



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 EXPLOITATION AND ABUSE AGAINST [REDACTED]**

REDACTED REPORT

ID Case No. 0076-06

7 JUNE 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	4
IV.	METHODOLOGY	5
V.	INVESTIGATIVE DETAIL	5
VI.	FINDINGS	25
VII.	CONCLUSIONS	27
VIII.	RECOMMENDATIONS	28

INVESTIGATION INTO AN ALLEGATION OF SEXUAL ABUSE AGAINST

[REDACTED]

I. INTRODUCTION

1. On [REDACTED] the Investigations Division of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (ID/OIOS) received, from [REDACTED] in the [REDACTED] information that the [REDACTED] were investigating an allegation that [REDACTED] (hereafter referred to as [REDACTED]) had been raped by [REDACTED] purported to be [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] alleged that on [REDACTED], they had met [REDACTED] at a [REDACTED] and were subsequently taken to a nearby [REDACTED] where they were given alcoholic drinks and then raped by [REDACTED].

2. It was further alleged that [REDACTED] subsequently attended at the [REDACTED] in order to investigate the complaint and became involved in an altercation with the occupants. This culminated in one of the [REDACTED] being pulled into [REDACTED] and held until the arrival of additional [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]). It was subsequently established that [REDACTED] was occupied by [REDACTED] providing [REDACTED] to [REDACTED].

3. ID/OIOS subsequently initiated an investigation of the sexual abuse allegations, which proceeded in cooperation with an investigation conducted by [REDACTED]. At the completion of the ID/OIOS investigation, [REDACTED] sought to initiate criminal proceedings against a number of [REDACTED]. However, during this process, the subjects fled the jurisdiction under the shadow of allegations of bribery and attempted bribery of [REDACTED]. This ultimately led to the establishment of a [REDACTED] inquiry and subsequent punitive action against a [REDACTED].

4. The ID/OIOS investigation was subsequently widened to examine whether [REDACTED] had interfered or attempted to interfere with the prosecution of its [REDACTED] by the [REDACTED]. These allegations have been the subject of [REDACTED] scrutiny by [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] raised the issue in discussions with the [REDACTED] and several [REDACTED] groups called for [REDACTED] of [REDACTED], as the [REDACTED].

II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

5. The [REDACTED] history of [REDACTED] can be traced back to [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] is a leading [REDACTED] in [REDACTED]. With [REDACTED], [REDACTED] is one of the [REDACTED] in the world. [REDACTED] operates in a number of [REDACTED]. According to data provided by [REDACTED], the total net value of [REDACTED] for the period [REDACTED] was in excess of [REDACTED].

At the time of this incident, [REDACTED] had [REDACTED] including [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED] are [REDACTED] and whilst some [REDACTED] are able to extend their [REDACTED] are required to return to [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] are eligible for [REDACTED] following a short period of time in [REDACTED].

6. The alleged victims are both [REDACTED] and residents of [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] is a [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] is [REDACTED] years old and [REDACTED].

III. APPLICABLE LAW

7. [REDACTED] Penal Code

Chapter 14, Subchapter D, Section 14.71 states:

"A male who has sexual intercourse with a female not his wife has committed a third degree felony if:

(b) *He knows that she is unaware that a sexual act is being committed upon her or knows that a sexual act is being committed on her or knows that she submits because of a mistaken belief in his identity [.]"*

Chapter 14, Subchapter D, Section 14.22 states:

"A person who, with the 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, for which the maximum fine shall be \$25."

Chapter 14, Subchapter C, Section 14.50 states:

"A person is guilty of kidnapping if he unlawfully removes another from his place of residence or business, or a substantial distance from the vicinity where he is found, or if he unlawfully confines another for a substantial period in a place of isolation, with any of the following purposes:

(f) *To interfere with the performance of any governmental or political function."*

Chapter 12, Subchapter D, Section 12.50 states:

"A person has committed bribery, a second degree felony, if he knowingly offers, gives, or agrees to give to another, or solicits, accepts or agrees to accept, from another, a thing of value as consideration for:

(a) *The recipient's official action as a public servant; or*
(b) *The recipient's violation of a known duty as a public servant."*

8. Long Term [REDACTED] Agreement [REDACTED] between the [REDACTED]

Annex "C", Section (1), subsection (a) states:

"[...] The [REDACTED] shall be responsible for the professional and technical competence of its [REDACTED] and will select, for work under this Charter Agreement, reliable individuals who will perform effectively in the implementation of this Charter Agreement, respect the local customs, and conform to a high standard of moral and ethical conduct."

Annex "C", Section (1), subsection (b) states:

"Sexual Exploitation: The [REDACTED] represents and warrants that it has taken all appropriate measures to prevent sexual exploitation or abuse of anyone by its employees or any other persons engaged by the [REDACTED] to perform any services under this [REDACTED] Agreement. For these purposes, sexual activity with any person less than eighteen years of age, regardless of any laws relating to consent, shall constitute the sexual exploitation and abuse of such person. In addition, the [REDACTED] represents and warrants that it has taken all appropriate measures to prohibit its employees or other persons engaged by the [REDACTED] from exchanging any money, goods, services, or other things of value, for sexual favors or activities or from engaging in any sexual activities that are exploitative or degrading to any person. This provision constitutes an essential term of this [REDACTED] Agreement, and any breach of this representation and warranty shall entitle the United Nations to terminate the [REDACTED] Agreement immediately upon notice to the [REDACTED] without any liability for termination charges or any other liability of any kind."

IV. METHODOLOGY

9. The allegation of sexual abuse was the subject of initial investigation by [REDACTED] also conducted an inquiry into the allegations. The involvement of multiple agencies in inquiries of this nature complicated the investigation process. However, in this case there was significant cooperation between ID/OIOS and [REDACTED] which was necessary in order to ensure that key material, specifically identification evidence, was not tainted.

10. The ID/OIOS investigation included, but not limited to, the collection and analysis of all available documents, including the [REDACTED] investigation file; the [REDACTED] investigation report and the [REDACTED] Agreement between the [REDACTED]. ID/OIOS also conducted interviews with [REDACTED] witnesses, [REDACTED] personnel, and the victims and the subjects of the allegations.

V. INVESTIGATIVE DETAILS

[REDACTED] Investigation

11. On [REDACTED] ID/OIOS met [REDACTED] the [REDACTED] e of the [REDACTED]). At this meeting, [REDACTED] outlined the circumstances surrounding allegations that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] had been allegedly raped by [REDACTED] believed at that stage, to be from [REDACTED]

12. [redacted] stated that on [redacted] and [redacted] went to [redacted] alleging that they had been raped by [redacted]. The [redacted] reported that on the [redacted], they had met [redacted] at the [redacted] and accompanied them [redacted]. The [redacted] reported that [redacted] they consumed a significant amount of liquor and as a result became extremely intoxicated. They told [redacted] that they were then raped by the [redacted] and a [redacted]. The [redacted] said that they were later removed from the premises and one of them reported that [redacted] left a [redacted] at the [redacted]. [redacted] told ID/OIOS that a team of [redacted] subsequently accompanied [redacted] to the scene of the alleged rapes. [redacted] identified the [redacted] who attended the [redacted].

13. ID/OIOS subsequently interviewed [redacted] who stated that on arrival [redacted] introduced [redacted] to the [redacted] and asked to speak to the occupants. A person described by [redacted] spoke to them outside [redacted] and was soon joined by [redacted]. [redacted] said that one of [redacted] asked to see [redacted] and when it was produced the [redacted] took it from [redacted] and threw it [redacted]. [redacted] told ID/OIOS that [redacted] informed the group of the general nature of the allegations and they became increasingly aggressive and uncooperative. [redacted] said that they denied ever having [redacted].

14. [redacted] told ID/OIOS that at this time one of the [redacted] appeared to go into [redacted] in the [redacted] before returning with [redacted] marked with the words [redacted] which on later inspection was found to contain [redacted]. [redacted] said that the [redacted] handed this bag to [redacted] said that when the [redacted] who retrieved the [redacted] was later questioned about the origins of the items, [redacted] stated that [redacted] had found them in [redacted] and believed that someone must have [redacted].

