



United Nations

Nations Unies

**OFFICE OF INTERNAL OVERSIGHT SERVICES
INVESTIGATIONS DIVISION**

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

**INVESTIGATIONS REPORT ON ALLEGED COLLUSION AND
CONFLICT OF INTERESTS REGARDING A [REDACTED] OF
THE UNITED NATIONS [REDACTED]**

ID Case No. 0555/06

REDACTED

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

2 APRIL 2007

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.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	3
II.	INVESTIGATIVE DETAILS	3
	A) "NO-SHOW" [REDACTED]	3
	B) OUTSIDE ACTIVITY	5
	C) RETALIATION	6
III	CONCLUSION	6
IV.	RECOMMENDATION	6

I. Introduction

1. On [REDACTED] a [REDACTED] for the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] complained to the Investigations Division of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) as follows:

a) [REDACTED] a [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] based in [REDACTED] colluded with some [REDACTED] residents contracted to perform [REDACTED] work for the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to kick-back a percentage of their salaries to [REDACTED] and one local [REDACTED] knowing that these [REDACTED] did not deliver any work to [REDACTED]

b) [REDACTED] had an ownership interest in a company, "[REDACTED]" ([REDACTED] which lists [REDACTED] as a client; and

c) [REDACTED] considered [REDACTED] reassignment to a [REDACTED] position in [REDACTED] as retaliation for bringing above allegations to the attention of United Nations authorities.

2. [REDACTED] had been [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] for about [REDACTED] before [REDACTED] became a staff member with [REDACTED] in [REDACTED]. Both with [REDACTED] and with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was engaged in assignments in which [REDACTED] facilitated [REDACTED] projects.²

II Investigative details

A) "No-show" [REDACTED]

3. The OIOS notes that the allegation concerning "no-show" [REDACTED] contracted by [REDACTED] was brought to the attention of the Office [REDACTED] of the [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. After an assessment of the allegation, the [REDACTED] concluded that it was a low risk/low priority matter that did not warrant investigation, and that the matter be closed regardless of "potentially sufficient material to support the allegation"⁴

4. The OIOS obtained contact information of nine alleged "no-show" [REDACTED] contracted by [REDACTED] during [REDACTED]. However, the OIOS succeeded to contact only one of these [REDACTED] as telephone numbers were either disconnected or not answered.⁵ According to [REDACTED], one of the alleged "no-show" [REDACTED] [REDACTED] had worked for [REDACTED] as an [REDACTED] until [REDACTED] and regularly submitted reports to [REDACTED] offices for which [REDACTED] was paid. [REDACTED] denied receiving salaries for services not rendered and showed the OIOS income tax payments relating to payments received from

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Figure 1: [REDACTED]

9. During [REDACTED] interview with the OIOS, [REDACTED] confirmed that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] are [REDACTED] of the registered [REDACTED]. According to [REDACTED] more than [REDACTED] ago, before [REDACTED] employment with [REDACTED], [REDACTED] had a contract with [REDACTED] for work on an [REDACTED] project, but the company was now inactive.¹⁰ However, the OIOS found that at the time of issuing the report, [REDACTED] had an active website. In addition [REDACTED] was approved as a [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] in [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] was not aware of Staff Regulation 1.2(m), which prohibits staff members from active association with, or a financial interest in, any profit-making, business or other concern which would allow the staff member to benefit from the association or financial interest by reason of his position with the United Nations.¹²

10. The OIOS found that [REDACTED] violated Staff Regulation 1.2(m) in that [REDACTED] is the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] of [REDACTED].

C) Retaliation

11. The [REDACTED] receives complaints of retaliation and conducts preliminary reviews of these complaints.¹³ If credible evidence of retaliation or threat of retaliation is found, the [REDACTED] refers the matter to the OIOS for investigation.

12. The OIOS noted that [REDACTED] followed this procedure and filed a complaint with the [REDACTED].¹⁴ Upon examining this complaint, the [REDACTED] found no "credible link between the disclosure of wrongdoing and alleged retaliation", and therefore did not refer the case to the OIOS.¹⁵ Upon its review of the same complaint, the OIOS concurred with the conclusion of the [REDACTED].

III. Conclusion

13. The OIOS concludes that despite indications of possible mismanagement concerning the [REDACTED] contracts, no evidence could be found that [REDACTED] was involved in selecting [REDACTED] while [REDACTED] was in the employment of [REDACTED] or that [REDACTED] received kick-backs from [REDACTED] as alleged by [REDACTED].

14. The OIOS concludes that [REDACTED] is in breach of Staff Regulation 1.2(m) in

[REDACTED]

that [REDACTED] is actively associated with the management of [REDACTED] a company that he and [REDACTED] owns, as admitted by [REDACTED] during [REDACTED] interview with the OIOS.

15. The OIOS found no evidence of retaliation against [REDACTED].

IV. Recommendation

16. In view of its findings, the OIOS recommends that [REDACTED] take appropriate action concerning [REDACTED] [REDACTED] interest, while a [REDACTED] staff member, in [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (ID Rec. No. IV06/555/01)