



United Nations

Nations Unies

**OFFICE OF INTERNAL OVERSIGHT SERVICES
INVESTIGATIONS DIVISION**

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

**INVESTIGATION REPORT INTO A REPORT OF SEXUAL
EXPLOITATION BY**

[REDACTED]

REDACTED REPORT

ID Case No. 0472-06

24 APRIL 2008

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.



CONFIDENTIAL

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

SUBJECT: Investigation report into a report of sexual exploitation by [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

1. [REDACTED], the Investigations Division of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (ID/OIOS) received, from the [REDACTED] a report that a [REDACTED] sexually exploited [REDACTED].

2. Specifically, it was claimed that [REDACTED] who was employed as [REDACTED], had maintained a sexual relationship with [REDACTED] nicknamed [REDACTED]. It was also claimed that [REDACTED] gave [REDACTED]; the [REDACTED] later died.

3. ID/OIOS conducted an investigation into this matter, which included, but was not limited to, the interview of civilians and United Nations personnel and the review and analysis of relevant documents.

4. ID/OIOS has completed its investigation and presents the following investigative findings.

Investigative details and findings

5. [REDACTED] confirmed that [REDACTED] had [REDACTED] that it was [REDACTED] assignment with [REDACTED] was a [REDACTED] and, at one point, [REDACTED] is presently [REDACTED] in [REDACTED], in the [REDACTED].

6. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] met [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] as [REDACTED]. According to [REDACTED] they commenced a consensual sexual relationship that continued thereafter, with [REDACTED] living with [REDACTED] and returning to [REDACTED] only during [REDACTED]. In contrast, [REDACTED], who only knew [REDACTED] as [REDACTED], stated that their relationship commenced in [REDACTED] and they had sexual intercourse [REDACTED] later. [REDACTED] denied that [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] ended the relationship [REDACTED].

7. [redacted] alleged that [redacted] had provided [redacted]: [redacted] when [redacted] would ask for [redacted] directly to [redacted] for a total [redacted]. This was confirmed by [redacted], who added that [redacted] gave [redacted] each time [redacted] was [redacted] due to [redacted] and that [redacted] had helped [redacted].
8. [redacted] stated that [redacted] to [redacted], but [redacted] of [redacted]. When asked, [redacted] stated that the [redacted] was a [redacted] in charge of [redacted] in [redacted] named [redacted]. [redacted] stated that [redacted] was sure that [redacted] was [redacted] as [redacted] was [redacted] at the time of [redacted]. Though [redacted] claimed that [redacted] was the [redacted], [redacted] stated that [redacted] was unaware that [redacted] had [redacted] as [redacted] was absent from [redacted] at the time. [redacted] denied any possibility that [redacted] was the [redacted] that [redacted] always wore [redacted] during their [redacted].
9. [redacted] stated that after hearing rumours th [redacted] [redacted] arranged a meeting around [redacted] with [redacted] at [redacted] later identified by ID/OIOS to be [redacted]. [redacted] claimed that when [redacted] asked [redacted] [redacted] told [redacted] was, and that the [redacted] [redacted] was a [redacted] named "[redacted]". [redacted] stated that it was not possible for [redacted] to ascertain if [redacted] at that stage and that [redacted] had no further contact with [redacted] after that meeting.
10. On [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted]—purportedly [redacted]—in which [redacted] [redacted] claimed that [redacted] had lied about [redacted] being the [redacted] and that the actual [redacted] was a [redacted]. In the [redacted] [redacted] apologized and sought to retract [redacted] against [redacted]. [redacted] stated that [redacted] was aware that [redacted] had withdrawn [redacted] against [redacted] and that [redacted] had received a [redacted].
11. [redacted] stated that, sometime [redacted] [redacted] was stopped by [redacted] and [redacted] as [redacted] was attempting to enter [redacted] [redacted] along with [redacted]. This was confirmed by [redacted] who stated that [redacted] was in [redacted] waiting to go [redacted], when [redacted] received a [redacted] at approximately [redacted] informing [redacted] that some people had arrived at [redacted] with [redacted]. [redacted] stated that [redacted] spoke on the [redacted] to [redacted] who told [redacted] that, if [redacted] accepted responsibility for the [redacted] [redacted], everything would be settled smoothly but, if [redacted] did not accept responsibility, they would go to [redacted] to complain and [redacted] would be dismissed from [redacted] and they would be [redacted].
12. ID/OOS established th [redacted] [redacted] d attend a [redacted] [redacted] and that the [redacted] between [redacted] [redacted] took place. This was confirmed by [redacted] [redacted] who attended the scene after receiving a [redacted] that someone had tried to break into the [redacted].
13. [redacted] stated that [redacted] had no contact wi [redacted] [redacted] until [redacted] when [redacted] received a [redacted] from [redacted] whilst [redacted] was in a [redacted].

13. During that [REDACTED] asked [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] which [REDACTED] declined.

14. ID/OIOS obtained corroboration from witnesses who confirmed that they knew about the relationship between [REDACTED]; that [REDACTED] gave [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] on a regular basis and, in addition, that [REDACTED] gave [REDACTED] to a [REDACTED] who later died. This information was verified by [REDACTED] who added that [REDACTED] often visited [REDACTED] and told [REDACTED] was in love with [REDACTED].

Documentary evidence

15. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] on [REDACTED]. The name of the [REDACTED] is not stated on the [REDACTED] which is standard for a [REDACTED] [REDACTED] did not have a [REDACTED] [REDACTED] that would have contained the name of the [REDACTED] ID/OIOS was not able to obtain a [REDACTED] which is not unusual as [REDACTED] are not routinely issued in [REDACTED], especially in [REDACTED] areas.

16. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] had [REDACTED] against [REDACTED] because [REDACTED] had told [REDACTED] to do so. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] lied when [REDACTED] claimed in the [REDACTED] that a [REDACTED] was the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] reiterated that [REDACTED] was the [REDACTED] denied having received [REDACTED] in order to withdraw [REDACTED] and stated that since the [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] no longer wanted to discuss the matter.

17. [REDACTED] obtained by ID/OIOS records [REDACTED], but during subsequent inquiries [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] had lied about [REDACTED] in order to obtain the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] was born in [REDACTED] and at the time [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] was [REDACTED]. This information was confirmed by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] did not have a [REDACTED] which is not unusual in the [REDACTED] as many [REDACTED] are not registered. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] never inquired of [REDACTED] as, according to [REDACTED], [REDACTED] believed [REDACTED] was an adult.

Conclusions and Recommendations

18. In the absence of acceptance [REDACTED], and given the affirmative recantation of claims from [REDACTED], ID/OIOS cannot conclude that [REDACTED].

19. In the absence [REDACTED] ID/OIOS cannot establish [REDACTED], thus preventing a determination as to whether or not [REDACTED] at the time of [REDACTED] with [REDACTED].

20. ID/OIOS concludes that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] had a consensual sexual relationship; however, the evidence adduced does not support the report that the relationship was exploitative. Notwithstanding, ID/OIOS concludes that [REDACTED] relationship with [REDACTED] was of the type "strongly discouraged" by ST/SGB/2003/13.

21. In light of the findings of this investigation, ID/OIOS recommends the following:

Recommendation 1: It is recommended that the [REDACTED] inform [REDACTED] of the outcome of the investigation. [REDACTED]

22. Your response, by [REDACTED], to the findings and recommendation of this investigation would be greatly appreciated. Should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact [REDACTED].

23. Thank you and best regards.

[REDACTED]