15. [redacted] said that [redacted] discussions with [redacted] then became heated and culminated in a physical confrontation during which [redacted] attempted to [redacted]. [redacted] said that [redacted] managed to [redacted] but was dragged into [redacted] at which time [redacted] and [redacted] was separated from [redacted]. [redacted] said that, whilst in the [redacted] was pushed up against the [redacted] and slapped and punched [redacted]. [redacted] estimated that [redacted] was struck at least [redacted] and that as a result of the confrontation [redacted] was torn. [redacted] later produced the [redacted] and it was examined and photographed by ID/OIOS. On inspection the [redacted] was found to have a small tear to the [redacted] and dark scuffmarks that [redacted] attributed to being pushed against [redacted].

16. [redacted] told ID/OIOS that [redacted] was informed about the events unfolding at [redacted] and as a result of [redacted] understanding that there were [redacted].

involved in the confrontation, [redacted] notified [redacted] and asked them to attend at the [redacted] [redacted] said that [redacted] and a [redacted] comprising of [redacted] then [redacted] told ID/OIOS that [redacted] arrived at the [redacted] at the same time as [redacted] and that upon their arrival, the [redacted] opened [redacted] and [redacted] was allowed to leave.

17. [redacted] and [redacted] told ID/OIOS that after the arrival of [redacted] of [redacted] became cooperative. They said that the [redacted] of the [redacted] remained [redacted] identified the [redacted] who had brought them to [redacted]. The subjects were identified as [redacted] of [redacted] [redacted] said that [redacted] told [redacted] that one of the [redacted] had given [redacted] [redacted] said that [redacted] instructed [redacted] to [redacted] and that one of the [redacted] in possession of [redacted] began to [redacted] [redacted] said that [redacted] asked [redacted] to come to [redacted] for the purpose of interrogation; however, they declined to accompany [redacted] or be interviewed.

18. ID/OIOS later showed [redacted] a photograph array of [redacted] associated with [redacted] and the [redacted] identified a photograph of [redacted] as being the [redacted] identified by [redacted] as being the person [redacted] had met at the [redacted] [redacted] said that [redacted] was also the person whose [redacted] when called by [redacted] 1 at [redacted] [redacted] instruction. [redacted] also identified a photograph of [redacted] as being the most aggressive [redacted] and the person who had dragged [redacted] into the [redacted] and assaulted [redacted] [redacted] identified a photograph of [redacted] as a person who had acted very aggressively towards [redacted] and who had thrown [redacted] on the ground after [redacted] asked to see proof that they [redacted] [redacted] also identified a photograph of [redacted] as a person who had pulled [redacted] into [redacted] and slapped and punched [redacted] [redacted] also identified photographs of [redacted] as being persons involved in [redacted] assault.

19. [redacted] was interviewed on [redacted] by ID/OIOS and provided additional detail on the description of the [redacted] involved in the altercation at the [redacted] [redacted] corroborated the accounts of [redacted] with respect to the assault and detention of [redacted] and stated that the [redacted] opened the [redacted] and [redacted] just prior to the arrival of [redacted]

20. [redacted] said that [redacted] told [redacted] that [redacted] had one of the [redacted] [redacted] said that [redacted] gave [redacted] to [redacted] who [redacted] The [redacted] subsequently [redacted] in the [redacted] of one of the [redacted] described this [redacted] as [redacted] [redacted] told ID/OIOS that [redacted] asked that all the [redacted] be brought outside so that [redacted] could identify [redacted] they had met at [redacted] [redacted] said that the [redacted] facilitated this request and an informal [redacted] was conducted. [redacted] said that [redacted] identified [redacted] as being [redacted] had met.

referred to [redacted] as [redacted] identified the [redacted] had met at the [redacted] as being [redacted] said that during [redacted] contact with [redacted] and [redacted] at the [redacted] they consistently denied knowing or having any contact with [redacted]

21. Over the course of [redacted] [redacted] nominated as being present at the [redacted] in [redacted] were interviewed by ID/OIOS. [redacted] and [redacted] all corroborated the accounts of [redacted] and [redacted] viewed a photograph array of [redacted] associated with [redacted] in [redacted] identified a photograph of [redacted] as being the person who was known to [redacted] as [redacted] and the one identified by [redacted] as being one of the [redacted] who had brought [redacted] and [redacted] to [redacted] reviewed the same photographic array and identified [redacted] as [redacted] who had acted aggressively towards [redacted] and had assaulted [redacted]. [redacted] corroborated [redacted] on this count, also identifying [redacted] as one of the [redacted] who had assaulted [redacted]

22. In a statement dated [redacted] [redacted] stated that approximately [redacted] earlier [redacted] had met a [redacted] knew as [redacted] at the [redacted] in [redacted] stated that they spoke, established a friendship and that [redacted] provided [redacted] with [redacted] [redacted] said that [redacted] next spoke to [redacted] on or about [redacted] when [redacted] contacted [redacted] and invited [redacted] to meet [redacted] at the [redacted] [redacted] told [redacted] that [redacted] met [redacted] and later went back to [redacted] where [redacted] remained for some time before returning home. [redacted] said that at about [redacted] on [redacted] called [redacted] and said that [redacted] would like [redacted] to meet [redacted] and [redacted] of [redacted] friends at [redacted] [redacted] told [redacted] that when [redacted] arrived [redacted] was introduced to [redacted] one of whom [redacted] referred to as [redacted] [redacted] said that [redacted] asked [redacted] to join them and that they sat [redacted] and [redacted] [redacted] said that [redacted] and [redacted] started to feel tired and decided to go home, but changed their minds after [redacted] told them that there was [redacted] [redacted] said that [redacted] and [redacted] were taken to [redacted] where they were given more [redacted] [redacted] said that they went to [redacted] at about [redacted] and fell asleep. [redacted] told [redacted] that [redacted] awoke sometime later and saw [redacted] on top of [redacted] [redacted] also said that a [redacted] who [redacted] didn't know, took [redacted] and placed it in [redacted] [redacted] said that [redacted] against them without success and eventually fell asleep and on waking, found [redacted] was [redacted] with a [redacted] on either side of [redacted]

23. [redacted] told [redacted] that [redacted] asked [redacted] why they had treated [redacted] in such a way and at this time [redacted] noticed that [redacted] was also in the room and [redacted] said that the [redacted] laughed at [redacted] and began speaking [redacted] [redacted] said that [redacted] told [redacted] that [redacted] was going to call [redacted] and one of them knocked the [redacted] from [redacted] and proceeded to force [redacted] from the premises. [redacted] said that in the process of being forcibly removed from the premises, [redacted] left a [redacted] containing [redacted] a [redacted] containing [redacted] [redacted] said that [redacted] also lost a [redacted] at the premises. [redacted] told [redacted] that [redacted] and [redacted] were eventually ejected from [redacted] [redacted] said that whilst outside [redacted] was approached by [redacted] who asked [redacted] what had occurred. [redacted] said that [redacted] explained what had happened and the [redacted] who said that that was their usual behavior and that every time they have a [redacted] in the premises, they force them

out of [redacted] and sometimes beat them. [redacted] said that [redacted] encouraged [redacted] to make a report to [redacted].

24. In a statement dated [redacted] [redacted] said that at about [redacted] on [redacted] [redacted] received a [redacted] from a [redacted] known to [redacted] as [redacted] who invited [redacted] to meet [redacted] at the [redacted] [redacted] told [redacted] that [redacted] [redacted] contacted [redacted] and together they went to [redacted] [redacted] said that on their arrival they were informed by [redacted] that they were celebrating [redacted] and they wanted the [redacted] to accompany them to [redacted] to celebrate. [redacted] said that [redacted] and [redacted] went with [redacted] to [redacted] and they all [redacted] until [redacted] fell asleep at around [redacted] [redacted] told [redacted] that [redacted] woke up [redacted] at about [redacted] [redacted] said that [redacted] and [redacted] asked the [redacted] why they had been treated in such a manner and they were subsequently ejected from [redacted].

