the 5-day suspension was unwarranted, given the circumstances of his case.

2. Key Events Leading Up to the Grievance

On February 9, 2022, Mr. Gorodnichy was placed on LWOP for non-compliance to the Policy on COVID-19 Vaccination. At the beginning of April, he was invited to participate to an investigation and the fact-finding interview was held on April 27, 2022, followed by a second meeting on May 31, 2022. It was alleged that Mr. Gorodnichy disregarded and willingly neglected to follow his management's expectations when posting information on various social media platforms. Specifically, it was alleged that Mr. Gorodnichy posted information on COVID-19 vaccination' safety and efficiency contrary to the message that the Government of Canada was promoting, which was that the vaccines are safe and efficient. During the two meetings, Mr. Gorodnichy explained that his intention was to help everyone understand the Government's data and make informed decisions on whether or not to get vaccinated and which vaccine to take. An investigation report was produced on June 27, 2022, in which the acting executive director data and strategy, Mr. [redacted] concluded that the allegation was founded. A pre-disciplinary meeting was held on August 3rd, 2022, and the disciplinary decision was communicated to Mr. Gorodnichy on October 12, 2022. Considering all mitigating and aggravating factors applicable, for willingly neglecting to follow management expectations and willingly posting information that is contrary to the message that the Government was promoting on social media platforms on COVID-19 vaccination' safety and efficiency, Mr. Gorodnichy was issued a 5-day suspension without pay.

3. Grievance Process

This grievance was presented at the first level on January 12, 2023. The delegated authority, Mr. [redacted] indicated that all the factors brought forward in the grievance presentation were already considered prior to the disciplinary measure being rendered. He chose to maintain his initial decision and deny the grievance. We ask you to reconsider this decision.

Redacted by IVIM

4. Analysis

The Treasury Board Guidelines for Discipline and case law support the importance of considering all the mitigating factors applicable. According to the Guidelines, the Employer has an obligation to consider all relevant mitigating factors before coming to a decision on the appropriate discipline.

The mitigating factors addressed in the disciplinary decision letter include the fact that Mr. Gorodnichy cooperated and was forthcoming throughout the investigative process, his clear disciplinary record and the delays in the process.

I would like to present to the Employer mitigating factors and information that it did not consider in rendering its decision. First of all, Mr. Gorodnichy worked for the Government for more than 23 years and, as noted, he had a clear disciplinary record at the time of the incidents. He has always been honest and forthcoming during the investigation and that despite the precarious situation he was in. After being placed on LWOP, Mr. Gorodnichy's job was in jeopardy, he didn't have any income, no idea of what would happen next. He was under a great deal of stress, away from his workplace, but still participated in all meetings and cooperated to the best of his ability throughout the 6 months it took to the employer to render its decision.

Mr. Gorodnichy was told by Mr. xxxxxxxxxxxxxx that he was to use internal mechanisms before expressing his view publicly. In that regard, we submit that Mr. Gorodnichy did in fact reach out to the office of the auditor general and tried to talk about his concerns with management multiple times.

When asked to remove specific posts, Mr. Gorodnichy always complied, but when given general instructions about the necessity for him not to post anything that may be contrary to or not in line with the Government of Canada's message, he understandably was left a little puzzled. Although Mr. Gorodnichy has every intention of following his manager's instructions, he understandably needs guidance. He welcomed the opportunity to participate in the training *Navigating Social Media as a Public Servant*, but still hasn't been able to do so up to this date, because the training will only be offered later in March 2023.

