



United Nations

Nations Unies

**OFFICE OF INTERNAL OVERSIGHT SERVICES  
INVESTIGATIONS DIVISION**

---

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

**INVESTIGATION REPORT ON THE FRAUDULENT USE OF**



**REDACTED REPORT**

**ID Case No. 0017-09**

**23 JUNE 2009**

**STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL**

This Investigation Report of the Investigations Division of the United Nations Office of Internal Oversight Services is provided upon your request pursuant to paragraph 1(c) of General Assembly resolution A/RES/59/272. The report has been redacted in part pursuant to paragraph 2 of this resolution to protect confidentiality and sensitive information. OIOS's transmission of this Report does not constitute its publication. OIOS does not bear any responsibility for any further dissemination of the Report.



**I. INTRODUCTION**

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

**II. APPLICABLE LEGAL NORMS**

5. Staff regulations and issuances:

Staff Regulation 1.2

(b) Staff members shall uphold the highest standard 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;

Secretary-General's Bulletin ST/SGB/2004/15 (In effect 1 December 2004)Section 5

- 5.1 Users of ICT resources and ICT data shall not engage in any of the following actions:
  - b) Knowingly, or through gross negligence, making ICT resources ... available to persons who have not been authorized to access them;
  - c) Knowingly, or through gross negligence, using ICT resources ... in a manner contrary to the rights and obligations of staff members;

[REDACTED] Administrative Instruction No. 08/2006 (In effect 1 August 2006)

- (3) Use of [REDACTED] shall be in accordance with the highest standards of conduct expected of UN staff members and subject to the policy on the use of information and communications technology resources and data (ST/SGB/2004/15).

...

- (24) Any form of abuse by staff in utilizing their [REDACTED] that may result in financial loss to the organization directly or otherwise will result in the immediate deactivation of this service. Fraudulent use of another [REDACTED] will also result in its immediate deactivation followed by administrative action against the staff involved.

**III. IMPLICATED PERSONNEL**

6. [REDACTED] (also known as [REDACTED], a [REDACTED] began [REDACTED] service with the Organization in [REDACTED] as a [REDACTED] with the [REDACTED] was later assigned to [REDACTED], a position [REDACTED] currently holds.

**IV. METHODOLOGY**

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

**V. BACKGROUND**

[REDACTED]

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

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

[REDACTED]

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

## VI. INVESTIGATIVE DETAILS

### A. [REDACTED]-ASSISTED IDENTIFICATION OF SUBJECT

12. After receiving complaints from [REDACTED] about [REDACTED] to their [REDACTED] that had not been personally incurred, [REDACTED] and OIOS collaborated in the identification of possible subjects. The results revealed that [REDACTED] incurred [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] during [REDACTED] that they had not made themselves and that originated from several [REDACTED] identified some of these [REDACTED] within the [REDACTED] of the [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED] at the [REDACTED]

### B. ANALYSIS OF [REDACTED]

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

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

### C. WITNESS INTERVIEWS

#### (i) Interview with [REDACTED]

15. On [REDACTED] OIOS interviewed [REDACTED] who stated that [REDACTED] utilized the [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] to make [REDACTED] and claimed [REDACTED] obtained [REDACTED] from [REDACTED]

16. During [REDACTED] subsequent interview on [REDACTED] elaborated on further aspects of [REDACTED] previous interview. [REDACTED] stated that it was the beginning of [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] allowed [REDACTED] to borrow [REDACTED] and when it was returned the [REDACTED] was recorded and that [REDACTED] explained how the [REDACTED] worked. [REDACTED] claimed that [REDACTED] said it was a general [REDACTED] free

of [REDACTED] to be used by everybody for [REDACTED] then began to use [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] outside [REDACTED]

17. [REDACTED] stated that in [REDACTED] allowed [REDACTED] to use the [REDACTED] again and when it was returned there were [REDACTED] made through the [REDACTED], with the [REDACTED] of not less than [REDACTED] queried [REDACTED] as to whether [REDACTED] made these [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] confirmed that [REDACTED] had. Apparently [REDACTED] further stated that the use of the [REDACTED] was a serious problem and it was illegal and if the [REDACTED] became aware of their usage, then they would both be suspended from [REDACTED]

(ii) Interview with [REDACTED]

18. On [REDACTED] OIOS interviewed [REDACTED] who worked in the [REDACTED] stated that many [REDACTED] used the [REDACTED] in the [REDACTED] in particular [REDACTED] noted [REDACTED] as a frequent user.

