



United Nations

Nations Unies

**OFFICE OF INTERNAL OVERSIGHT SERVICES
INVESTIGATIONS DIVISION**

*This Report is protected under the provisions of
ST/SGB/273, of paragraph 18, of 7 September 1994*

**REPORT ON ALLEGED ABUSE OF AUTHORITY AND
MISUSE OF RESOURCES AT THE UNITED NATIONS**

██████████ ██████████
ID Case No. 0324/06

REDACTED

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

This Investigation Report of the Investigations Division of the United Nations Office of Internal Oversight Services is provided upon your request pursuant to paragraph 1(c) of General Assembly resolution A/RES/59/272. The Report has been redacted in part pursuant to paragraph 2 of this resolution to protect confidential and sensitive information. OIOS' transmission of this Report does not constitute its publication. OIOS does not bear any responsibility for any further dissemination of the Report.

14 MARCH 2007

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	3
II.	Background Information	3
III.	Applicable law	4
IV.	Methodology	4
V.	Investigative details	4
	A. Authorization to print the Yearbook	5
	B. Printing of the Yearbook	7
	C. Distribution of the Yearbook	7
	D. Costs for the printing of the Yearbook	8
VI.	Findings	8
	A. [REDACTED]	9
	B. [REDACTED]	9
VII.	Conclusions	10
VIII.	Recommendations	11
Annex 1:	[REDACTED]	
Annex 2:	[REDACTED]	
Annex 3:	[REDACTED]	

I. INTRODUCTION

1. On [REDACTED], the Investigations Division of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) received information concerning the alleged abuse of authority and misuse of resources within the [REDACTED] Section, [REDACTED]. The allegation concerned the improper printing in [REDACTED] of an alumni yearbook ("the yearbook") relating to the [REDACTED] formerly [REDACTED].
2. It was alleged that at the end of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] authorized printing of the yearbook for non-official use.
3. The OIOS investigation established that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] abused their authority, misused property and assets of the Organization, and caused the Organization financial loss by tasking the [REDACTED] Section with printing hundred copies of the yearbook for personal use.
4. This report depicts the OIOS investigation in detail.

II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

5. In [REDACTED] was the [REDACTED] was the [REDACTED] and reported directly to [REDACTED]. In [REDACTED] was promoted to [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] and reported directly to the [REDACTED]. Prior to their employment with the United Nations, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] all graduated from the [REDACTED].
6. The [REDACTED] is responsible for [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] requests for the printing of official documents at [REDACTED]. The procedure is that a [REDACTED] System [REDACTED] card is issued for each printing request duly authorized by [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] card outlines the various requirements associated with each request, and includes specific instructions relating to the printing work to be undertaken. As of [REDACTED] became [REDACTED] and by virtue of this role [REDACTED] was the authorizing officer for all printing work at [REDACTED] associated with the [REDACTED] card system. Printing at [REDACTED] is undertaken within the [REDACTED] Section, which is headed by [REDACTED] who in turn reports to [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] is one of four services under [REDACTED].
7. The [REDACTED] yearbook is a [REDACTED] publication, which was originally printed in the [REDACTED] and contains photographs of the [REDACTED] graduates of the university, including [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] did not graduate from the [REDACTED] during that period and therefore [REDACTED] photograph does not appear in the yearbook.
8. During the course of the OIOS investigation, it was established that from [REDACTED] the [REDACTED], [REDACTED] had been undertaking a review of management and

administration practices at [REDACTED], focusing on several issues, including the printing of the yearbook. The [REDACTED], as part of its review, made requests to the [REDACTED] for information on the printing of the yearbook in [REDACTED]. The OIOS liaised with the [REDACTED] to avoid duplication of investigation. According to the most recent information, the [REDACTED] has not yet issued its report, which relates to administrative and management practices at [REDACTED] and not specifically to the printing of the yearbook. The [REDACTED] had no additional evidence to offer the OIOS concerning the printing of the yearbook.

III. APPLICABLE LAW

9. United Nations Staff Regulation 1.2:

(a) Staff members shall uphold and respect the principles set out in the Charter, including faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women. Consequently, staff members shall exhibit respect for all cultures; they shall not discriminate against any individual or group of individuals or otherwise abuse the power and authority vested in them.

(b) Staff members shall uphold the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity. The concept of integrity includes, but is not limited to, probity, impartiality, fairness, honesty and truthfulness in all matters affecting their work and status.

(q) Staff members shall use the property and assets of the Organization only for official purposes and shall exercise reasonable care when utilizing such property and assets.