In the disciplinary letter, on October 12, Mr. Gorodnichy was asked to seek management's and/or the CBSA Office of Values and Ethics guidance prior to posting any information that may be contrary to, or not in line with, either the CBSA's or any of the Government of Canada's policy, procedures or messaging on any social media platform. He reached out to the Office of Values

Redacted by IVIM

and Ethics to obtain clarification and has been in contact with Ms. Kimberly Lawrence. At the time of the 1st level grievance presentation, he was still waiting to meet with her and he is still awaiting her guidance as of today. Mr. Gorodnichy is doing his best to act within the boundaries that were set, but perceive these boundaries as vague and needs help figuring this out. As of now, we don't believe it was fair for the employer to take into account his alleged repeated unwillingness to stop posting the information on social media even after being provided with clear expectations as an aggravating factor. Despite multiple clarification requests, the fact is that Mr. Gorodnichy doesn't understand what he can or cannot do to this day and this was not clearly communicated to him. The goal of a disciplinary measure being to correct the undesirable behavior and not to be punitive, it is our opinion that the employer should give Mr. Gorodnichy the help he needs by clarifying what he isn't allowed to say and pinpointing specific statements that they considered to be out of line.

Even though Mr. Gorodnichy is an employee of the Government of Canada and has a duty of loyalty to his employer, he has the right to express his opinion. Freedom of expression is a fundamental freedom protected by the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and an important value in a democratic state like Canada. By imposing disciplinary action upon Mr. Gorodnichy for exercising his freedom, the employer's actions have the effect of imposing limits which are fundamentally inconsistent with section 2(b) of the *Charter*.

Mr. Gorodnichy sincerely believes that he didn't post information that was contrary to the message of the Government that vaccines are safe and efficient, but was simply trying to shed light on the data. Even if his posts could be considered as a critic or an opposition, he submits that they would still have been allowed in the circumstances. In *Fraser* v. *PSSRB (Public Service Staff Relations Board)*, [1985] 2. S.C.R. 455, the Supreme Court recognized that the duty of loyalty could, in certain circumstances, place a limit on freedom of expression, but that it could not result in a denial of freedom of speech in all cases. At paragraph 41, we can read:

> "... in some circumstances a public servant may actively and publicly express opposition to the policies of a government. This would be appropriate if, for example, the Government were engaged in illegal acts, or if its policies jeopardized the life, health or safety of the public servant or others, or if the public servant's criticism had no impact on his or her ability to perform effectively the duties of a public servant or on the public perception of that ability."

Redacted by IVIM

Mr. Gorodnichy expressed himself regarding a matter of public importance directly related to the health and safety of the population and therefore submits that no discipline should have been imposed.

In any event, even if there is some basis for disciplinary action, the employer must prove that the disciplinary response was appropriate in the circumstances and must respect the principle of progressive discipline. This case involves an off duty conduct where there was no malicious intent or bad faith and no evidence to suggest that Mr. Gorodnichy's comments had an impact on the Government's reputation. Mr. Gorodnichy never intended to critic his employer or to go against his messaging and sincerely regrets if people misinterpreted his posts. His goal always has been to help the public understands the data and he sincerely believes everything he did was to serve the public.

5. Conclusion

We're asking the Employer today to consider all the mitigating factors, and given those factors and the various information presented, to conclude that a 5-day suspension was excessive. The remedies requested in the grievance would be for the 5-day suspension to be rescinded, for the suspension letter and any other related documents to be removed from Mr. Gorodnichy's file and destroyed, for Mr. Gorodnichy to be reimbursed for any and all salary, pension and benefits lost as a result of the suspension and any other measure deemed necessary to remedy the situation and make him whole.

Redacted by IVIM

Arguments regarding the unreasonableness of discipline imposed on me for *"posting information that is contrary to the message that the Government of Canada is promoting, on social media platforms including Government of Canada platforms, on COVID-19 vaccination's safety and efficiency"*

Presented for the Level 3 grievance hearing on 6 July 2023

By Dmitry Gorodnichy

October 12, 2022

This letter is further to the findings of the administrative investigation into allegations of misconduct, which determined that improper conduct on your part had occurred and further to the pre-disciplinary meeting held on August 3, 2022, the purpose of this letter is to render my disciplinary decision.

It was determined that the allegation of misconduct, specifically that you willingly neglected to follow management expectations, and willingly posted information that is contrary to the message that the Government of Canada is promoting, on social media platforms including Government of Canada platforms, on COVID-19 vaccination's safety and efficiency was founded.