(iii) Interview with [REDACTED]

19. OIOS interviewed [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] stated that after [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] had been [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] did not make, [REDACTED] decided to [REDACTED] at random some of the [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] spoke to a [REDACTED] who immediately thought [REDACTED] was [REDACTED] However, the only information [REDACTED] obtained was that [REDACTED] worked in the United Nations, but no specific department was established [REDACTED]

(iv) Interview with [REDACTED]

20. OIOS interviewed [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] explained to [REDACTED] the use of the [REDACTED] and how it could be used to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] never received any [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] had never seen [REDACTED] using a [REDACTED]

D. INTERVIEW WITH THE SUBJECT

21. OIOS interviewed [REDACTED]. During the first interview [REDACTED] advised that [REDACTED] had neither received a [REDACTED] nor a [REDACTED] though [REDACTED] was aware of the [REDACTED]

22. [REDACTED] was advised by OIOS that witnesses had claimed that they had left their [REDACTED] allocated [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] and when returned there were a number of [REDACTED] that had been made. [REDACTED] denied the claims in their entirety.

23. OIOS specifically addressed the claims made by [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] had utilized [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] and provided [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] details. [REDACTED] denied all of [REDACTED]. When asked about possible motives witnesses may have to make these claims, [REDACTED] started yelling and shouting and ran out of the OIOS office, thereby unilaterally terminating the interview [REDACTED].

24. With the assistance of [REDACTED]'s supervisor, OIOS conducted a further interview with [REDACTED] on [REDACTED]. During this interview, [REDACTED] reiterated that [REDACTED] was never issued with [REDACTED].

25. Further, [REDACTED] denied that any [REDACTED] had left their [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] was aware of any [REDACTED] or that [REDACTED] had provided [REDACTED] to [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] has no disputes with any of [REDACTED] however [REDACTED] asserts any individual making these claims against [REDACTED] is a 'liar' [REDACTED].

26. OIOS presented [REDACTED] with the opportunity to address further claims of [REDACTED] misuse of [REDACTED]. Specifically –

a) witnesses had seen [REDACTED] using the [REDACTED] in the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] – [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] visited the [REDACTED] a few times to [REDACTED] and that [REDACTED] rarely used the [REDACTED] there, except maybe once or twice to [REDACTED] at another [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] added that the [REDACTED] are the responsibility of the assigned [REDACTED] who should be held accountable for any incidents within their [REDACTED].

b) that a [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] from a disputed [REDACTED] was [REDACTED] and the recipient thought that [REDACTED] was [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] denied this claim and disputed the veracity of the [REDACTED]. When asked why [REDACTED] questioned the authenticity of this [REDACTED] stated that perhaps the person/s making the [REDACTED] were seeking to impress their [REDACTED]. Further [REDACTED] proposed that the recipient of the [REDACTED] may have had intended another person sharing [REDACTED].

[REDACTED]

**VII. FINDINGS**

27. OIOS finds that [REDACTED] fraudulently misused the [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] in order to make [REDACTED] for which [REDACTED] did not pay, totalling [REDACTED] in [REDACTED].

28. Although there was some evidence that [REDACTED] had provided a [REDACTED] to [REDACTED], in the absence of corroborative evidence, OIOS is unable to make a conclusive finding in this regard.

**VIII. CONCLUSIONS**

29. Based on the evidence collected and the findings above, OIOS concludes that [REDACTED] failed to adhere to the standard of integrity expected of United Nations personnel and that [REDACTED] contravened staff regulation 1.2(b) and relevant administrative issuances.

**IX. RECOMMENDATIONS**

30. In view of the preceding findings, OIOS makes the following recommendations:

**Recommendation 1.** It is recommended that the [REDACTED] take appropriate action against [REDACTED].

**Recommendation 2.** It is recommended that the [REDACTED] finalize estimated losses and consider seeking [REDACTED] recovery from [REDACTED] for the [REDACTED] defrauded.