10. United Nations Staff Rule 112.3:

Any staff member may be required to reimburse the United Nations either partially or in full for any financial loss suffered by the United Nations as a result of the staff member's negligence or of his or her having violated any regulation, rule or administrative instruction.

IV. METHODOLOGY

11. The OIOS interviewed [REDACTED] staff members involved in the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] of the yearbook, including [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. The OIOS also obtained and examined relevant documentary evidence, including the [REDACTED] card and e-mail correspondence.

12. [REDACTED] provided the OIOS with a written statement as discussed below.

V. INVESTIGATIVE DETAILS

13. The OIOS reviewed a copy of the yearbook printed at [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED] card authorizing the printing of the yearbook. [REDACTED] name appears on the [REDACTED] card as the requesting and authorizing officer. The special instructions section on the [REDACTED] card

contains the following typewritten words in French: "Accord de [redacted] et de [redacted]" ("Agreement of [redacted] and [redacted] is a computer based system and thus there are no manual signatures on the [redacted] card. [redacted]

A. Authorization to print the yearbook

14. [redacted] stated to the OIOS that [redacted] initiated the printing of the yearbook by instructing an assistant in [redacted], [redacted] to complete and issue a [redacted] card (see Annex 1). [redacted] confirmed to the OIOS that [redacted] told [redacted] the words to type under special instruction on the [redacted] card. [redacted] completed the [redacted] card in the system and forwarded it to the [redacted] Section. According to [redacted] this action authorized printing of the yearbook. Although the [redacted] card shows that both [redacted] and [redacted] agreed to the printing of the yearbook, [redacted] stated that only [redacted] instructed [redacted]. A review of the audit trail of the [redacted] system, confirmed that neither [redacted] nor [redacted] accessed the system with additional instructions.

15. [redacted] stated that upon completion of the printing on [redacted], [redacted] [redacted] Section, informed [redacted] that the yearbooks could be collected. Subsequent to their collection, [redacted] delivered them to [redacted] in [redacted] office. [redacted] told the OIOS that when [redacted] informed [redacted] the yearbooks were ready for collection, [redacted] had spontaneously remarked, "So, they are ready. I have to see [redacted]"

16. [redacted] stated to the OIOS that [redacted] first received a copy of the yearbook from [redacted] which was after [redacted] return from [redacted] in [redacted]. The yearbook was printed in the [redacted]. According to [redacted] [redacted] suggested to [redacted] that [redacted] should reprint the yearbook because of its connection to [redacted]. [redacted] confirmed to the OIOS that the yearbook contained photographs of [redacted] and [redacted] as both graduated at the [redacted] between [redacted] and [redacted]. [redacted] added that [redacted] and [redacted] jointly agreed to print hundred copies of the yearbook.

17. [redacted] stated that [redacted] justified [redacted] proposal for printing the yearbook as:

- a) [redacted] was a student at the [redacted] and it would be a nice gesture to present a yearbook to [redacted]
- b) The copy obtained by [redacted] in [redacted] appeared to be the only copy available, and therefore a reprint would produce more copies; and
- c) [redacted] and [redacted] were the [redacted] of the recently established [redacted] alumni association in [redacted]—it would be good to have additional copies of the yearbook.

18. [redacted] stated that at that time [redacted] was [redacted] and [redacted] would not go against [redacted] advice. [redacted] added that [redacted] was regarded as a powerful figure at [redacted] and staff members generally obeyed [redacted] instructions. [redacted] agreed

with [redacted] proposal and ensured that the special instructions on the [redacted] card reflected that it was [redacted] joint agreement to print the yearbook. [redacted] stated that, at the time, [redacted] did not believe the request was private in nature, and agreed to authorize the printing of the yearbook. [redacted] added that if [redacted] had not obtained a copy of the yearbook and proposed its printing, [redacted] would not have initiated the process.

19. During the investigation, [redacted] was frank and candid, admitting [redacted] responsibility for authorizing the printing of the yearbook as [redacted]. The OIOS noted that [redacted] did not in any way defer responsibility for the printing to [redacted] but rather clarified that [redacted] felt embarrassed by [redacted] disregard for the United Nations rules, which [redacted] had successfully upheld during fifteen years of service within the Organization. [redacted] conceded that the printing should not have been undertaken by [redacted] as it was not related to the work of the United Nations. [redacted] further acknowledged that [redacted] members would not raise objections to the printing of the yearbook because the [redacted] card specifically bore the instructions of [redacted] and [redacted]. During their interviews with OIOS, [redacted] agreed that staff members within the [redacted] Section would have no reason to question [redacted] authorization and issuance of a [redacted] card, given [redacted] position as [redacted].

