



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*

**REPORT OF THE INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGATIONS OF  
SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND ABUSE OF AUTHORITY BY A  
██████████ UNITED NATIONS ██████████ STAFF MEMBER  
IN ██████████**

**REDACTED REPORT**

**ID Case No. 0627/06**

**29 MAY 2007**

**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.

## Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION	3
II.	BACKGROUND INFORMATION	3
III.	APPLICABLE LAW	3
IV.	METHODOLOGY	5
V.	INVESTIGATIVE DETAILS	5
VI.	FINDINGS	11
VII.	CONCLUSIONS	12
VIII.	RECOMMENDATIONS	13

ALLEGATIONS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND ABUSE OF AUTHORITY  
BY A ██████████ IN THE

I. INTRODUCTION

1. On ██████████ the Investigations Division of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (ID/OIOS) received, from the ██████████, allegations of sexual harassment and abuse of authority against ██████████ the ██████████).

2. It was alleged that ██████████ had sexually harassed a number of female staff members of the ██████████ section of the ██████████. Additional allegations received against ██████████ included:

- a. engagement in retaliatory actions against staff members;
- b. that ██████████ had, on a number of occasions, ordered one of ██████████ to deliver young local ██████████ to ██████████ place of residence;
- c. ██████████ authoritarian ██████████ style and use of abusive and threatening language towards staff members;
- d. ██████████ use of a staff member to perform domestic duties at ██████████ place of residence.

3. During the course of the ID/OIOS investigation, an additional allegation was received that ██████████ had offered a ██████████ bribe to one of the alleged ██████████ ██████████ in exchange for information regarding the ID/OIOS investigation.

II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

4. The ██████████ was established in ██████████. The ██████████'s main ██████████ was initially based at the ██████████ however, in late ██████████ it was relocated to the ██████████ - ██████████. The ██████████ comprises a ██████████ section and a ██████████ section – the allegations against ██████████ pertain to the ██████████ section. On its establishment, the ██████████ comprised one ██████████ the ██████████ now comprises a total of ██████████ staff members, who are ██████████ amongst seven ██████████ in the ██████████ area. The staffing table includes ██████████ and ██████████ staff. ██████████ was appointed the ██████████ on ██████████

III. APPLICABLE LAW

5. Chapter 14, Subchapter D, Section 14.77 of the ██████████ Penal Law provides:

*"A person who knowingly has sexual contact with another person or causes such other to have sexual contact with him or her, when they are not married to each other, has committed a second degree misdemeanor if:*

*(a) The actor knows that the contact is offensive to the other person when such other person is not a voluntary social companion or has not previously permitted sexual liberties to be taken."*

6. Chapter 14, Subchapter C, Section 14.51 of the [REDACTED] Penal Law provides:

*"A person, who with purpose of offending another person not a member of his household, by any means strikes or touches such other person, is guilty of an infraction [...]."*

7. 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."*

8. Staff Rule 101.2

*(d) "Any form of discrimination or harassment, including sexual or gender harassment, as well as physical or verbal abuse at the workplace or in connection with work is prohibited."*

9. ST/AI/379 of 29 October 1992

2. *"Sexual harassment is defined as any unwelcome sexual advance, request for sexual favours or other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature, when it interferes with work, is made a condition of employment or creates an intimidating, hostile or offensive work environment. It is particularly serious when behaviour of this kind is engaged in by any official who is in a position to influence the career or employment conditions (including hiring, assignment, contract renewal, performance evaluation or promotion) of the recipient of such attentions."*

10. ST/IC1996/29

7(c) *"Abuse of authority includes, for example, any discharge of management responsibilities and any act or failure to act, which is motivated other than by the interests of the Organization."*

#### IV. METHODOLOGY

11. ID/OIOS conducted an investigation of the allegations, which included, but was not limited to, the interview of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] staff members, including [REDACTED]; the interview of non-UN persons, and the review and analysis of relevant documents, including personnel files, email and telephone records.

