

INVESTIGATIONS DIVISION / OIOS

NOTE to the CASE FILE

(ID/F13-4/96)

Date: 20 May 2013
ID staff member: Peter A Gallo
Case Number: 0392/12
Subject: Email RMB-PAG of Tuesday 14 May at 3:19PM with revised Draft with Referral B attached

In 006 Final Draft Referral B.doc, [Citrix Doc 006] para 2, RMB corrected two mistakes made by me; clearly a sign of the near total collapse of western education - at least as received by me - and for which the UN doubtless stands ready willing able to remedy.

RMB deleted a duplicate word that I had missed, and for which I remain suitably grateful. RMB also changed “was’ into “were” – which was also correct, and for which I shall remain similarly grateful. Both these mistakes were made by me, and pointed out by RMB. A bouquet of flowers is being considered.

However, RMB also substituted the correct name of the company for a wrong one, which shows that she did not take the time to look at the underlying report. She changed manufacturers (plural) into manufacturer (singular) – while leaving past tense of the verb ‘to be’ in the singular. She also changed IED into ‘Improvised Explosive Device’ – with two spelling mistakes.

I am fairly confident that DFS will know that anything relating to the protection of armoured vehicles in Somalia from land mines will know that IED would refer to an Improvised Explosive Device and not a visit from the Inspection and Evaluation Division, but given the rest of the nonsense that one encounters around here on a daily basis, perhaps I shouldn’t attribute them with so much common sense.

Still in terms of the petty typos game, the score is 5-2 to me. **What does this say about OIOS “management”?**

I, however, do not have the audacity to suggest that anyone should be put on a PIP or that you should go on a report writing class.

Moreover, this is a referral memo, the purpose of which is to tell DFS - for whatever reason - that they should look into the matter.

Just a minor observation.... The precise words used in para 3 have next to no bearing on the substance of the memo. DFS will still have to read the original complaint. The operative text is that the company

called N4 Trucks had knowledge of the ITB before it was made public. That was made quite clear in para 2.

How OIOS relates what the anonymous complainant said he THINKS happened, or what impression he (the anonymous complainant) THINKS that the UN might have formed, or what he THINKS about whether or not the vehicle was or was not connected to a different South African vehicle, can hardly be as important as even the most basic analysis of the complaint.

Having actually taken some time to look at the original complaint, my analysis was such that the Intake Committee might want to reconsider this one.

That of course, would deprive everyone of a good excuse to correct the minutiae of irrelevant memos and waste even more time on unnecessary paperwork.

Still, I have no doubt RMB will make more changes and send it back for me to make more corrections so RMB can then revise it again and send it back to waste even more time.

I appreciate that this organisation considers it appropriate to employ P4 level professional staff to draft administrative memos that any other cost conscious organisation would have done by support staff but it is not for me to question the wisdom of how the Fifth Committee allocates the Member States money.

As I have pointed out in the past, JO 15922 called for the employment of an investigator and not a filing clerk so you will excuse me for not having much of an aptitude for it.

This whole referral case is indicative of the unnecessary time-wasting that goes on in this office.

The referral was overlooked by me back in August 2012. This oversight was my fault entirely. In keeping with what the organisation describes as the 'Core Competency' of Accountability, I have no hesitation in taking full responsibility for my own shortcomings.

The allegation - for what it is worth - involves an unsubstantiated claim of very dubious credibility. Having looked at the complaint, I concluded that the matter was probably worth wasting DFS's time over. I made a note to that effect at the time.

With reference to email VZD-PAG Wednesday 1 May at 5:58pm, VZD is quite correct in that the document register in CITRIX lacks the very basic and "essential" pieces of information as to who placed the documents in the case file and the date when the documents were placed there. Clearly, 'inference' is not a skill possessed by many OIOS investigators. VZD also suggested that the matter be referred to the Ethics Office. I am not entirely sure how this fits within their mandate. **Harassment?**

TO: Ms Ameerah Haq
A: Under-Secretary-General
Department of Field Support

DATE: 27 August 2013
REFERENCE: ID-0392/12

Formatted: Highlight

FROM: Michael Stefanovic, Director
DE: Investigations Division
Office of Internal Oversight Services

SUBJECT: **Referral of Alleged Misconduct in UNSOA (ID Case No. 0392/12 [B])**
OBJET:

1. On 9 August 2013 the Investigations Division of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) received information from an anonymous source alleging serious procurement irregularities with regard to:

- ITB No. 11ITB-110023/KB;
- Contract No. UNSOA/CON/12/010; and
- PO No. 12SOA-120269.

2. Specifically, it was reported that 4 Trucks Limited, together with their associates were privy to information about the pending ITB before it was made public, and that the vehicle for which the contract was awarded, the Mamba Mk5 Iveco or KF411, had not been built at the time the contract was awarded.

Deleted: that N

Deleted: was

3. The complainant also alleges that the vehicle was never subjected to any land mine blast or Improvised Explosive Devise testing and that the manufacturer were deceptive in creating the impression that their (who arwe they? 4 Trucks Limited?) vehicle was related to another South African vehicle with which he (? Who is he?) claims it does not have any connection.

Deleted: s

Comment [UN1]: Does this person indicated that there is no connection or does he imply there is a connection? Please clarify.

4. OIOS considers that this matter will best be handled by your office; accordingly, it is referred to you for your attention and appropriate action.

5. Upon your acknowledgement of receipt, OIOS will consider the matter closed.

6. Thank you and best regards.

Copy to:

Ms Carmen Lapointe, USG
OIOS

Mr. Dmitri Dovgopoly, Director
Procurement Division

att: Complaint Memo [UN Aug 2012].pdf [Doc 003]