20. [redacted] provided the OIOS with a written statement, dated [redacted] (see ANNEX 2). In it [redacted] wrote: "I took knowledge of this Yearbook when my [redacted] then [redacted] and [redacted] brought it from [redacted] vacation in [redacted]". [redacted] further stated: "We have discussed with [redacted] the quantity of the reprint: 100 copies". [redacted] concluded: "In the light of the above I do not remove any responsibility from myself and ready to assume my part of it".

21. During [redacted] interview with the OIOS, [redacted] at [redacted] confirmed to the OIOS that [redacted] initiated the printing of the yearbook. [redacted] advised that [redacted] summoned [redacted] to [redacted] office, where [redacted] showed [redacted] a copy of the yearbook and asked [redacted] if it would be possible to reproduce it at [redacted]. After consulting colleagues, [redacted] confirmed to [redacted] that it could be done if [redacted] received a [redacted] card to authorize the work.

22. When the OIOS first met with [redacted] on [redacted] [redacted] provided the OIOS investigators with a copy of the yearbook. On this occasion [redacted] also advised the OIOS that the [redacted] had previously been conducting enquiries into the matter. During a subsequent interview on [redacted] with the OIOS, [redacted] denied any knowledge or involvement in the authorization of the reproduction of the yearbook. [redacted] asserted that [redacted] did not discuss the printing of the yearbook or the creation of the [redacted] card with [redacted] or anyone else. [redacted] added that [redacted] felt uncomfortable that [redacted] name was included in the instruction on the [redacted] card and that [redacted] and [redacted] should have consulted [redacted] before using [redacted] name in such a manner.

23. [redacted] confirmed that [redacted] was in [redacted] between [redacted] and [redacted]. [redacted] denied that [redacted] obtained a copy of the yearbook during this visit or that [redacted] had brought a copy to [redacted] and passed it to [redacted]. [redacted] stated that [redacted] was unaware who brought the yearbook to [redacted] or how the reprinting of it was processed. [redacted] conceded that [redacted] had seen a copy of the [redacted] printed yearbook, either whilst [redacted] was visiting [redacted] during [redacted] or whilst [redacted] was in [redacted] in [redacted].

24. [redacted] stressed to the OIOS that [redacted] first became aware that [redacted] had reproduced the yearbook on [redacted] as a result of the [redacted] enquiries into the matter. [redacted] stated that prior to that date [redacted] had not seen a copy of the [redacted] reprint. According to [redacted] the [redacted] sent a memorandum to the [redacted] via [redacted] at the time [redacted] on [redacted] requesting further information on the printing of the yearbook. The memorandum was forwarded to [redacted] who then instructed [redacted] staff to assist with the [redacted] enquiry.

25. Although [redacted] denied any knowledge or involvement in the printing of the yearbook by [redacted], [redacted] accepted ultimate responsibility for its printing by virtue of [redacted] then position as [redacted]. [redacted] reiterated [redacted] denial and advised that [redacted] could not account for any comments made by [redacted] or anyone else with regard to [redacted] alleged involvement. The OIOS notes that [redacted] statement clearly contradicts [redacted] account.

26. On [redacted] [redacted] produced five copies of the yearbook, which [redacted] had with [redacted] in [redacted] office, to the OIOS. [redacted] stated that all the copies were printed at [redacted]. According to [redacted] [redacted] forwarded the copies to [redacted] through the internal mail system around [redacted] but the same day [redacted] received the [redacted] memorandum requesting details of the reproduction of the yearbook.

27. During [redacted] interview with the OIOS, [redacted] denied that [redacted] ever sent any copies of the yearbook to [redacted]. In fact, [redacted] stated that [redacted] was requested by [redacted] to retrieve a copy of the yearbook as a result of the [redacted] enquiry, the [redacted] Section had only three copies, [redacted] had one and [redacted] had two copies. [redacted] added that on [redacted] [redacted] sent one of [redacted] copies to [redacted] under memorandum (see Annex 3). [redacted] copied the memorandum to [redacted] and [redacted]. The OIOS established from [redacted] n, [redacted] to [redacted] that [redacted] delivered the memorandum and single copy of the yearbook to [redacted] who is the [redacted] to [redacted]. Thereafter, the yearbook was forwarded to [redacted] and ultimately received by the [redacted].

B. Printing of the Yearbook

28. The OIOS established that [redacted] printed about [redacted] of the yearbook. Although the [redacted] card indicates [redacted], [redacted] stated that they usually printed additional copies in case of damaged copies during the printing process. In this case, at least 30 extra copies were printed. [redacted] and [redacted] of the [redacted] Section, advised the OIOS that the scanning phase of the reproduction of the yearbook took approximately three weeks given the complexity of the task.