#### V. INVESTIGATIVE DETAILS

##### Sexual Harassment

12. ID/OIOS interviewed [REDACTED] who stated that [REDACTED] began [REDACTED] duties with the [REDACTED] in early-[REDACTED] where [REDACTED] was initially employed as a [REDACTED] and later as an [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that whilst transporting [REDACTED] to and from [REDACTED] place of residence and work, [REDACTED] was sexually harassed by [REDACTED] and that [REDACTED] was subsequently [REDACTED] when [REDACTED] refused [REDACTED] advances. The alleged harassment comprised declarations that [REDACTED] was attracted to and wanted to engage in a sexual relationship; invitations to [REDACTED] residence; queries about [REDACTED] and previous sexual partners; and inquiries about strip clubs in [REDACTED] to which the both of them could visit. These incidents allegedly occurred between late-[REDACTED] and early-[REDACTED]; however, they were not recorded in any way and [REDACTED] did not report them to anyone until early to mid-[REDACTED] when [REDACTED] detailed [REDACTED] allegations to other alleged victims. [REDACTED] attributed [REDACTED] delay in reporting to [REDACTED] belief that [REDACTED] was a sole victim and that there seemed little value in making a report.

13. ID/OIOS established that in [REDACTED] allegations and other staff complaints against [REDACTED] were addressed by [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that [REDACTED] denied the allegations of [REDACTED] and stated that [REDACTED] and other staff members did not like being made to work hard. [REDACTED] reiterated this sentiment and [REDACTED] denial of [REDACTED] allegations when interviewed by ID/OIOS. [REDACTED] proffered that [REDACTED] and the other alleged [REDACTED] may have colluded in raising their allegations against [REDACTED] as, at one time or another, [REDACTED] had had cause to reprimand the alleged [REDACTED] for poor work performance. However, ID/OIOS found no record of complaint or reprimand in [REDACTED] personnel file. Moreover, ID/OIOS found no evidence of collusion between [REDACTED] and other alleged [REDACTED].

14. ID/OIOS found [REDACTED] credibility somewhat undermined by the subsequent alleged bribery offer to [REDACTED] by [REDACTED] who allegedly sought information from [REDACTED] about the ID/OIOS investigation. [REDACTED] gave evidence of alleged disclosures to them by [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] had solicited information from [REDACTED] about the ID/OIOS investigation and that thereafter [REDACTED] had given [REDACTED] – however, [REDACTED] refuted this evidence. In interview with ID/OIOS, [REDACTED] confirmed a meeting and conversation with [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] office on the relevant date and time; however, [REDACTED] stated that they had discussed work issues and that [REDACTED] had given [REDACTED] to purchase [REDACTED] lunch. [REDACTED] refuted [REDACTED] evidence.

15. ID/OIOS interviewed [REDACTED] who stated that [REDACTED] began [REDACTED] duties as a [REDACTED] with the [REDACTED] in early [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS of having been sexually harassed by [REDACTED] which included declarations of wanting to engage in a relationship with [REDACTED]; that sometime in [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] office [REDACTED] grabbed [REDACTED] on the breast and in early [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] again grabbed [REDACTED] on the breast. Moreover, that [REDACTED] was transferred to the sectors after refusing [REDACTED]'s unwanted advances. [REDACTED] further alleged that sometime later, [REDACTED] approved [REDACTED] request for [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] on condition that [REDACTED] visit [REDACTED] private residence and that [REDACTED] was annoyed when [REDACTED] did not visit. [REDACTED] claimed that this may have been the reason for [REDACTED] denial of a subsequent [REDACTED] submission.

16. The alleged harassment occurred in early-[REDACTED] and that sometime during the same period, [REDACTED] whilst in company with another alleged [REDACTED] - [REDACTED] reported the alleged harassment to [REDACTED] the [REDACTED]. Following a subsequent alleged incident of sexual harassment involving [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] reported the alleged sexual harassment of them both by [REDACTED] to [REDACTED]. Both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] admitted to ID/OIOS of having received the reports from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and of having taken no action pursuant to the respective reports. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] was a shy [REDACTED] and did not know how to broach the subject with [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that [REDACTED] had great respect for [REDACTED] and did not think it was [REDACTED] responsibility to report such matters.

17. [REDACTED] denied [REDACTED]'s allegations. [REDACTED] described [REDACTED] as failing to have met [REDACTED] work expectations and that [REDACTED] was [REDACTED] however, these sentiments are not reflected in [REDACTED] personnel assessments where [REDACTED] is, as with the other alleged sexual harassment [REDACTED] the [REDACTED] for their [REDACTED].

18. ID/OIOS interviewed [REDACTED] who stated that [REDACTED] began [REDACTED] duties as a [REDACTED] with the [REDACTED] in early-[REDACTED], having previously been employed on a voluntary basis. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that during [REDACTED] period of voluntary [REDACTED], [REDACTED] was in the habit of hugging [REDACTED] in a way that made [REDACTED] feel uncomfortable. No other [REDACTED] personnel described this alleged practice by [REDACTED] and, in interview with ID/OIOS, [REDACTED] denied initiating any such greeting with [REDACTED] staff though admitted that some staff members greeted [REDACTED] on return from periods of absence in such a manner.