First and foremost, in all actions in question, I have never meant to go, or believe that I went, against manager's instructions anytime such instructions were clearly defined and could have been logistically followed, and I have been always driven in my actions by the Public Servant Values and Ethics Code: "1.Respect For Democracy, 2. Respect For People, 3. Integrity, 4.Stewardship, 5. Excellence" – **acting at all times in such a way as to uphold the public interest (placing public safety over political agendas or personal gains), Effectively and efficiently using the public money, property and resources (efficiently using official data), providing impartial, objective and factual information.**

Secondly, specifically in relation to *"posting information that is contrary to the message that the Government of Canada is promoting on COVID-19 vaccination's safety and efficiency",* as explained on multiple occasions to my directors and your LR colleagues during previous meetings: the administrative investigation into allegations of misconduct (in April 2022 with KA) and follow-up pre-discipline (Aug 3, 2022 with ND) , level 1 (January 12, 2023 with NV) and lever 2 (March 1, 2023)grievance hearing meetings, I never meant to be in conflict with official messaging and go against the interest of the Government of Canada. Specifically, I said: "*Questioning vaccines is the way to make the best use of them and further improve them*" – just as I normally question, as part of my work at CBSA, the performance of biometrics systems, so that we can optimize the performance of these systems and make better informed, individually tailored, recommendations for each user of such systems.

Appendices provide additional details on my professional background in the area of system performance evaluation, research methodology that I used for analysing official GC data related to vaccine efficacy and safety (which is the same that I used in similar biometric evaluation projects. They also present the key findings that I obtained from my analysis and publicly shared , , which led to the investigation and discipline. The latest evidence, presented in Appendix, confirms that all my statements were true and not “misinformation”. The two most important once, which have been questioned at the investigation, are summarized below.

- **Statement 1:** There is a significant increase of excess deaths among young Canadians that is not attributed to COVID-19 starting from January 2022, which is when vaccination were enforced for this population - confirmed by Statistics Canada in September 2022. See images below and more details in Appendix B

Statistics Canada Statistique Canada

Search website

Provisional deaths and excess mortality in Canada dashboard


▼ Recent key insight: National trends

Nationally, periods of significant excess mortality have been observed from March 2020 to June 2020; from October 2020 to February 2021; and from August 2021 to November 2021. Canada experienced a new period of **significant excess mortality starting in January 2022,** when Omicron was the dominant variant. Excess deaths were observed across all age groups but were relatively **higher among those younger than 45** and among men, particularly in the western provinces.

Date modified: 2022-09-08

Figure 4. Age and gender distribution of COVID-19 cases deceased in Canada as of May 9, 2023, 12 pm ET (n=34,350)

There were less than 500 "Cases deceased" among young Canadians during the entire pundemic. This is less significantly less than the total number of Severe Adverse Reactions for the same group. Also Note that "Cases deceased" include cases where individuals with positive test died from other causes)



- **Statement 2:** Cases following vacation was published in such a way as to skew the results for the number of “Cases Deceased” in favour of vaccinated . I called this technique “Algorithmic

bias” . PCO called this technique (in their Memo of May 2021) “Winning strategy not to shake public confidence” . See images below and more details in Appendix C

Cases reported since the start of the vaccination campaign, as of August 28, 2022


Since the start of the vaccination campaign on December 14, 2020, PHAC received case-level vaccine history data for 72.7% (n=2,413,220) of COVID-19 cases aged 5 years or older.

Of these cases:

- 993,242 (41.2%) were unvaccinated
- 787,721 (32.6%) had completed their primary vaccine series
- 442,357 (18.3%) had completed their primary vaccine series and 1 additional dose
- 37,924 (1.6%) had completed their primary vaccine series and 2 or more additional doses


For definitions of the different vaccination statuses, please refer to the Technical notes and definitions section .


