



United Nations

Nations Unies

**OFFICE OF INTERNAL OVERSIGHT SERVICES
INVESTIGATIONS DIVISION**

*This Report is protected by paragraph 18 of
ST/SGB/273 of 7 September 1994*

INVESTIGATION REPORT ON THE FRAUDULENT USE OF



REDACTED REPORT

ID Case No. 0016-09

23 JUNE 2009

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 confidentiality and sensitive information. OIOS's transmission of this Report does not constitute its publication. OIOS does not bear any responsibility for any further dissemination of the Report.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. On [REDACTED], the Investigations Division of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) received a report of possible misconduct implicating United Nations personnel in [REDACTED].
2. Specifically, [REDACTED] reported that [REDACTED] had fraudulently utilized the [REDACTED] assigned to other [REDACTED] in order to obtain [REDACTED].
3. OIOS conducted investigations into the matter and found that [REDACTED] had misused the [REDACTED] of [REDACTED].
4. This report details the investigation into [REDACTED] participation and involvement in the reported misconduct.

II. APPLICABLE LEGAL NORMS

5. ST/AI/1999/7 – Consultants and Individual Contractors (1 September 1999)
Section 5 –
Standards of conduct

5.5 ...During the period of their service for the United Nations, [REDACTED] shall refrain from any conduct that would adversely reflect on the United Nations and shall not engage in any activity that is incompatible with the aims and objectives of the Organization.

III. IMPLICATED PERSONNEL

6. [REDACTED] a [REDACTED] began [REDACTED] with the Organization on [REDACTED] as [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] was not renewed and [REDACTED] was subsequently separated on [REDACTED].

IV. METHODOLOGY

7. The OIOS investigation included, but was not limited to the analysis of [REDACTED]
 - i) [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]
 - ii) [REDACTED] documentation identifying [REDACTED] assigned to the [REDACTED] and/or [REDACTED] from which fraudulent [REDACTED] originated.
8. Finally, OIOS interviewed all relevant witnesses and subjects pertaining to this matter.

V. BACKGROUND

[REDACTED]

9. Due to an increase in [REDACTED] traffic to [REDACTED], [REDACTED] experienced [REDACTED] congestion which impacted upon their operational capability. Therefore a [REDACTED] was required to initiate a [REDACTED] that were not [REDACTED]. As the United Nations has limited [REDACTED] resources, the [REDACTED] were only provided to [REDACTED] with [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] also enabled [REDACTED] to place [REDACTED] at a [REDACTED] than that offered by the [REDACTED]. As a result only [REDACTED] could be [REDACTED] without a [REDACTED]; all other [REDACTED] required the [REDACTED] to input their [REDACTED].

[REDACTED]

10. According to the [REDACTED] 'Guidelines on the Use of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] catered for the demand for [REDACTED] services with, amongst other things, the employment of the [REDACTED] in the [REDACTED].

11. The [REDACTED] have the capability of retrieving [REDACTED] input by [REDACTED] without the need for [REDACTED]. Therefore, individual [REDACTED] assigned to [REDACTED] were compromised once they utilized the [REDACTED] allocated to other [REDACTED].

VI. INVESTIGATIVE DETAILS**A. [REDACTED] ASSISTED IDENTIFICATION OF SUBJECT**

12. After receiving complaints from [REDACTED] about [REDACTED] to their [REDACTED] that had not been personally incurred, [REDACTED] and OIOS collaborated in the identification of possible subjects. The results revealed that [REDACTED] incurred [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] that originated from the [REDACTED] assigned to [REDACTED].

B. ANALYSIS OF [REDACTED]

13. All relevant information from the respective [REDACTED] was entered into [REDACTED]. This data was then analyzed by sorting and cross-referencing the disputed [REDACTED] with the originating [REDACTED] which were then matched with the individual(s) assigned to those [REDACTED]. The disputed [REDACTED] produced by the [REDACTED] contained [REDACTED] implicating [REDACTED] in the misuse of their [REDACTED]. In addition, the analysis undertaken by OIOS extrapolated further [REDACTED] which were possibly misused by [REDACTED].

[REDACTED]

14. OIOS calculated that the [REDACTED] defrauded totalled [REDACTED] in [REDACTED]. The affected [REDACTED] and a summary of the unauthorized [REDACTED] are depicted in [REDACTED].

C. INTERVIEW WITH THE SUBJECT

15. [REDACTED] was interviewed by OIOS on [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] told OIOS that [REDACTED] had been allocated the [REDACTED] since [REDACTED]; however, [REDACTED] was never allocated a [REDACTED].

16. [REDACTED] admitted that [REDACTED] utilized the [REDACTED] facility to call [REDACTED] but that [REDACTED] was unaware the [REDACTED] were issued to [REDACTED] on an individual basis.

17. When asked how [REDACTED] obtained the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] was provided the information from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

18. [REDACTED] claimed that, upon the demand of [REDACTED] left [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] and also because [REDACTED] did not receive a [REDACTED] with the [REDACTED].

19. At the beginning of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] recalled that when [REDACTED] received [REDACTED] back from [REDACTED] found many [REDACTED] recorded and the [REDACTED] listed on the [REDACTED]. Apparently [REDACTED] advised [REDACTED] that this [REDACTED] enabled [REDACTED].

20. [REDACTED] claimed that it was not until [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] that the [REDACTED] were allocated to [REDACTED] on an individual basis.

21. During [REDACTED] subsequent interview on [REDACTED] [REDACTED] elaborated on further aspects of [REDACTED] previous interview. [REDACTED] stated that it was the beginning of [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] allowed [REDACTED] to borrow [REDACTED] and when it was returned the [REDACTED] was recorded and that [REDACTED] how the [REDACTED] worked. [REDACTED] claimed that [REDACTED] said it was a general [REDACTED], free of charge to be used by everybody for making [REDACTED] then began to use the [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] outside [REDACTED].

22. [REDACTED] stated that in [REDACTED] allowed [REDACTED] to use the [REDACTED] again and when it was returned there were [REDACTED] made through the [REDACTED], with the [REDACTED] duration of not less than [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] queried [REDACTED] as to whether [REDACTED].

[REDACTED]

made these [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] confirmed that [REDACTED] had. Apparently [REDACTED] further stated that the use of the [REDACTED] was a serious problem and it was illegal and if the [REDACTED] became aware of their usage, then they would both be suspended from [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that from the day [REDACTED] advised [REDACTED] about the illegality of their actions, [REDACTED] never used the [REDACTED], nor allowed anyone to borrow [REDACTED].

23. [REDACTED] admitted that [REDACTED] failed to provide this additional information about the [REDACTED] made by [REDACTED] during the [REDACTED] interview or [REDACTED] previous OIOS interview because [REDACTED] did not want further problems. [REDACTED]

24. [REDACTED] expressed remorse for [REDACTED] actions and confirmed that [REDACTED] had not provided the [REDACTED] to others, however [REDACTED] was aware that [REDACTED] had given these details to [REDACTED].

VII. FINDINGS

25. OIOS finds that [REDACTED] is responsible for the fraudulent misuse of [REDACTED] of [REDACTED], totalling [REDACTED] in [REDACTED].

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

26. Based on the evidence collected and the findings above, OIOS concludes that [REDACTED] contravened the standards of conduct pursuant to the terms of [REDACTED] obligations with the [REDACTED].

IX. RECOMMENDATIONS

27. In view of the preceding findings, OIOS makes the following recommendation:

Recommendation 1: It is recommended that the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] take appropriate action with regard to [REDACTED].