Interviews

25. On [redacted] [redacted] investigators obtained statements from [redacted] and [redacted].

26. [redacted] stated that [redacted] was a [redacted] and [redacted] and a number of [redacted] and [redacted] went to [redacted] where they remained until about [redacted] at which time [redacted] returned to [redacted] in [redacted] [redacted] told [redacted] that [redacted] had never met [redacted] and avoided contact with members of [redacted] as [redacted] had difficulty communicating in [redacted] [redacted] named the people [redacted] resides with as [redacted] and [redacted] [redacted] stated that [redacted] sometimes visited the [redacted] [redacted] denied knowing [redacted] and [redacted] denied [redacted] g with them; denied taking them to [redacted] or engaging in sexual activity with them. [redacted] said the [redacted] questioned [redacted] about [redacted] relationship with [redacted] and [redacted] told them that [redacted] didn't know [redacted] and had never had any contact with them.

27. In [redacted] statement to the [redacted] [redacted] stated that [redacted] went to [redacted] and remained there until [redacted] when [redacted] returned [redacted] [redacted] said that [redacted] had never previously met the [redacted] who attended at [redacted] in the company of the [redacted] and was surprised that they had made allegations against [redacted] [redacted] said that [redacted] resided [redacted] at the [redacted] with [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] said that [redacted] sometimes visited the [redacted] but was [redacted] all [redacted] [redacted] denied knowing [redacted] and said that there were no [redacted] people in [redacted] company on [redacted] in question. [redacted] denied being with [redacted] at [redacted] and denied [redacted] or engaging in sexual activity with them. [redacted] said that [redacted] attributed the allegations to retribution for a complaint the occupants had made about [redacted].

ID/OIOS Investigation

Interviews of [redacted]

28. ID/OIOS interviewed [REDACTED] stated that in late - [REDACTED] was at the [REDACTED] when [REDACTED] started talking to a [REDACTED] who identified [REDACTED], a [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] introduced [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] who was also a [REDACTED] described [REDACTED] as being of [REDACTED] and with [REDACTED] and a [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] appeared to be [REDACTED] than [REDACTED] and had no distinguishing features. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] had a [REDACTED] with the [REDACTED] and at the end of the [REDACTED] exchanged [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] exchanged [REDACTED] with [REDACTED].

29. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that on the [REDACTED] following this initial introduction, [REDACTED] contacted [REDACTED] and asked [REDACTED] to come to [REDACTED] in [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] described the [REDACTED] as being on the [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] surrounded by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] then provided ID/OIOS with a detailed description of the [REDACTED] the location of [REDACTED] within the [REDACTED] that [REDACTED]'s premises [REDACTED] and had [REDACTED] each containing [REDACTED] described the location of [REDACTED] within the premises and the contents of the [REDACTED] was unable to name the other person sharing [REDACTED] but described [REDACTED] as being [REDACTED].

30. [REDACTED] also said that [REDACTED] had been into [REDACTED]. Once again, [REDACTED] described the location of [REDACTED] within the premises and described the [REDACTED] and its contents. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that [REDACTED] shared this [REDACTED] with another [REDACTED] however, [REDACTED] did not know [REDACTED] said that the [REDACTED] had a [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and that whenever [REDACTED] went to [REDACTED] noticed that there was always a lot of [REDACTED] in the [REDACTED].

31. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that [REDACTED] sexual intercourse with [REDACTED] on a [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said that the [REDACTED] went to [REDACTED], they had sexual intercourse in [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] gave [REDACTED] said that they never discussed money before having sex and that the amount [REDACTED] gave [REDACTED] varied from [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] said that the [REDACTED] time they had sex was about [REDACTED] after [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] had only had sex with [REDACTED] and that no one had seen them having sex. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] was aware that [REDACTED] was seeing [REDACTED] but did not know whether they were having a sexual relationship.

32. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] last met [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] at about [REDACTED] and invited [REDACTED] to the [REDACTED] for a [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that [REDACTED] arrived at the [REDACTED] a short time later and was met by [REDACTED], [REDACTED] said that soon after [REDACTED] arrival [REDACTED] rang [REDACTED] and asked [REDACTED] to join them at [REDACTED] [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that [REDACTED] arrived about [REDACTED] later. [REDACTED] said that they all sat [REDACTED] [REDACTED] estimated that [REDACTED] whilst at the [REDACTED] and whilst [REDACTED] could not estimate how much intoxicating liquor was consumed by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] did not believe that anyone was substantially impaired. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that [REDACTED] left the [REDACTED] at about [REDACTED] and that [REDACTED] stayed until sometime between [REDACTED] at which time [REDACTED] suggested that they all go back to [REDACTED] as they were [REDACTED] an important [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that they walked to [REDACTED] and on arrival noticed a [REDACTED].

large group of ██████████ in the ██████████. On entering ██████████ ██████████ said that ██████████ noticed another ██████████ seated in ██████████ told ID/OIOS that ██████████ thought that these ██████████ but did not know their names.

33. ██████████ told ID/OIOS that ██████████ took ██████████ into ██████████ and ██████████ and ██████████ joined them. ██████████ said that ██████████ recognized one of the ██████████ as ██████████. The ██████████ had ██████████ and ██████████ said that ██████████ consumed ██████████ while the ██████████ what ██████████ thought was ██████████ said that after a while ██████████ offered some ██████████ and when ██████████ refused ██████████ said that ██████████ would ██████████ with ██████████ to make it ██████████ said that ██████████ mixed the ██████████ and gave them to ██████████ said that ██████████ but was stronger than the ██████████ usually consumed.

34. ██████████ told ID/OIOS that ██████████ looked at the time on ██████████ and was able to say that they were still all ██████████ said that at about this time the ██████████ left ██████████ alone in the ██████████ before returning some ██████████ said that the all continued ██████████ until about ██████████ when ██████████ fell asleep ██████████ on the ██████████ said that at this time ██████████ could recall the ██████████ were still separated and that ██████████ and the ██████████ were still in the ██████████

35. ██████████ estimated that, about ██████████ woke up and could feel someone on top of ██████████ engaging in sexual intercourse ██████████ told investigators that ██████████ was completely naked and that the ██████████ said that there was another ██████████ said that both ██████████ and the other ██████████ were ██████████ and that the ██████████ which had been separated before ██████████ were now pushed together. ██████████ told ID/OIOS that ██████████ told ██████████ and the other ██████████ to get off ██████████ and tried to push them away. ██████████ said that ██████████ didn't want either of them to ██████████ with ██████████ but ██████████ could not push them away because ██████████ felt too weak. ██████████ said that the ██████████ were on and ██████████ could see clearly everyone who was ██████████ said that she saw ██████████ lying on the other ██████████ said that ██████████ was asleep and naked as were ██████████ and another ██████████ who were also ██████████ said that at this time ██████████ felt very ██████████ and was struggling to ██████████ described the feeling as being 'strange' and not like being ██████████ said that ██████████ was ██████████ to get up and believes that ██████████ must have ██████████

36. ██████████ told ID/OIOS that ██████████ woke up at about ██████████ and saw that the same ██████████ were still ██████████ said that ██████████ and the same unknown ██████████ were ██████████ told investigators that ██████████ was confused and upset and woke everyone ██████████ said that ██████████ accused them of bringing ██████████ to the ██████████ to rape them. ██████████ also told them that ██████████ was going to ██████████ and report the rape. ██████████ said that at this time ██████████ pushed the ██████████ and ██████████ and the other ██████████ forced ██████████ to get ██████████ described the ██████████ as being very angry. ██████████ said that they escorted ██████████ and ██████████ to the ██████████ and pushed them ██████████ stated that ██████████ left a ██████████ inside the ██████████ containing ██████████, a ██████████ and a ██████████

37. [redacted] told ID/OIOS that once [redacted] they met a [redacted] who asked them what had occurred. [redacted] told [redacted] what had happened and the [redacted] told [redacted] that it was not uncommon and that [redacted] go to the premises [redacted] or get raped by [redacted] and are then thrown out [redacted]

38. [redacted] said that [redacted] discussed with [redacted] what had occurred and they decided to report the matter to [redacted] told ID/OIOS that they [redacted] where they reported the incident to one of the [redacted] said that this [redacted] told [redacted] that the [redacted] who deal with those types of matters would not be available until [redacted] and asked them to come back [redacted]

39. [redacted] told ID/OIOS that at about [redacted] that day [redacted] and [redacted] returned to the [redacted] where [redacted] reported the incident to [redacted] whereupon statements were taken from them and [redacted] asked [redacted] and [redacted] to accompany [redacted] to [redacted] so that they could help to identify [redacted] and the other [redacted] involved in the assault. [redacted] told ID/OIOS that they [redacted] and [redacted] pointed out the [redacted] where [redacted] and the others [redacted]

40. [redacted] said that on arrival [redacted] spoke to [redacted] and told [redacted] that [redacted] was a [redacted] and that they wanted to speak to the [redacted] and returned with a [redacted] who was from one of [redacted] in the [redacted] and who was not involved in the incident the [redacted] described [redacted] as [redacted] and said that although [redacted] couldn't hear the conversation between [redacted] and this [redacted] it appeared to be [redacted]. [redacted] told investigators that a [redacted] came out of [redacted] and had a conversation with the [redacted] said that [redacted] had never seen this [redacted] before and described [redacted] as [redacted] said that as a result of the conversation with the [redacted] became angry and demanded the [redacted] [redacted] said [redacted] handed their [redacted] to this [redacted] who looked at them, laughed and threw [redacted] said that this [redacted] then [redacted] and told them that they were [redacted] and they should 'go away'.