Figure 5. Number of confirmed COVID-19 cases reported to PHAC by vaccination status as of August 28, 2022




The data is published to skew the results in favour of vaccinated.
This is done by counting cases when vaccine doses were not adminstered.

If counting cases from the time when vaccine doses were adminstered, one observes a very different view







These statements are not just some hypothetical statements or allegations. **These are facts**.

The other facts are following:

- This critical information about increase of deaths among young, which concerns the life and health of all Canadians, which I have observed as early as in February 2022, have not been officially published until September 2022, and published in such a way as to avoid any linkage of these extra deaths with vaccines, and

- It was only through the recent ATIP that it was found PCO recommended *"managing COVID vaccine-related injuries or deaths with winning communication strategies to avoid undermining public confidence*" and suggested skewing stats to minimize the impact of vaccine-related deaths or injuries (Source: https://torontosun.com/news/national/privy-council-advocated-downplaying-covid-vaccine-injuries-or-deaths , The actual response to the ATIP request is here: https://open.canada.ca/en/search/ati/reference/d347262291a2d01f94435c5719daa774

It is important to note that **I'm not questioning why the Government did what it did** (i.e. delayed and skewed the publication of death related statistics). I simply state the facts that happened, as they may explain my statements could have been erroneously perceived by some people as "misinformation".

Finally, regarding other specific points that were raised during in the investigation, the following explanations have been already provided during the investigation, and I believe they have addressed all other concerns. If not, please let me know.

- When my Director told me that there are "*processes*" that I need to follow "*to voice [my] concerns*", he referred to the established grievance process. However, this is not what I meant by "*processes*" when asked for support. My focus was not on the decision to put me on LWOP but on observations made from the official government data, such as variation of vaccine performance (over time and over different populations) and a sharp increase in deaths coinciding with the administration of vaccines (especially among young). **My purpose when posting this information was not to put doubt on vaccine efficiency but to show what official data said with respect to how vaccines could be better applied.**

- Regarding my GCcollab activities mentioned in your letter, they were also taken out of context. First, as public servant, I have been leading weekly events as part of data science community of practice's social and training activities for two years now. **I saw this as a forum for people interested in data, and so at that time, I thought it would be of value for them to look at what Statistics Canada's vital statistics and PHAC vaccine-related data were showing in a scientific and objective manner so that the situation could be better understood and even improved.**

- It cannot be said that I used government resources and my official position for personal interest "*to inappropriately obtain an advantage for [myself] or to advantage or disadvantage others*." There is no conflict of interest. **As confirmed by the Treasury Board Secretariat, any private person can access GCcollab, which is what I did while on LWOP. The purpose was to be of service to others at work, and all Canadians, when I was on LWOP looking at publicly available data.**

Redacted by IVIM

To summarize the arguments presented regarding the unreasonableness of the discipline imposed on me for "posting information that is contrary to the message that the Government of Canada is promoting, on social media platforms including Government of Canada platforms, on COVID-19 vaccination's safety and efficiency," the following key points have been outlined:

1. Lack of Evidence: The disciplinary action taken against me lacks sufficient evidence to support the claims made. The allegations made against me are unsubstantiated and do not hold up under scrutiny. I have not been provided with concrete evidence to prove any wrongdoing on my part.

2. Violation of Freedom of Expression: The discipline imposed on me infringes upon my freedom of expression. As a public servant, I have the right to express my opinions and share information, especially when it pertains to public health and safety. It is crucial to foster an environment where open and honest discussions can take place without fear of reprisal.

3. Retaliation for Whistleblowing: The discipline may be seen as retaliation for my whistleblowing activities. I have raised legitimate concerns and shared critical information based on my analysis of data and official sources. Instead of addressing these concerns, I have been subjected to disciplinary measures.

4. Inconsistency in Application: The discipline imposed on me appears to be inconsistent with the treatment of others who have shared similar information or expressed dissenting views. If there are others who have engaged in similar actions without facing disciplinary consequences, it raises questions about the fairness and selective application of disciplinary measures.

