



**UNITED NATIONS  
NATIONS UNIES**

*This report is protected under the provisions of  
ST/SGB/273, paragraph 18, of 7 September 1994"*

**STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL**

**OFFICE OF INTERNAL OVERSIGHT SERVICES  
INVESTIGATIONS DIVISION**

**REDACTED  
REPORT OF INVESTIGATION**

**ID CASE NO Nos. 0186/03, 0258/03 No. 1,  
0258/03 No. 2, 0464/03 and 0594/03**

**27 July 2004**

REPORT INTO ALLEGATIONS OF CERTAIN IRREGULARITIES AT THE  
ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR AFRICA (ECA)

(ID Case Nos. 0186/03, 0258/03 No. 1, 0258/03 No. 2, 0464/03 and 0594/03)

1. ID/OIOS received the following complaints in relation to the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA):

- (i) **Case No. 0186/03** - that there were irregularities in the award to a vendor of the catering contracts to manage the Main Cafeteria, the Delegates Lodge and the Press bar. It was further alleged that the vendor paid a staff member in order for the vendor to be awarded the said catering contracts.
- (ii) **Case No. 0258/03 No. 1** - that a staff member constructed another staff member's house utilizing labour and material from the United Nations.
- (iii) **Case No. 0258/03 No. 2** - that a manager illegally recruited a staff member by ignoring the rules and that the staff member employed her niece at L3 level. Further, that the staff member employed more than ten relatives (none of whom were named) in the general services section of the ECA.
- (iv) **Case No. 0464/03** - that a manager employed a renown individual of an international organization for the purpose of spearheading his election campaign for the directorship position at that organization and further that the manager is using UN money for this purpose.
- (v) **Case No. 0594/03** - that a staff member at ECA was terminated after she turned down the sexual advances of a manager.

2. After a thorough investigation of these matters, ID/OIOS has concluded the following:

- (i) **Case No. 0186/03** - the evidence in this case does not support the allegation made.

It is recommended that the staff member be exonerated in relation to this allegation. (Rec. No. IV03/186/01)

- (ii) **Case No. 0258/03 No. 1** - The staff member did not construct the other staff member's house but assisted him in renovating it and doing minor work on it. The staff employed in his Unit carried out the work (independent contractors) utilizing UN tools, under his supervision, on evenings and on weekends. The staff member, however, was not paid for rendering such services. Even though it seems clear that the staff member was merely trying to be helpful in providing the service, in so doing he was in breach of Regulation 1.2 (o) which provides that "Staff members shall not engage in any outside occupation or employment,

whether remunerated or not, without the approval of the Secretary-General” and by using UN tools – in breach of Staff Regulation 1.2q. This Regulation provides that “Staff members shall only use the property and assets of the Organization for official purposes and assets.”

Normally when a staff member is in breach of a Staff regulation, some administrative or disciplinary action would be recommended. However, because of the limited use in this case and the apparent lack of personal benefit, no recommendation is made as to the staff member’s action in this case.

It is however suggested that these regulations be brought to the attention of this staff member and staff members in general in order that they exercise greater judgment in their off duty activities and consider that their actions may be seen to affect their integrity.

- (iii) **Case No. 0258/03 No. 2** - the evidence in this case does not support the allegations made.

It is recommended that the manager and the staff member be exonerated in relation to these allegations. (Rec. No. IV03/258/01)

- (iv) **Case No. 0464/03** - the evidence in this case does not support the allegation made. However evidence gathered shows that there were irregularities in the recruitment of the individual in that the requirements of the Administrative Instruction for Consultants – ST/AI/1999/7 section 4.2 were not followed. Instead of identifying several qualified candidates for the assignment, the individual only was identified as the person to be hired for the position. Section 4.2 provided that “on an exceptional basis and only in a case of force majeure a consultant may be engaged even though he or she was the only candidate considered provided a reasoned documented justification for such an exception is recorded prior to the selection”. No reasoned documented justification was recorded prior to the individual’s selection to bring this case within the exception provided.

It is recommended that to promote transparency, ECA management should take steps to ensure adherence to the recruitment process as stipulated by the Administrative Instruction ST/AI/1999/7. (Rec. No. IV03/464/01)

- (v) **Case No. 0594/03** - the evidence in this case does not support the allegation made in this matter. Moreover, it was found that the complainant did not seek recourse or review of the termination of the contract through the usual UN – JAB and/or UNAT channels.

It is recommended that the manager be exonerated in relation to this allegation. (Rec. No. IV03/594/01)