41. [redacted] told investigators that at this time [redacted] emerged from the [redacted] and started yelling at [redacted] and telling them to go away. [redacted] said that [redacted] told them that they were [redacted] and that they were investigating a complaint of rape. [redacted] said that the [redacted] pushed and slapped [redacted] and that [redacted] the one [redacted] described as [redacted], grabbed [redacted] the [redacted] and dragged [redacted] into [redacted] said that others assisted the [redacted] and once inside [redacted] were closed. [redacted] said that [redacted] could hear [redacted] calling for help but the [redacted] were unable to [redacted] told ID/OIOS that after about [redacted] a [redacted] arrived at [redacted] and [redacted] followed [redacted] said [redacted] from both [redacted] spoke to [redacted] and instructed [redacted] to open [redacted] said [redacted] emerged looking very upset.

42. [redacted] said that [redacted] went into the [redacted] and asked [redacted] and [redacted] to accompany them. [redacted] told ID/OIOS that once [redacted] observed about [redacted] [redacted] said that [redacted]

recognized some but not all of [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] could see [REDACTED] but not [REDACTED] or any of the others who had been with them the [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] spoke to the group and [REDACTED] went inside and returned with [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] told that [REDACTED] had never seen [REDACTED] before and pushed [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] had found it in [REDACTED] and thought that someone must have thrown it there. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] went into [REDACTED] and came back out with [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] told the [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] was one of the [REDACTED] that had raped [REDACTED] however, [REDACTED] denied knowing [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] had [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] said [REDACTED] began to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] ran back inside [REDACTED]

43. When asked, [REDACTED] said that neither [REDACTED] nor [REDACTED] went into [REDACTED] when they went back to [REDACTED] to help identify their assailants. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that as far as [REDACTED] was aware, the only people who went into [REDACTED], apart from the [REDACTED], were the [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] was also asked to comment on [REDACTED]'s language skills. [REDACTED] said that when [REDACTED] was with [REDACTED] found [REDACTED] to be 'alright' and said that they appeared to understand each other.

44. [REDACTED] was interviewed by ID/OIOS on [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] confirmed the account of how [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] came to meet [REDACTED] description of the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] where they [REDACTED] was consistent with that provided by [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] first visited [REDACTED] in early [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that over the subsequent [REDACTED] would contact [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] would go to [REDACTED] where they would go to [REDACTED] and talk about [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said they never had sex and [REDACTED] never asked for sex. [REDACTED] also said that [REDACTED] never provided [REDACTED] with any [REDACTED].

45. [REDACTED]'s account of the events of [REDACTED] was also consistent with that of [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] told investigators that on the [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] was contacted by [REDACTED] who asked [REDACTED] to meet [REDACTED] at the [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] arrived there about [REDACTED] and was met by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said they [REDACTED] and consumed a [REDACTED] before [REDACTED] left the [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said that, at about [REDACTED] suggested that they go back to [REDACTED] as it was an important [REDACTED] in [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that [REDACTED] went into [REDACTED] where they were joined by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] not known to [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said that they consumed [REDACTED] before [REDACTED]'s mixed [REDACTED] with a [REDACTED] described as [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] consumed this [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that sometime later [REDACTED] started to feel [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] described the sensation as different to feeling [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] told investigators that sometime [REDACTED] on the [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said that at this time [REDACTED] could recall the [REDACTED] were still separated and that the [REDACTED] were still in [REDACTED].

46. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that [REDACTED] at a time [REDACTED] estimated to be about [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] were on and [REDACTED] was [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] said that a [REDACTED] was [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] trying to [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] did not want to have sex with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] told them to leave [REDACTED] alone. [REDACTED] said that they didn't seem to [REDACTED].

listen and kept [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] told investigators that the [REDACTED] finally managed to [REDACTED]; however, [REDACTED] was able to push them away. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] were not amongst those with whom [REDACTED] had been associating with [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that although many of the [REDACTED] felt that [REDACTED] would recognize these [REDACTED] if [REDACTED] saw them again.

47. [REDACTED] told investigators that whilst [REDACTED] was [REDACTED] next to [REDACTED] and surrounded by [REDACTED] couldn't identify the [REDACTED] or what they were doing to [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] was very [REDACTED] and struggling to [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said [REDACTED] felt 'not in control' and must have fallen asleep. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] woke up at about [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] was still [REDACTED] and that [REDACTED] and another [REDACTED] were [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] told investigators that [REDACTED] could see [REDACTED] I was [REDACTED] and a [REDACTED] - whose name [REDACTED] couldn't recall - was [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said [REDACTED] woke up and was very upset and angry. [REDACTED] accused the [REDACTED] of bringing them to [REDACTED] to be raped and said they would complain to [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said [REDACTED] tried to call [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] but [REDACTED] of the [REDACTED] pushed the [REDACTED] out of [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that, at this point, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] became very angry and told them to [REDACTED] said [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] took them to [REDACTED] and pushed them out on [REDACTED] said that as this was happening [REDACTED] dropped a [REDACTED] somewhere in the [REDACTED].

48. [REDACTED]'s account of the meeting with a [REDACTED] outside [REDACTED], the details of the report they made to [REDACTED] and confrontation between [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED] are all strikingly similar to the account of [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that while [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] had gone in [REDACTED] neither of them had gone into any of [REDACTED] after the matter had been reported to [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] was asked to provide investigators with an assessment of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] proficiency in [REDACTED] said that in [REDACTED] contact with [REDACTED] everyone seemed to communicate in [REDACTED] quite well.

Examination of the Incident Scene

49. On [REDACTED] ID/OIOS were able to inspect and photograph the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] where the incident was alleged to have occurred. This was facilitated by representatives of [REDACTED]. The inside of [REDACTED] was consistent with the description provided by [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] was observed to have [REDACTED] with each [REDACTED] containing [REDACTED] and a [REDACTED]. The color of the [REDACTED] in the [REDACTED] was consistent with the statements of [REDACTED] as was the presence of a [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] in the [REDACTED]. The occupants of [REDACTED] were identified as [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

Identification Evidence

50. As a result of discussions with representatives of [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED] it was agreed that a photographic identification parade would be conducted; accordingly a photograph array of [REDACTED] was prepared.

51. On [REDACTED] was shown the photographic array. [REDACTED] identified [REDACTED] as the [REDACTED] known to [REDACTED] as [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] as the [REDACTED] known to [REDACTED] as ' [REDACTED] e'. [REDACTED] also identified [REDACTED] as the [REDACTED] who had tried to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] as a person who had been involved in the rape.