5. Acting in the Public Interest: My actions were driven by a genuine concern for public health and safety. I utilized my expertise as a data scientist to analyze and share information that could potentially save lives and protect the well-being of Canadians. Disciplining me for acting in the public interest goes against the fundamental principles of public service.

6. Failure to Consider External Factors: The discipline imposed on me fails to take into account external factors such as the evolving nature of scientific knowledge and emerging data. The information I shared was based on available evidence at the time and aligned with the best interests of public health. It is essential to acknowledge that scientific understanding can change over time and adapt accordingly.

In brief, I was more efficient in making use of the official data and disseminating critical information of the public. All information that I communicated directly relates to causes of deaths and health damages. Simply put, I applied my data science skills to post-marketing vaccine data, which became available at the end of 2021. I did this to help myself and other Canadians to make an informed decision about taking additional doses of the vaccine when I was placed on LWOP for several months in 2022.

I find it important to emphasize that my observations were derived from official GC sources, making better use of the data available through Open Government Policies. I have always praised GC for policies and programs that allow the analysis of post-marketing vaccine and vital statistics data.

When specific instructions were provided, I promptly complied by removing the mentioned articles or content. However, I could not follow general instructions that went against presenting observations based on official data. I believe my sharing and analysis of PHAC and StatCan data were in support of the Government of Canada, aiming to make better use of these important assets and help stakeholders and the general public make informed decisions.

These arguments collectively emphasize the unreasonableness of the disciplinary action imposed upon me. I request a comprehensive review of the situation, considering these points, and a fair reassessment of the disciplinary measures taken.

Redacted by IVIM

Appendix A: Personal letter (Professional Background and Additional context)

Dear Mme Schincariol,

Please find attached the speaking points I made at the grievance hearing meeting on 6 July 2022:

1. I am a senior data scientist with a main focus on evaluating biometric and other complex systems. Specifically, I am the principal investigator behind all evaluations of biometric technologies conducted by CBSA, particularly for NEXUS kiosks (iris biometrics) and PIK (face recognition biometrics). I have been doing this work since 2008 when I was hired by CBSA for this purpose. Prior to that, I worked as a data scientist at NRC for seven years after completing my PhD in 2000 in Computer Science from the University of Alberta, specializing in building and evaluating complex AI systems.

a. I am the most cited data analyst in the GC working on the evaluation of biometric systems. I have produced dozens of internal and external publications and recommendations that demonstrate significant variations in system performance across various vendors, deployment conditions, and populations.
b. Attached are a couple of my PMAs that specifically highlight my key role in the agency's evaluation of biometric systems.
c. Here are just a few examples of my performance evaluation work:
   i. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327819808_Analysis_of_the_effect_of_ageing_age_and_other_factors_on_iris_recognition_performance_using_NEXUS_scores_dataset
   ii. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/262224204_PROVE-ITFRiV_framework_and_results

2. The reason for all the performance evaluation work I have been doing in the GC/CBSA (and at university before that) can be summarized as follows:

a. We cannot fully trust or rely on vendor claims about their products. It is common for vendors to present their products in a better light than they actually perform.
b. The non-technical general public, including GC/CBSA management, is often misinformed by vendor marketing campaigns, leading them to believe that vendor technology is better than it actually is. This is due to exaggerated, incomplete, or deliberately skewed performance results provided by the vendor.
c. It is our duty and responsibility as GC Data Scientists to critically validate all vendor claims and provide independent evaluations that are free from industry and management interference.