C. Distribution of the Yearbook

29. [redacted] related in [redacted] written statement (see Annex 2), that the day after the yearbooks were delivered to [redacted] by [redacted], [redacted] collected between [redacted] yearbooks from [redacted] office with the intention of delivering them to [redacted]. Although [redacted] did not witness [redacted] taking the yearbooks to [redacted] office, [redacted] later advised [redacted] that [redacted] had visited [redacted] office. When interviewed by the OIOS, [redacted] denied collecting the

yearbooks from [redacted] office and reiterated that [redacted] had no involvement or knowledge about the authorization, reproduction or subsequent distribution of the yearbooks.

30. The OIOS was unable to establish the means of distribution of the yearbooks. Neither [redacted] nor [redacted] who were also involved in the establishment of the [redacted] alumni association in [redacted] were aware that the yearbook had been printed at [redacted]. They had no knowledge whether [redacted] possessed copies of the yearbook or was involved in its distribution.

31. During [redacted] interview with the OIOS, [redacted] stated that [redacted] received one copy of the yearbook as a gift from the [redacted] and that it was either [redacted] or [redacted] who passed the yearbook to [redacted] sometime in late [redacted] or early [redacted]. Despite checking [redacted] office, [redacted] was unable to locate the yearbook and had no knowledge of its whereabouts; thus OIOS could not establish the origin thereof. [redacted] had no knowledge of the reproduction of the yearbook by [redacted] and considered its printing to be an improper use of [redacted] resources. [redacted] added that those responsible should reimburse the Organization for the associated costs.

D. Costs for the printing of the Yearbook

32. [redacted] informed the OIOS that the estimated cost of [redacted] for printing the yearbook, increased to [redacted] based on the actual pages and number of hours spent. [redacted] added that if the yearbooks had been printed commercially, the cost of printing would have been about [redacted] (about [redacted]).

33. The OIOS learned from [redacted] that no payment or reimbursement of the printing costs associated with the yearbook has been received from anyone up to and including [redacted].

VI. FINDINGS

34. The OIOS investigated first, whether [redacted] and [redacted] abused their power and authority, second, whether they misused the property and assets of the Organization for activities not related to the United Nations, and third, whether the Organization suffered any financial loss because of any improper activities.

35. The OIOS investigation established that in [redacted], the [redacted] Section printed more than [redacted] of the yearbook based on special instructions of [redacted] as outlined in a [redacted] card. The instruction on the [redacted] card reads: "Agreement of [redacted] and [redacted]. The yearbook contains photographs of [redacted] and [redacted] who were both graduates of the [redacted]. Also, that [redacted] and [redacted] are [redacted] of the recently established [redacted] alumni association in [redacted]. It was also established that [redacted] at one time, possessed at least [redacted] yearbooks printed at the [redacted].

A. [REDACTED]

36. [REDACTED] accepted full responsibility for improperly authorizing printing of at least [REDACTED] of the yearbook. [REDACTED] conceded to the OIOS that the yearbook was printed for private use, and was not related to the United Nations. [REDACTED] described [REDACTED] involvement in this matter as poor judgement on [REDACTED] part. [REDACTED] acknowledged that [REDACTED] staff simply followed the instructions contained on the [REDACTED] card and did not question it because the instruction bore [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] names. Staff members interviewed by the OIOS, confirmed this position; they stated that given the level of authority, staff within the [REDACTED] will have no reason to question [REDACTED] authorization for printing the yearbook.

B. [REDACTED]

37. [REDACTED] accepted ultimate responsibility for the improper printing of the yearbook for non-official use by virtue of [REDACTED] then position as [REDACTED]. As [REDACTED] which includes [REDACTED] [REDACTED] had responsibility for all printing work undertaken by [REDACTED] at the time the yearbooks were printed. However, [REDACTED] denied any knowledge or involvement in the printing of the yearbook by [REDACTED]. The OIOS does not accept [REDACTED] reliance on ignorance for reasons set forth below.

38. Evidence shows, on a balance of probabilities, that [REDACTED] was indeed involved in the authorization to reproduce the yearbooks. According to [REDACTED] the decision to reproduce the yearbook was a joint agreement between [REDACTED] direct [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] had originally received a copy of the yearbook from [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] return from [REDACTED] in late [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] added that it was [REDACTED] initiative to print the yearbook at [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] had full knowledge of its printing and agreed to hundred copies being printed, thus, [REDACTED] instruction on the [REDACTED] card. [REDACTED] confirmed that [REDACTED] later collected at least twenty yearbooks from [REDACTED] office with the intention of delivering them to [REDACTED].