52. On [REDACTED] was shown the photographic array. This process was conducted separately from [REDACTED] identified [REDACTED] as the [REDACTED] who had [REDACTED] also identified [REDACTED] as the [REDACTED] known to [REDACTED] as [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] as the person known to [REDACTED] as [REDACTED] also identified [REDACTED] as a person who had [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] as a person involved in the rape and who had also [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

ID/OIOS Interview of [REDACTED]

53. On [REDACTED] ID/OIOS interviewed the [REDACTED] who attended at the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] told investigators that they were [REDACTED] when, at about [REDACTED] they were directed to [REDACTED] in response to a report that a [REDACTED] had gathered in that area and were causing a disturbance. They told ID/OIOS that on arriving at that location, they observed a [REDACTED] standing around the [REDACTED], which they later found to be occupied by [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] said that they also observed [REDACTED] standing near the [REDACTED] and, whilst they did not see [REDACTED] involved in any [REDACTED] they were engaged in a lot of [REDACTED]

54. The [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that they approached [REDACTED] and were met by a person, who identified [REDACTED] as [REDACTED], who informed them that they had gone to [REDACTED] to investigate the reported sexual assault of [REDACTED]. They said that [REDACTED] asked that all [REDACTED] of the [REDACTED] be brought out of [REDACTED] and were particularly interested in the [REDACTED] immediately on the [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that they entered [REDACTED] and located [REDACTED], who were reluctant to come out [REDACTED], but after some discussions finally did so and stood with about [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] told investigators that they then asked [REDACTED] whether they could identify the [REDACTED] who had brought them to the [REDACTED] pointed to the [REDACTED] that the [REDACTED] had located [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that they recorded the details of these [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] stated that the [REDACTED] claimed that they had not previously met [REDACTED], but that one of the [REDACTED] said that they had met the [REDACTED] at the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] said that they heard [REDACTED] speak to [REDACTED] and inform [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] had one of the [REDACTED] contact [REDACTED] in [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] then [REDACTED] the [REDACTED] provided by the complainant and a [REDACTED] in the [REDACTED] of either [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] said that this person then ran inside one [REDACTED] without answering [REDACTED].

55. The [redacted] told ID/OIOS that a short time later, an unknown [redacted] left the [redacted] and went inside [redacted] returned carrying a [redacted]. They said that this [redacted] then approached [redacted] and pushed it into [redacted]. They said that this [redacted] asked that if [redacted] hadn't been inside [redacted] then how could [redacted] and [redacted] have been found [redacted]. They said that the [redacted] responded by saying that [redacted] had found the [redacted] in the [redacted] and speculated that someone must have thrown [redacted] over the [redacted].

Local Inquiries - [redacted]

56. On [redacted] ID/OIOS conducted an examination of the area in the vicinity of [redacted]. The [redacted] was found to be surrounded by a [redacted] and the [redacted] in [redacted] on the [redacted].

57. ID/OIOS subsequently observed [redacted] seated outside a [redacted] situated a short distance from the [redacted]. Whilst they refused to provide their personal details, they told investigators that they had observed [redacted] some as [redacted] enter [redacted] - and in their view - to have sex with [redacted]. They had observed [redacted] touching [redacted] of [redacted] in front of [redacted] before the [redacted] would then make their selection and invite those [redacted] into [redacted]. They also told ID/OIOS that they had witnessed many disputes outside [redacted] apparently caused by [redacted] of the [redacted] to pay [redacted] for the rendering of sexual services. They added that [redacted] went to [redacted] several [redacted].

58. The [redacted] told ID/OIOS that they were aware of the incident involving the [redacted] and had witnessed [redacted] being pushed by [redacted]. They said that they were too far away to identify any of [redacted] and whilst there was a lot of [redacted], they were unable to distinguish what was being said. They said that a short time later they saw other [redacted] and a [redacted] arrive at the [redacted].

59. [redacted] who was prepared to provide [redacted] details to ID/OIOS was [redacted] a [redacted] and [redacted] of [redacted] was asked whether [redacted] had experienced any problems with the [redacted] of the [redacted] and responded that the [redacted] were annoyed about the [redacted] that were being [redacted] from a [redacted].

60. [redacted] also told ID/OIOS [redacted] had often seen the [redacted] walking [redacted] with [redacted] and taking them into [redacted] said that this occurred on most [redacted], but in particular on [redacted]. [redacted] was aware that these [redacted] were [redacted] because [redacted] had witnessed arguments at [redacted] over the [redacted] failure to pay for sexual services. [redacted] said that on [redacted] had spoken to [redacted], estimated ages between [redacted], who had confirmed that they had gone to [redacted] to exchange sex for money, but had been thrown out of [redacted] without payment. [redacted] told ID/OIOS that the activities in [redacted] were common knowledge amongst [redacted].

repeated the claims made by [redacted] and stated that [redacted] would congregate at [redacted] before [redacted] would select a [redacted] to take back inside [redacted].

61. [redacted] is located approximately [redacted]. [redacted] ID/OIOS interviewed [redacted] an [redacted] of [redacted] told [redacted] was asked whether [redacted] had any [redacted] who lived a [redacted] and who frequented the [redacted] was shown the [redacted] photographic array of [redacted] stated that [redacted] recognized most of the [redacted] who [redacted] described as [redacted] and [redacted] a person who goes to [redacted] with others about [redacted] to [redacted] said that [redacted] had helped [redacted] recover a [redacted] which was stolen from [redacted] by a [redacted] sometime earlier.

Interview of [redacted]

62. During the course of the investigation, ID/OIOS interviewed a number of [redacted]. One of the [redacted] informed investigators that [redacted] had seen the [redacted] speaking to [redacted] the [redacted] and negotiating a price of [redacted] for sex. [redacted] said that once a price had been settled, the [redacted] would then accompany the [redacted].

63. ID/OIOS also interviewed a [redacted] ([redacted]) who had [redacted] for almost [redacted]. [redacted] said that until the end of [redacted] had been supplying [redacted] to the [redacted] who lived in the [redacted] who were [redacted], lived in [redacted] and that the [redacted] who resided in [redacted] described as being on the [redacted] often asked [redacted] to supply [redacted]. When so asked, [redacted] would go to [redacted], including the [redacted], and find [redacted].

64. The former [redacted] told ID/OIOS that [redacted] would act as a [redacted] between the [redacted] and the [redacted] and [redacted] would negotiate a price in the range of [redacted] for [redacted]. [redacted] said that sometimes [redacted] would turn up at [redacted] and if they were [redacted] knew would cause problems, [redacted] would instruct them to leave the area. [redacted] said that if [redacted] knew that they were [redacted] who could be trusted [redacted] would tell the [redacted] that and they would come [redacted] to make their selection.

65. On [redacted] ID/OIOS interviewed [redacted] the [redacted] who was present during the altercation [redacted]. [redacted] stated that on [redacted] in the company of [redacted] attended at [redacted] told ID/OIOS that [redacted] spoke to [redacted] who told [redacted] that they had not been paid for having sex with the [redacted] who [redacted] on the [redacted] also told [redacted] that [redacted] and [redacted] had been ejected from [redacted] that [redacted] and [redacted] had left a [redacted]. [redacted] said that as a result of this conversation, [redacted] entered [redacted] and told one

of the [redacted] about the allegations being made by [redacted]. This [redacted] who described as [redacted], came [redacted] and spoke to the [redacted] said that [redacted] later, another [redacted] came [redacted] and asked for [redacted] said that [redacted] looked at [redacted] before [redacted] and simultaneously, other [redacted] emerged from [redacted] as well as a [redacted] to join the group. [redacted] told ID/OIOS that [redacted] then identified a [redacted] who [redacted] alleged had forced [redacted] from [redacted] earlier [redacted]. One of the [redacted] and attempted to place [redacted] in [redacted]. [redacted] said that at this point, the dispute escalated and [redacted] attempted to retreat [redacted]. [redacted] said that in doing so, they dragged [redacted] inside [redacted] and the [redacted] told ID/OIOS that [redacted] was inside [redacted] and that whilst this [redacted] was not assaulted, [redacted] was held [redacted] by [redacted] until the [redacted] removed.

66. [redacted] account was consistent with that provided by [redacted] of the [redacted] who was [redacted] at the time of the altercation. [redacted] told ID/OIOS that [redacted] to the [redacted] to deliver [redacted] at about [redacted] [redacted] said that upon arrival, [redacted] noticed [redacted] outside [redacted] and a group of [redacted] having a heated discussion with [redacted] told ID/OIOS that [redacted] overheard the [redacted] telling [redacted] that they were [redacted] to investigate an allegation of rape that had been made by [redacted] who also happened to be present [redacted] said that at [redacted] attempted to [redacted] however, [redacted] were able to push [redacted] out of the [redacted] and shut [redacted] said [redacted] was unable to say whether any of [redacted] were dragged into [redacted] told ID/OIOS that because [redacted] couldn't deliver [redacted] at that time, [redacted] left the area and returned a [redacted] when everyone had dispersed.