19. [REDACTED] stated that during this same voluntary duty period, [REDACTED] sought to meet with [REDACTED] at a [REDACTED] for no apparent reason, which made [REDACTED] feel uncomfortable. On a number of occasions, [REDACTED] allegedly asked [REDACTED] to meet [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] residence, again for no apparent reason, but which [REDACTED] believed was for the purposes of forming a sexual relationship. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] had been grabbed - on three separate occasions - on the breast by [REDACTED] whilst taking [REDACTED]. These incidents allegedly occurred between early-[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and immediately after the final such sexual contact, [REDACTED] immediately reported the incident to [REDACTED] and thereafter to [REDACTED] who failed to take appropriate action. [REDACTED] also reported the alleged sexual harassment to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

██████████ All of these witnesses confirmed to ID/OIOS that ██████████ reported the allegations to them.

20. ██████████ denied ██████████ allegations. As previously stated, ██████████ suggested that the alleged ██████████ had concocted their allegations as a result of various reprimands of them for poor work performance. ██████████ described ██████████ to be of average professional standard and that on occasion ██████████ had had to raise ██████████ voice when speaking with ██████████ because ██████████ had not followed instructions. ██████████ had also corrected ██████████ regarding inappropriate attire in the workplace. Other than a letter of caution from ██████████ for inattentiveness at work, these criticisms of ██████████ were not reflected in ██████████ personnel file.

21. ID/OIOS interviewed ██████████ who stated that since early-██████████ ██████████ has worked as a ██████████ with the ██████████ on both a casual and full-time basis. ██████████ told ID/OIOS of having been called on a ██████████ in mid-██████████ by ██████████ for a meeting as ██████████ wanted to spend some time with ██████████. ██████████ stated that ██████████ did not attend the meeting as a result of concerns based on office rumors about ██████████. ██████████ stated that ██████████ subsequent professional relationship with ██████████ was very unpleasant. No corroborative evidence for the allegations was tendered by ██████████ and none was found by ID/OIOS. ██████████ denied ██████████ allegations.

22. ID/OIOS interviewed ██████████ who stated that ██████████ had been a ██████████ with the ██████████ since late-██████████ ██████████ told ID/OIOS that on numerous occasions, ██████████ asked ██████████ to come to ██████████ residence and that ██████████ believed this to be a pretext for forming a sexual relationship with ██████████. Moreover, ██████████ stated that sometime in ██████████ ██████████ had on ██████████ occasions grabbed ██████████ while in ██████████ office at the ██████████ and attempted to kiss ██████████. ██████████ further alleged that in early-██████████, whilst in ██████████ office at the ██████████ ██████████ had placed ██████████ hand in ██████████ blouse with the intention of grabbing ██████████ breast. ██████████ stated that ██████████ refusal to submit to ██████████ unwanted advances resulted in ██████████ being reviewed and changed from a ██████████ to a ██████████ employment period. ██████████ denied ██████████ allegations. ID/OIOS found that ██████████'s performance appraisal for the relevant period records a "fully successful performance"; however, a report written by ██████████ describes ██████████ performance as fair and that ██████████ required monitoring.

23. When interviewed by ID/OIOS, none of the alleged ██████████ was able to particularize the dates on which the alleged incidents of sexual harassment by ██████████ occurred.

#### Abuse of Authority

24. A large number of alleged incidents of abuse of authority and verbal abuse were reported to ID/OIOS involving ██████████ ID/OIOS interviews of ██████████ personnel found ██████████ staff members, including ██████████ staff, either reported and/or witnessed incidents that they felt were an abuse of authority by ██████████. ID/OIOS was told of verbal abuse by ██████████ of staff members, either in public or in private, in relation to work habits. Moreover, that such abuse was often followed by threats of contract

termination or non-renewal of contracts. Complaints of excessively long work hours being required of staff were also raised, as were complaints that staff were [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] unfairly and that leave and [REDACTED] requests were not approved by [REDACTED]

25. In contrast to the complaints raised, the balance of respondents, other witnesses interviewed and [REDACTED] gave evidence of the difficulties faced by [REDACTED] in dealing in a high-pressure environment with [REDACTED] staff who were allegedly lazy; not interested in learning new tasks; showed little respect for authority and often did not carry out instructions from more [REDACTED] staff. In interview with ID/OIOS, [REDACTED] conceded that [REDACTED] raised [REDACTED] voice in frustration but also felt it was necessary in order to make [REDACTED] point; however, [REDACTED] never threatened staff with contract termination or non-renewal of contract. [REDACTED] further conceded that [REDACTED] expected staff to work long hours but [REDACTED] staff often walked out at [REDACTED] whether or not they were actually [REDACTED] at the time and that [REDACTED] had been found on occasion [REDACTED] with no [REDACTED] staff. ID/OIOS established that following an intervention by the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] tempered [REDACTED] demands for long work hours and declared observance of the [REDACTED] designated work hours for [REDACTED] staff.