39. The evidence as to [REDACTED] role in the decision to print the yearbooks is largely based upon the admission of [REDACTED]. The OIOS attributes credibility to [REDACTED] information as [REDACTED] has fully acknowledged [REDACTED] own role in the printing of the yearbook and has provided a written statement to that effect. The OIOS believes that [REDACTED] has nothing to gain by implicating [REDACTED] in the rather close-knit working environment in [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stepping forward and implicating [REDACTED] direct [REDACTED] requires significant courage and confidence in light of personal or career ramifications that may result from such disclosure.

40. In addition to [REDACTED] implication of [REDACTED] the OIOS found that [REDACTED] was in possession of six copies of the yearbook in [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] claimed that he obtained the copies from [REDACTED] a fact that [REDACTED] denied.

41. Whilst [REDACTED] created the [REDACTED] card and followed [REDACTED] instructions, the information on that card, namely that the reproduction was jointly agreed by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] must be assessed against the fact that neither [REDACTED] nor anyone else was party to the alleged discussion between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. However, when [REDACTED] informed [REDACTED] that the yearbooks had been printed, [REDACTED]

spontaneously remarked to - "I have to see This remark adds further credence to statement.

42. It should be noted that no members of the alumni interviewed by the OIOS indicated that possessed or distributed any copies of the yearbook. However, stated that attended an alumni association meeting in early 2006 along with and and observed that was in possession of at least four or five copies of the yearbook. As of the alumni association in and taking into account the significance of the yearbook for this association, it would be unlikely if did not discuss the printing of the yearbook at with

43. confirmed receipt of one copy of the yearbook as a gift from the albeit, alleged that the copy in question was passed to from either or Significantly, received this yearbook around the time of printing of the yearbooks at

44. The OIOS found that clearly, spontaneously and unambiguously implicated and in the decision to have the yearbook reproduced at Although denied any knowledge or involvement in the printing of the yearbook, evidence shows that should have been involved, or at least must have had some knowledge about the printing of the yearbook.

45. The OIOS found that and abused their power and authority by authorizing the improper printing of the yearbook, using the property and assets for non-official purposes.

46. Lastly, the OIOS ascertained the cost of the reproduction of the yearbooks amounted to This sum was borne by the United Nations.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

47. The OIOS concludes that violated Staff Regulation 1.2(b) by failing to uphold the standards of conduct and integrity expected of an international civil servant, particularly in the ways set forth below.

48. The OIOS concludes that abused authority in violation of Staff Regulation 1.2(a) by instructing staff through the DRITS system to improperly print the yearbook, well knowing that the reproduction was not for official purposes, and that instruction will not be questioned by staff.

49. The OIOS concludes that violated Staff Regulation 1.2(q) by authorizing to print a private publication, thus using the property and assets of the Organization for non-official purposes.

50. The OIOS concludes that violated Staff Regulation 1.2(b) by failing to uphold the standards of conduct and integrity expected of an international civil servant, particularly in the ways set forth below.

51. The OIOS concludes that [REDACTED] abused [REDACTED] authority in violation of Staff Regulation 1.2 (a) when [REDACTED] as the [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] initiated and authorized printing of a private publication by [REDACTED] through [REDACTED] [REDACTED] which reproduction [REDACTED] knew was not for official purposes.

52. The OIOS concludes that [REDACTED] violated Staff Regulation 1.2(q) by authorizing [REDACTED] print a private publication, thus using the property and assets of the Organization for non-official purposes.

53. The OIOS concludes that the printing of non-official publication for purposes not related to United Nations activities caused financial loss to the Organization in the amount of [REDACTED]

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

54. In view of the findings of this investigation, the OIOS recommends:

Recommendation 1: The OIOS recommends that [REDACTED] takes appropriate action against [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in light of the above findings and conclusions. (ID Rec. No. IV06/324/01)

Recommendation 2: The OIOS recommends that [REDACTED] takes appropriate action against [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in light of the above findings and conclusions. (ID Rec. No. IV06/324/02)

Recommendation 3: The OIOS recommends that [REDACTED] recovers the costs of printing the yearbooks (7,414 [REDACTED]) from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] (ID Rec. No. IV06/324/03)

Recommendation 4: The OIOS recommends that [REDACTED] implements safeguards to ensure that printing through [REDACTED] system are only for official purposes. (ID Rec. No. IV06/324/04)