Call Charge Records

67. ID/OIOS obtained the call charge records (CCRs) for the [redacted] being used by [redacted]. ID/OIOS established that both [redacted] changed [redacted] on [redacted] which was the day after the altercation with [redacted]. [redacted] were obtained for the period [redacted]. An analysis of the calls showed that the [redacted] attributed to [redacted] contacted the [redacted] attributed to [redacted] on [redacted] between [redacted]. The total length of the calls was [redacted]. The [redacted] attributed to [redacted] contacted the [redacted] attributed to [redacted] on [redacted]. The total length of these calls was [redacted]. There were no calls identified in the CCRs that linked [redacted] with [redacted].

Interview of [redacted]

68. ID/OIOS conducted interviews with [redacted] residing at [redacted]. [redacted] interviews were conducted and without exception all of those questioned stated that they were aware that [redacted] prevented them

from having sexual relations with [REDACTED]. They stated that there was a section in their [REDACTED] that required them to behave appropriately at all times, adding that this was reinforced by [REDACTED] prior to their [REDACTED] and after their [REDACTED]. One of those interviewed, [REDACTED], told ID/OIOS that [REDACTED] received [REDACTED] training on the prohibition of sexual exploitation and abuse soon after [REDACTED].

69. All of those interviewed stated that the only [REDACTED] who accessed [REDACTED] were [REDACTED] a [REDACTED] a [REDACTED] sometimes collected [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] of [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] all denied being solicited for sex [REDACTED] and all denied being involved or seeing other [REDACTED] socializing with [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] or at any other location. [REDACTED] also denied being at [REDACTED] but did state that this was a [REDACTED].

70. [REDACTED] all denied assaulting [REDACTED], although [REDACTED] admitted that [REDACTED] managed to [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] who admitted involvement in the altercation denied that [REDACTED] were assaulted or that [REDACTED] were dragged [REDACTED] or held against their will. Most of those interviewed said that they were unaware that the [REDACTED] who attended [REDACTED] were [REDACTED] until after the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] also denied knowing [REDACTED] or of having any involvement in the alleged sexual assault. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that they saw the [REDACTED] enter the [REDACTED] with the [REDACTED] after the altercation with [REDACTED].

71. ID/OIOS conducted detailed interviews with [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] had been [REDACTED] as a [REDACTED] and had worked in [REDACTED], including those in [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that [REDACTED] sometimes frequented [REDACTED] but denied knowing or having contact with [REDACTED], or being involved in any relationships with [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said that on [REDACTED] remained [REDACTED] and did not go to any [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that [REDACTED] had not given [REDACTED] to any [REDACTED], but that from time to time, [REDACTED] would receive [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] whom [REDACTED] didn't know. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] spoke very little [REDACTED] and was unable to converse with [REDACTED] on the [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said that despite the language difficulties the duration of these [REDACTED] would range between [REDACTED].

72. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that [REDACTED] had been [REDACTED] as a [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] and had been [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] had never been involved in a relationship with [REDACTED] and had never been solicited for sex whilst in [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that [REDACTED] sometimes frequented [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] and other [REDACTED] but had never been approached by [REDACTED] at that location. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that on the [REDACTED] remained at [REDACTED] and did not go to any [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] had not contacted any [REDACTED], but from time to time, received [REDACTED].

██████ didn't know. ██████ said that ██████ was limited and as a result ██████ could spend up to ██████ before realizing ██████ didn't know ██████. ██████ denied the allegations made by ██████ and ██████ and said that the complaint was retaliation for the ██████

██████ - Cooperation with the ID/OIOS Investigation

73. ID/OIOS held ██████ meetings with representatives of ██████ during the course of the investigation, namely with the ██████ and the ██████. The ██████ undertook to cooperate in all facets of the investigation and during a meeting on ██████ was asked about the sexual exploitation and abuse training ██████ receive prior to ██████. ██████ stated that all ██████ being ██████ are given a presentation on ██████ the ██████ expectations on their standard of conduct and matters relating to sexual exploitation and abuse.

74. ██████ stated that the ██████ are ██████ and are not subject to ██████. ██████ said that the only ██████ that existed with respect to ██████ was the one between ██████. ██████ said that the rules and regulations that dealt with sexual exploitation and abuse were codified in section ██████ and that ██████ were all aware of their responsibilities in this regard. ██████ told ID/OIOS that ██████ did sign ██████ with ██████ prior to ██████. A template for this ██████ was provided to ID/OIOS. Paragraph 3.1.9 outlines the obligations of the ██████ with respect to their compliance with local legislation. This paragraph requires the ██████ *'[o]n the territory of a ██████ observe both aviation regulations of this country and regulations in the field of passport, customs, exchange, quarantine and other legislation'*.

██████ Investigation

75. The ██████ representatives also conducted an investigation into the allegations. In correspondence to ID/OIOS, ██████ sought to provide investigators with facts and circumstances that they determined were relevant to the inquiry.

76. The ██████ submitted that the allegations made by ██████ and ██████ were linked to an incident that had occurred on ██████. On this day, the ██████ had terminated the ██████ for allegedly stealing ██████ from ██████. They said that the ██████ blamed ██████ for the decision and threatened to retaliate against ██████. This incident was not reported to ██████, however, on the ██████, during the ██████, ██████ presented themselves to the ██████ and informed them that they were there to investigate the theft of ██████. The ██████ submitted that ██████ invited these ██████ into ██████ to inspect the scene of the alleged theft. However, the ██████ refused and directed ██████ to

accompany them to [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] refused because they became increasingly concerned that the [REDACTED] were not [REDACTED]. These [REDACTED] were joined by others from [REDACTED] and on checking the [REDACTED] noticed that they had [REDACTED]. The fact that these [REDACTED] were in [REDACTED], combined with the [REDACTED] and lack of [REDACTED], resulted in the rejection of the claim to be [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] investigation found that their [REDACTED] resisted attempts by these [REDACTED] force them into [REDACTED] and that they had retreated into [REDACTED] to await the arrival of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. A [REDACTED] purporting to [REDACTED] entered [REDACTED] and despite the proposals of [REDACTED], refused to leave [REDACTED].

77. In the narrative submitted by [REDACTED], it is suggested that it was only after the arrival of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] that these [REDACTED] disclosed that they were investigating an allegation that [REDACTED] had been raped at the [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] submitted that [REDACTED] were brought into [REDACTED] and asked to identify [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED] involved in the incident. The [REDACTED] then pointed out [REDACTED] where they alleged the incident had occurred. The [REDACTED] submitted that there were [REDACTED] inconsistencies in the [REDACTED] account of the events. At the time that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] pointed out [REDACTED] where the incident occurred, they failed to recognize [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] who were standing [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] suggested that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were only identified as assailants because they happened to walk out of [REDACTED] as the [REDACTED] were identifying [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] maintained that it was at this point that [REDACTED] changed their version of events and reduced from [REDACTED] they claimed were involved in their rape.

78. In the document submitted by [REDACTED], it was also claimed that [REDACTED] as well as several [REDACTED], inspected the [REDACTED] where the incident was said to have occurred. They said that this provided [REDACTED] with the opportunity to view the premises and establish the location of [REDACTED] where [REDACTED].

79. The main issue raised in the [REDACTED] was whether [REDACTED] entered the [REDACTED] when they attended [REDACTED]. In order to establish the veracity of the assertion, ID/OIOS re-interviewed a number of [REDACTED] on that day. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] all stated that the only [REDACTED] who entered the [REDACTED] on that day were the [REDACTED]. One of the [REDACTED] present at [REDACTED] was interviewed and told ID/OIOS that whilst [REDACTED] went into [REDACTED] to assist in locating [REDACTED], most of [REDACTED] remained [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] remained [REDACTED] and at no time entered any of [REDACTED].

Allegation - Bribery of [REDACTED]

80. On [REDACTED] spoke to ID/OIOS and informed them that [REDACTED] had been contacted through [REDACTED] by [REDACTED] acting on behalf of [REDACTED] seeking a meeting to discuss the [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] expressed some concern about the meeting to ID/OIOS, as the [REDACTED] had made contact

through [REDACTED], rather than coming to [REDACTED] through [REDACTED] said that this could be an indication that [REDACTED] may be preparing to offer a bribe to escape prosecution.