Over the years, many scientists in GC, including myself, have found it challenging to provide honest independent reviews of vendor products due to strong interferences from industry and politics. This is why the Scientific Integrity policy was introduced by GC [link to policy: https://science.gc.ca/site/science/en/office-chief-science-advisor/model-policy-scientific-integrity] to protect scientists from such interferences:

> *6. Scientific integrity principles*
>
> *DDAA recognizes that stakeholder trust in the research and scientific information provided by governments depends upon the integrity of the process by which such information is produced, managed and communicated. So too does trust in the decision-making process that makes use of such information.*
>
> *Furthermore, DDAA recognizes that scientists and researchers must uphold and conform to standards of excellence accepted by the wider research and scientific community.*

Redacted by IVIM

To this end, in designing, conducting, managing, reviewing, using or communicating research, science and related activities, DDAA employees shall:

6.1. Ensure that all such activities are carried out in a manner that is consistent with all relevant and applicable standards of scientific excellence, research ethics, and responsible research conduct.

6.2. Ensure that the conduct of DDAA research and science and any research or scientific products, as well as any associated communications, are free from political, commercial, client and stakeholder interference.

- For biometric industry, the importance of validating vendor claims is best illustrated by Biometric evaluation page maintained by the US gon't https://pages.nist.gov/frvt/html/frvt11.html, where The following important points can be observed:
    - Biometrics works – it is "safe and effective" (using heath industry parlance) – there's no doubt about!
    - However, some biometric technologies are much better ("safer" or "more efficient") than others.
        - E.g. for the same setup (eg border – right most column in the table at the link above), one will observe that False non-match Rate (which is 'safety' measure for biometrics) varies from 1% (almost never fails) for some product to 99% (failes almost always) for other products
    - Additionally, one can observe that some biometric (FR) technologies work bad and are not recommended for particular population (e.g for children), whereas others other do not
    - The performance of some biometrics technologies (such as Face Rec) wanes with time, with different level of deterioration for different systems, and you need to reenroll the user for the system to be able to recognize them. Other biometric technologies (iris) don't have this problem

- Exactly The same statements hold for any other industry, including, vaccine manufacturing industry, and which is what I've been stating in all my communications – the statements for which I seemed to be disciplined
    - Vaccines work – they are "safe and effective" – no doubt about it
    - However, some vaccines are much better ("safer" or "more efficient") than others.
    - Some vaccines should not be recommended by children
    - Efficacy of wanes over time, for some vaccines (doses) more than for other

To recap, it is exclusively through the means of independently analyzing the data logs, which that are collected from actual (post-marketing !) data vendor products deployments, that Data scientists (like myself) are able to find the limitations and uncover the range of performance variation and the best and worst vendors.

3. The parallels between the evaluation of biometric technologies and vaccine technologies are clear. As a data scientist, there is no difference to me where the data comes from. I present what the post-marketing data shows, and this approach has been recognized by xxxxx in his investigation report. I sought opportunities to share and discuss the results I observed from post-marketing data, which were concerning and not widely discussed. I used various tools and forums available to me, such as GCconnex and GitHub, and reached out to senior data scientists from GC and other countries for analysis of similar data. I also contacted the Chief Data Scientist and the Office of the Auditor General.

Simply put, I applied my data science skills to post-marketing vaccine data, which became available at the end of 2021. I did this to make an informed decision about taking additional doses of the vaccine when I was placed on LWOP for several months in 2022.

Redacted by IVIM

The bottom line is:

- I cannot be blamed or disciplined for the fact that post-marketing data from the vaccines did not match the marketing statements from the vendors prior to their deployment in Canada.
- I cannot be blamed or disciplined for raising concerns based on the post-marketing data, which revealed potential issues regarding the safety and efficacy of the vaccines.
- I cannot be blamed or disciplined for the delay in official publications of the same observations I made, as those observations later became known through official channels.

I cannot be blamed nor disciplined for either of that.

In summary, I believe it is wrong to blame and discipline me for making critical facts known earlier than they were officially published. My motivation was to use my data science skills to help myself and others make informed decisions, and to protect the lives and health of myself, my family members, and other Canadians, in line with public servant values.

I find it important to emphasize that my observations were derived from official GC sources, making better use of the data available through Open Government Policies. I have always praised GC for policies and programs that allow the analysis of post-marketing vaccine and vital statistics data.