26. [REDACTED] denied the allegation that [REDACTED] continually denied staff members annual leave or the approval of their [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] insisted that they take their annual leave days; however, [REDACTED] was aware that they were reluctant to do so because they would not be entitled to any hazard payments during their time on leave. With respect to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] personnel, [REDACTED] stated that this was part of [REDACTED] management portfolio, which [REDACTED] confirmed to ID/OIOS but stated that despite [REDACTED] responsibilities staff often made administrative requests, such as leave and [REDACTED] applications, directly to [REDACTED]

27. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that upon entering on [REDACTED] staff were told of the possibility of [REDACTED], which they accepted. [REDACTED] stated that staff on [REDACTED] were given appropriate notice; however, on occasion, due to the exigencies of the service, they were [REDACTED] with short notice and that this was an inevitable consequence of the nature of their work.

28. Several staff members raised concerns that [REDACTED] a [REDACTED] staff member employed as an [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] was being used by [REDACTED] to perform domestic duties at [REDACTED] residence in the [REDACTED] ID/OIOS interviewed [REDACTED] who stated that [REDACTED] had been to [REDACTED] residence on [REDACTED] occasions to assist [REDACTED] who were being [REDACTED] within the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] denied ever performing domestic duties for [REDACTED] however, [REDACTED] stated that at times [REDACTED] would obtain [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] if [REDACTED] was getting some for [REDACTED] [REDACTED] confirmed, to ID/OIOS, that [REDACTED] had assisted [REDACTED] at the [REDACTED] on occasion, generally on a [REDACTED] [REDACTED] denied ever having asked [REDACTED] to perform any domestic service at [REDACTED] residence.

Allegation of Bribery

29. On [redacted] ID/OIOS was informed by [redacted] that [redacted] had been visited at [redacted] home that evening by [redacted] [redacted] stated that [redacted] had told [redacted] that, several times that day while at the [redacted] [redacted] had been approached by [redacted] who asked to speak to [redacted] regarding [redacted] interview with ID/OIOS. Later that day, [redacted] had allegedly called [redacted] into [redacted] office and again asked about [redacted] discussions with ID/OIOS investigators. [redacted] allegedly refused to tell [redacted]; nonetheless, [redacted] gave [redacted] [redacted] stated that [redacted] reportedly discussed the matter later with several other staff members.

30. [redacted] a [redacted] assigned to the [redacted] who took over [redacted] duties upon [redacted] and [redacted] an [redacted] told ID/OIOS that [redacted] had shown them a new [redacted] note, which [redacted] claimed to have been given by [redacted] in the period shortly after it had allegedly been given to [redacted] by [redacted] Furthermore, [redacted] told ID/OIOS that, on the morning of [redacted] while collecting [redacted] from [redacted] residence, [redacted] had been asked by [redacted] what the ID/OIOS investigators had been interested in during their interview with [redacted] [redacted] stated that [redacted] informed [redacted] that the investigators had told [redacted] not to discuss the matter and [redacted] asked [redacted] not to mention it again.

31. When interviewed by ID/OIOS, [redacted] and [redacted] both denied the alleged bribery. [redacted] told ID/OIOS that [redacted] had spoken with [redacted] in [redacted] office at the relevant time and date and of giving [redacted] for the purchase of [redacted] lunch, which was never provided and [redacted] money not returned. [redacted] told ID/OIOS that [redacted] attended in [redacted] office, discussed work-related issues and then left. [redacted] denied ever having received any moneys from [redacted]

Procuring of Young Prostitutes at [redacted]

32. ID/OIOS established that [redacted] resides alone in a [redacted] in the [redacted] within a building that houses the [redacted] [redacted] has been a resident of the [redacted] since [redacted] arrival in [redacted]