81. On [REDACTED] ID/OIOS interviewed [REDACTED] who supply [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] had referred [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] so that they could take advice on the [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] had recently obtained [REDACTED] and would make [REDACTED] problems 'go away'. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] considered the sexual assault complaint a trivial matter and believed that [REDACTED] did not have to worry about criminal charges being laid against [REDACTED].

82. On [REDACTED] ID/OIOS conducted a [REDACTED] with the [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED]. They were asked about the [REDACTED] that they had engaged to [REDACTED] during the [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] they had engaged [REDACTED] and had instructed [REDACTED] to be present for all of the [REDACTED] s, act as a [REDACTED] and obtain information from the [REDACTED] said that from their [REDACTED], [REDACTED] assured them that there was little [REDACTED] and that [REDACTED] would not be in a position to [REDACTED] against the accused. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] undertook to obtain [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] so that the accused could be [REDACTED] [REDACTED] said that in the following [REDACTED] stressed that there would be no difficulties in resolving the issues. [REDACTED] said that at no time had they instructed [REDACTED] to make any representations to [REDACTED] or any other person that could be construed as an attempt to undermine or pervert the criminal investigation being conducted by [REDACTED] stated that if [REDACTED] made such an approach it was done without their knowledge.

83. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that [REDACTED] had a [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] and arranged for [REDACTED] to bring the [REDACTED] concerned to [REDACTED] for interview on [REDACTED] said that prior to the agreed time, [REDACTED] received a [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] asking [REDACTED] to meet [REDACTED] at a location other than the [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] should be brought to [REDACTED] as arranged and [REDACTED] sought assurances that [REDACTED] would not be arrested and held in custody. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] that they would not be [REDACTED] and if they were to be [REDACTED] they would be released into the custody of [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that at about [REDACTED] arrived at [REDACTED] and asked [REDACTED] to go to [REDACTED] to discuss the matter in private. [REDACTED] said that this is the usual precursor to the offer of a bribe. [REDACTED] said [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] would not go to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] wanted the subjects brought to [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] returned with the subjects a short time later. ID/OIOS also interviewed [REDACTED] who were present during this conversation, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] who [REDACTED] corroborated the account of [REDACTED] and said that a proposal to discuss an investigation at [REDACTED] was common practice in [REDACTED] when a bribe would be offered to make the matter [REDACTED].

Flee the Jurisdiction

84. The allegations were initially investigated by [redacted] and [redacted] of the [redacted] however, the matter was subsequently transferred to [redacted] and [redacted]. The continuing investigations were actively monitored by experienced [redacted], who provided written reports on the progress of [redacted].

85. On [redacted] 6, [redacted] submitted a report to [redacted] outlining recent developments in the investigation. The report stated that on [redacted] [redacted] made the decision to charge [redacted] with rape and [redacted] with assault. The report explained that detention was authorized and that the accused were expected to appear [redacted] on the [redacted] of [redacted]. While the accused were being escorted to [redacted], discussions took place between [redacted] and [redacted]. As a result, the accused were released into the custody of [redacted] on a [redacted] that [redacted] would return them to [redacted]. The report stated that on the morning of [redacted] [redacted] met with [redacted] who told [redacted] that, as a result of a meeting with [redacted] a decision had been made to transfer the investigation to [redacted]. [redacted] said that, after a period of review, a decision would be made on whether criminal charges were warranted.

86. In a report from [redacted] involved in the [redacted], it was stated that the accused persons were interviewed by [redacted] on the [redacted] of [redacted]. [redacted] anticipated that the accused would appear in [redacted]. In a report submitted on [redacted] [redacted] informed the [redacted] that the accused were yet to appear [redacted] and that [redacted] was preparing a summary of the [redacted].

87. Over [redacted] [redacted] attempted to locate and detain [redacted] for offences relating to the sexual assault of [redacted] and the assault of [redacted] outside the [redacted] on [redacted]. The [redacted] were: [redacted]. Despite assurances from the [redacted], they failed to surrender themselves into [redacted] and were later found to have fled the [redacted].

88. In [redacted] notified the [redacted] [redacted] had returned to [redacted] and would not face [redacted]. In correspondence to the [redacted] stated that on or about [redacted] the [redacted] had gone to [redacted] where they purchased [redacted]. This [redacted] was said to have occurred without the knowledge or cooperation of [redacted] attached a signed [redacted] from the [redacted] outlining the reasons for their [redacted]. They expressed concern over the way the investigation had been conducted and the strength of the [redacted].

Response

89. The original allegations were the subject of intense scrutiny by [REDACTED] and received some [REDACTED]. This scrutiny increased after it was revealed that the accused had [REDACTED]. There was widespread [REDACTED] that the [REDACTED] had been bribed to allow the [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] the [REDACTED] suspended [REDACTED] for mishandling the [REDACTED]. The ability of the accused to escape prosecution caused [REDACTED] raised the issue in discussions with the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] called for [REDACTED] as the [REDACTED].

Interview with [REDACTED]

90. ID/OIOS interviewed [REDACTED] who stated that [REDACTED] was a [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] was also an [REDACTED] who dealt with both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that in [REDACTED] was contacted by a [REDACTED] and retained to assist in a [REDACTED] involving allegations of rape leveled against [REDACTED] subsequently met with [REDACTED] who had [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] was instructed to provide advice to [REDACTED] on the [REDACTED] and to assist the [REDACTED] in their dealings with [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] initially dealt with [REDACTED] who [REDACTED] described as [REDACTED].

91. [REDACTED] was asked whether [REDACTED] had attempted to arrange a meeting with [REDACTED] in a [REDACTED] on the [REDACTED] admitted that [REDACTED] had spoken with [REDACTED] prior to arriving at [REDACTED] but there had been no mention of [REDACTED] confirmed that [REDACTED] between [REDACTED] usually occur when the [REDACTED] is so compelling that there is a reasonable prospect that the accused will [REDACTED] said that in these circumstances, bribes may be discussed. [REDACTED] said that this was not the situation with respect to [REDACTED], as it was [REDACTED] assessment that the prosecution case was [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] also told ID/OIOS that as a [REDACTED] was not in the habit of offering bribes to [REDACTED].

92. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that [REDACTED] was present for [REDACTED] and subsequently arranged for them to be brought to [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] said that on that date [REDACTED] were to be [REDACTED] relating to the rape of [REDACTED] said that on arrival at the [REDACTED] it became apparent that the [REDACTED] had taken over the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] said that once this occurred the inquiry was poorly managed. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that [REDACTED] was advised that the [REDACTED] could [REDACTED] and escape prosecution if [REDACTED] was paid in bribes, but [REDACTED] refused to identify this person. However, [REDACTED] said that it was a [REDACTED] [REDACTED] told investigators that [REDACTED] informed [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] would not agree to such a proposal as [REDACTED] was [REDACTED], and in any case felt that the accused would be [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] and the accused were aware of this offer, but did not know whether the [REDACTED].