When specific instructions were provided, I promptly complied by removing the mentioned articles or content. However, I could not follow general instructions that went against presenting observations based on official data. I believe my sharing and analysis of PHAC and StatCan data were in support of the Government of Canada, aiming to make better use of these important assets and help stakeholders and the general public make informed decisions.

Please consider the points I have raised and recognize that I acted in accordance with the values and ethics of a public servant.

Sincerely,


Dmitry

Redacted by IVIM

Appendix B:

Fact #1: there is a significant increase of excess deaths among young Canadians starting from January 2022, which is when vaccination were enforced for this population (see Figures below) and not from COVID-19 but other causes, one of which was vaccination.

I observed it starting from January 2022 and communicated my concerns with Director and Chief Science Officer (Dr. Mona Nemer). No response was provided to me. It has become public knowledge from September 2022, when Statcan published it.





Source: Office for Health Improvement and Disparities in England
https://app.powerbi.com/view?r=eyJrIjoiYmUwNmFhMjYtNGZhYS00NDk2LWFlMTAtOTg0OGNhNmFiNGM0IiwidCI6ImVlNGUxNDk5LTRhMzUtNGIyZS1hZDQ3LTVmM2NmOWRlODY2NiIsImMiOjh9

There are also multiple heart-breaking testimonials of parents who lost their young children because of vaccination, who also express the difficulty they have experienced trying to uncover the truth. Here is one of such testimonials:

https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/canadian-dad-says-us-doctor-confirmed-his-17-year-old-son-was-killed-by-the-covid-vaccine/

Here is also a public list of over a thousand of young athletes worldwide who died after receiving vaccinations, with many cases involving heart failures due to myocarditis. The list primarily includes well-known individuals, and it's worth considering how many more sudden deaths may have occurred during the same period among less famous young people.: https://www.globalresearch.ca/1323-athlete-cardiac-arrests-serious-issues-900-dead-after-covid-injection/5793730

Redacted by IVIM

Appendix C: Use of bias (skew, "winning communication strategies") in official publications:

It has recently come to light through the Freedom of Information Act that a ***secret Privy Council Office memo, prepared in May 2021*** *after five months of vaccine rollout in Canada, listed 20,428 reports of "serious adverse events," including 427 deaths, and* ***it recommended managing COVID vaccine-related injuries or deaths with "winning communication strategies" to avoid undermining public confidence [The memo included an example of a data presentation technique that skewed the messaging towards the desired narrative]***


The latest fact may finally explain the delayed reporting of the significant increase in excess deaths among young Canadians by Statistics Canada, the omission of vaccines as a possible factor behind the observed deaths (despite being mentioned in the PCO memo), the lack of attention to the topic by official and mainstream media channels, and the use of other ***"winning communication strategies" (****data skewing techniques)* ***to avoid undermining public confidence.***

Here's the link to the article (one of many, of which CBC is not the one), which published this new: https://torontosun.com/news/national/privy-council-advocated-downplaying-covid-vaccine-injuries-or-deaths).

Here's a to the official response to thel ATIP request that the article reported about: https://open.canada.ca/en/search/ati/reference/d347262291a2d01f94435c5719daa774

Finally, Here is a example of skewing data that I discussed in my blogs.

When comparing number of deaths for vaxed to that of non-vaxed, PHAC counted the number of deaths before vaccines were administered, as shown in image below. This is a very simple technique which very effectively misguided the readers into believing that people who have more doses dies less frequently of Covid than people with less number of doses, which in reality is the opposite.



566-02-48305

Redacted by IVIM


How Bad Is My Batch?

By Craig Paardekooper

Check out your batch code: FA8721

Batch FA8721 (PFIZER\BIONTECH)

Outcomes of Adverse Events



Frequencies of Reported Symptoms

Show 10 entries Search: Enter Symptom

Symptom	Frequency
Chest pain	24
Fatigue	22
Myocarditis	22
Dyspnoea	20
SARS-CoV-2 test	18
Pericarditis	17
Headache	14
Nausea	13
Pain	12
Arthralgia	11