33. [redacted] situated on the outskirts of [redacted] and houses [redacted] comprising [redacted] houses, smaller [redacted] and [redacted] that are divided into [redacted] The [redacted] houses a [redacted] It is surrounded by a [redacted] and has [redacted] a local [redacted] is contracted to provide [redacted] services for the [redacted] including [redacted] and providing [redacted] Additional [redacted] is provided by [redacted] personnel as the [redacted] resides within the [redacted] however, this [redacted] detail is confined to the [redacted] residence and the main gate. The [redacted] is privately owned and all of the residents are [redacted]

34. As part of the investigation process, ID/OIOS sent an e-mail questionnaire to all UN staff residing in the [redacted] The questionnaire solicited their

views on [redacted] access; unauthorized [redacted] in the [redacted]; approaches by [redacted] women offering sexual services and any information on residents suspected of engagement in sexual activities with local [redacted].

35. [redacted] responded to the questionnaire. [redacted] respondents stated that they were not happy with the access arrangements into the [redacted] respondents had noticed [redacted] in the [redacted] who they thought were out of place; [redacted] respondents had been propositioned by local [redacted] for sex within the [redacted] and [redacted] respondents knew of other residents in the [redacted] who were engaged in sexual activities with [redacted]. None of the respondents nominated [redacted] as being involved in any illicit activities with [redacted].

36. ID/OIOS interviewed [redacted] the [redacted] of [redacted] and [redacted] the [redacted] of [redacted] who stated that non-residents entering the [redacted] have their details recorded in the security log book; however, details of UN staff and people in UN vehicles were not recorded. The security log book also recorded any suspicious activities or incidents of note. At [redacted] a summary is created listing any notable incidents and the number of people signed into the compound by security. The ID/OIOS review of the security summaries for the period [redacted] showed an average of only [redacted] people per [redacted] recorded. There were also no reported incidents for that period. When asked what procedures were in place if a resident brought a local [redacted] into the [redacted], [redacted] stated that it was not [redacted] business to involve [redacted] in the private affairs of others and would expect [redacted] staff to do the same.

37. ID/OIOS interviewed [redacted] staff members who had been long-term [redacted] of the [redacted] regarding prostitutes allegedly frequenting the [redacted] the then [redacted] told ID/OIOS of an incident in either [redacted] when a local [redacted] had knocked on the door of [redacted] residence and asked if [redacted] needed a companion. [redacted] declined, told [redacted] to leave and contacted the [redacted] who then had the [redacted] removed. It was later discovered that this [redacted] had been to several other residences in the [redacted] asking the same question.

38. Unknown local [redacted] walking around the [redacted] and knocking on the doors of residents, had been witnessed by [redacted] of the other [redacted] interviewed by ID/OIOS. One of the witnesses had been propositioned for sex by two local [redacted] aged between [redacted] years, while several other [redacted] had exposed their breasts to [redacted] while [redacted] was exercising.

39. ID/OIOS interviewed [redacted] the [redacted] who stated that if [redacted] had a complaint regarding the [redacted] they could either speak to [redacted] personally or e-mail [redacted]. [redacted] stated that [redacted] was not aware of any problems with prostitutes visiting the [redacted]; however, it was often difficult to differentiate between the [redacted] and other [redacted]. [redacted] further stated that if a resident brought a prostitute into the [redacted] it was their own business and not something that [redacted] would interfere with.

40. ID/OIOS established that [redacted] had [redacted] since [redacted] arrival in the [redacted] was [redacted] through [redacted] until [redacted] transfer from the [redacted] [redacted] has performed this duty since [redacted] transfer. Both staff members denied ever having been requested by [redacted] to locate young local [redacted] and bring them to [redacted] residence at the [redacted]. Both staff members further stated that they would not have done this even if asked.

41. [redacted] denied ever being sexually involved with local [redacted] asking anyone to procure young local [redacted] for [redacted] or having any locals visit [redacted] residence. [redacted] stated that [redacted] had heard that several of the [redacted] residents had been approached by local [redacted] asking if they would like to engage in sexual activity but that this had never happened to [redacted].

## VI. FINDINGS

### Sexual Harassment

42. In the absence of corroboration, and with due consideration to [redacted] impaired credibility, ID/OIOS found [redacted] allegations against [redacted] to be unsubstantiated.

43. Though [redacted] reported the alleged sexual harassment to [redacted], and then to both [redacted] and [redacted] ID/OIOS found that there is insufficient corroborative value in these reports to substantiate [redacted] allegations against [redacted].