93. [redacted] told ID/OIOS that at the completion of [redacted] signed a [redacted] for the [redacted] undertaking to return with [redacted] the [redacted] returned on [redacted] to [redacted] with the accused and [redacted] again signed [redacted] said that on [redacted] other commitments prevented [redacted] from accompanying the [redacted] told ID/OIOS that [redacted] were released [redacted] however on this occasion [redacted] which [redacted] said was unusual and that [redacted] now believed that the [redacted] bribe had been paid to secure the [redacted] told ID/OIOS that [redacted] disappeared sometime later, but [redacted] was unsure as to how [redacted] or who had assisted [redacted] denied any involvement in the payment of bribes to [redacted]

VI. FINDINGS

94. ID/OIOS considers that the evidence of [redacted] is credible. They have remained consistent in the information they have provided to investigators and many aspects of their accounts have been corroborated. The corroboration takes the form of the call charge records and the detailed descriptions [redacted] provided about the [redacted] [redacted]. By contrast, the [redacted] were proven to have lied about the contact they had with [redacted] both on the [redacted] incident and in the [redacted] [redacted] could also be considered to have displayed a consciousness of guilt by [redacted]

95. ID/OIOS accepts the evidence of [redacted] and finds that on the evening of [redacted] and [redacted] were at the [redacted] when they met with [redacted]. This [redacted] [redacted] where the [redacted] with a [redacted] They remained at [redacted] for a period of time before the [redacted] suggested that they [redacted] ID/OIOS established that [redacted] were known to each other and had been in regular [redacted] since [redacted]

96. ID/OIOS established that on arrival [redacted] 5th [redacted] were supplied with more [redacted] including a [redacted] which made both [redacted] unwell [redacted]

97. ID/OIOS established that during [redacted] and [redacted] engaged in sexual activity with [redacted] and [redacted] of the [redacted] This sexual activity included [redacted]

98. ID/OIOS established that on [redacted] were forcefully removed from [redacted]. In the process of being removed from [redacted] both [redacted] left [redacted] in the [redacted] subsequently went to [redacted] where they made a complaint of sexual assault against [redacted]

99. ID/OIOS established that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] in order to investigate the complaint and identify any potential suspects. On arrival at [REDACTED], led by [REDACTED], introduced themselves to [REDACTED] who arranged for [REDACTED] come [REDACTED]. ID/OIOS established that [REDACTED] informed this person of the allegations that had been made and sought [REDACTED] cooperation in conducting [REDACTED].

100. ID/OIOS established that [REDACTED], a [REDACTED] emerged from [REDACTED] and joined the discussion. One [REDACTED] demanded to see [REDACTED] of the [REDACTED] and after the [REDACTED] one of them [REDACTED]. An altercation between the [REDACTED], during which [REDACTED] placed [REDACTED] on the [REDACTED] and attempted to place [REDACTED]. As a result of this action, the [REDACTED] was dragged [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED] inside [REDACTED] and separated from [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] was held against [REDACTED] will by [REDACTED] until [REDACTED] was removed from the [REDACTED].

101. ID/OIOS established that shortly after this incident, additional [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] arrived at [REDACTED] which seemed to diffuse the situation and [REDACTED] was released. At this time, [REDACTED] briefed [REDACTED] on the nature of the allegation being investigated and requested their assistance in identifying the alleged offenders. ID/OIOS established that [REDACTED] searched the [REDACTED] identified as the scene of the incident and located [REDACTED] who at first were reluctant to accompany [REDACTED]. Once [REDACTED] were asked to identify [REDACTED] who had brought them [REDACTED]. They both identified [REDACTED].

102. ID/OIOS established that whilst [REDACTED], an [REDACTED] returned the [REDACTED] containing personal items to [REDACTED]. At this time [REDACTED] claimed that [REDACTED] had been [REDACTED] by person or persons unknown.

103. ID/OIOS established that both [REDACTED] denied knowing or having any contact with [REDACTED]. However, [REDACTED] provided [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] this [REDACTED] and a [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] then ran back into [REDACTED]. ID/OIOS established that [REDACTED] made false denials when questioned about their relationships with [REDACTED].

104. ID/OIOS established that at no time during the [REDACTED] did [REDACTED] enter the [REDACTED] at the [REDACTED]. ID/OIOS established that the accounts to the contrary by [REDACTED] were falsehoods and part of a deliberate attempt to undermine [REDACTED] and ID/OIOS investigations.

105. ID/OIOS established that many of [REDACTED] had been involved in the widespread and systemic sexual exploitation of [REDACTED] over [REDACTED]. ID/OIOS established that [REDACTED].

██████████ would procure prostitutes for ██████████ on a ██████████
ID/OIOS also established that ██████████ would attend ██████████ of
their own volition to engage in prostitution with ██████████

106. ID/OIOS established that ██████████ engaged ██████████
██████████ to act as their ██████████ in matters relating to the ██████████
investigation. ID/OIOS established that in ██████████ were
preparing to ██████████ against ██████████ for offences relating
to sexual assault of ██████████ and for offences relating to the assault ██████████
The ██████████

107. ID/OIOS considers on the balance of probabilities that a bribe somewhere in
the amount of ██████████ was paid to ██████████ by a person or
persons associated with ██████████. The purpose of the bribe was to prevent the
██████████ ID/OIOS established that on or about ██████████
the ██████████ fled the ██████████, and then
returned to ██████████

108. There is some evidence to suggest that ██████████
██████████ to engage in prostitution with ██████████
Nevertheless, the demonstrable lies and false denials by both the subjects and their
colleagues leaves the ██████████'s version of events as the only credible and verifiable
account of what took place on ██████████ ██████████ and the ██████████
██████████ Therefore, ID/OIOS finds credible the allegation that ██████████
and ██████████ raped and sexually assaulted ██████████

109. ID/OIOS established that a ██████████ on the
██████████ in question were also involved in the rape and sexual assault of ██████████
However, ID/OIOS considers the evidence as to who may have participated in the
rape, and the assault upon the ██████████ is not sufficiently robust to support findings
against particular individuals. In establishing the identification and involvement of
██████████ in the sexual assault of ██████████ ID/OIOS
relies upon the CCRs linking ██████████ with ██████████ and the spontaneous
identification of the ██████████ on ██████████

VII. CONCLUSIONS

110. This investigation brought into sharp focus the fact that ██████████
██████████ do not differentiate between the various classes of ██████████
██████████. Such communities view ██████████ and thus their
conduct can bring the Organization into disrepute as effectively as an allegation
against ██████████. It is therefore important to ensure that
██████████ providing ██████████ to the ██████████ in ██████████
██████████ must be aware of the standard of conduct expected whilst ██████████

111. ██████████ to provide services to ██████████ also have a responsibility
to ensure that their ██████████ are not violating ██████████ standards of conduct. In this case,
it is difficult to believe that ██████████ and ██████████ were
unaware of the sexual misconduct taking place at ██████████ This

misconduct was pervasive and said to have included the practice of [REDACTED] in front of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] before selecting one [REDACTED]. This misbehavior is, by any standards, inconsistent with the standards of the [REDACTED]. The treatment meted out to [REDACTED] and the contempt displayed towards [REDACTED] is disturbing. Even more disturbing was the payment of a bribe to [REDACTED] so that the [REDACTED] were able to evade prosecution. It is evidence of a complete disregard for the laws and customs of [REDACTED].

112. In [REDACTED] the total net value of [REDACTED] was over [REDACTED] from the [REDACTED]. Therefore, it is clearly in the interests of [REDACTED] to take all reasonable steps to safeguard their [REDACTED] with the [REDACTED] must ensure that [REDACTED] conduct themselves appropriately at all times as failure to adhere to [REDACTED] jeopardizes the overall [REDACTED] status of [REDACTED]. As a result, it also reflects badly on the name and activities of the [REDACTED]. In this regard, [REDACTED] clearly failed to meet their [REDACTED] responsibilities.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

113. In view of the findings of this investigation, ID/OIOS recommends the following:

Recommendation 1: It is recommended that the [REDACTED] provide a copy of this report to the [REDACTED] to inform them of the circumstances of the case and for whatever action they deem appropriate with respect to the person/s who aided and abetted the escape of the accused [REDACTED] from the jurisdiction. [REDACTED]

Recommendation 2: It is recommended that [REDACTED] refer this case to [REDACTED] to allow for their review of the findings of the investigation in order to ensure that appropriate action is considered against the [REDACTED] adversely named in this report and the results of such action be reported back to [REDACTED] for passage to ID/OIOS. [REDACTED]

Recommendation 3: It is recommended that [REDACTED] advise [REDACTED] that based on the findings of the investigation, [REDACTED] will not be accepted for assignment to any current or future [REDACTED].

Recommendation 4: It is recommended that [REDACTED] develop a Code of Conduct for [REDACTED] to [REDACTED].

Recommendation 5: It is recommended that [REDACTED] review the provision of training on sexual exploitation and abuse to [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] in light of the findings of this report. [REDACTED]

Recommendation 6: It is recommended that [REDACTED] give consideration to including pecuniary penalty clauses in [REDACTED] for substantiated incidents of sexual exploitation and abuse by [REDACTED]

Recommendation 7: It is recommended that based on the findings of the investigation, [REDACTED] review the suitability of [REDACTED] to provide [REDACTED]