44. ID/OIOS found that [redacted] and [redacted] failed in their respective [redacted] responsibilities to take appropriate action upon receiving the sexual harassment complaints of [redacted].

45. ID/OIOS found the evidence of [redacted] [redacted] showed consistency in respect to complaints; however, they provide insufficient corroboration to support [redacted] allegations against [redacted]. Accordingly, ID/OIOS found the allegations of [redacted] against [redacted] to be unsubstantiated.

46. In the absence of any corroborative evidence, ID/OIOS found [redacted] allegations against [redacted] to be unsubstantiated.

47. In the absence of any corroborative evidence, ID/OIOS found [redacted] allegations against [redacted] to be unsubstantiated.

### Abuse of Authority

48. Whilst ID/OIOS empathizes with [redacted] frustration with under-performing staff and the high pressure under which [redacted] works, ID/OIOS found it inappropriate for a [redacted] within the Organization to deal with work place issues with such

strong language and in an abrasive manner, particularly when there are specific administrative and training processes in place to deal with personnel issues.

49. Although local staff members complained about their transfers to the sectors and posited that such transfers were unfair, ID/OIOS found it appropriate for [REDACTED] to respond to the exigencies of the service and to [REDACTED] staff as required and appropriate.

50. ID/OIOS found no evidence in support of the allegation that [REDACTED] was used by [REDACTED] to perform domestic duties at [REDACTED] residence in the [REDACTED] accordingly ID/OIOS found the allegation to be unsubstantiated.

#### Allegation of Bribery

51. ID/OIOS found that a reasonable inference can be drawn that [REDACTED] lied to ID/OIOS about the alleged bribe. ID/OIOS is aware that [REDACTED] is a significant sum of money in poverty-stricken [REDACTED] accordingly ID/OIOS considers that [REDACTED] lie was given in fear of having to relinquish the money. Nevertheless, in the absence of eye-witness testimony or a credible account from [REDACTED] about the alleged bribe, ID/OIOS considers that the evidence falls short of the legal standard required to make an adverse finding against [REDACTED] on the issue. Accordingly, ID/OIOS found the bribery allegation against [REDACTED] to be unsubstantiated.

#### Procuring of Young [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]

52. ID/OIOS found that there were concerns amongst the residents of the [REDACTED] - where [REDACTED] resided - about the propensity for local [REDACTED] who are likely to be [REDACTED] gaining access to the [REDACTED]. There was, however, no evidence to suggest that [REDACTED] was procuring local [REDACTED] for sexual intercourse and [REDACTED] (both of whom, at one time or another, were [REDACTED]) denied that they were ever asked by [REDACTED] to procure [REDACTED]. Furthermore, no other evidence was located. ID/OIOS found that the allegation that [REDACTED] asked [REDACTED] to facilitate the procuring of young [REDACTED] to be unsubstantiated.

### IV. CONCLUSIONS

53. ID/OIOS concludes that the allegations of [REDACTED] harassment and bribery against [REDACTED] to be unsubstantiated.

54. ID/OIOS concludes that whilst the allegation of abuse of authority against [REDACTED] is unsubstantiated, the evidence adduced supports the conclusion that [REDACTED] has an abrasive [REDACTED] style that is the source of tensions between some [REDACTED] personnel, particularly [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

55. ID/OIOS concludes that [REDACTED] failed in their respective [REDACTED] responsibilities to take appropriate action upon receiving the sexual harassment complaints of [REDACTED].

## VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

56. In view of the preceding findings, ID/OIOS makes the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1: It is recommended that [REDACTED] ensure that all [REDACTED] personnel undertake the system-wide, self-administered, compulsory learning programme entitled "Prevention of workplace harassment, sexual harassment and abuse of authority" pursuant to ST/SGB/2005/20. [REDACTED];

Recommendation 2: Given the preponderance of evidence, including partial admissions by [REDACTED] lends support to the suggestion that [REDACTED] has an abrasive style that is assessed as the basis of tensions between [REDACTED] and some [REDACTED] personnel, particularly [REDACTED] it is recommended that [REDACTED] provide guidance, advice and training to [REDACTED] on a more appropriate and acceptable [REDACTED] style. [REDACTED]

Recommendation 3: It is recommended that [REDACTED] provide appropriate guidance and counseling to [REDACTED] as to the required action upon receipt of such complaints. [REDACTED];

Recommendation 4: It is recommended that given the many and various complaints as to the work ethic of some [REDACTED] staff, [REDACTED] review the adequacies of the policies, procedures and programmes with regard to the recruitment and training of [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

