



**OIOS**

Office of Internal Oversight Services

## **INTERNAL AUDIT DIVISION**

# **AUDIT REPORT**

---

## **Audit of the implementation of quick impact projects in UNMIS**

**Improvements in monitoring and evaluating quick impact projects needed to ensure timely completion**

**3 September 2008**

**Assignment No. AP2008/632/01**

---

United Nations  Nations Unies

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

MEMORANDUM INTERIEUR

OFFICE OF INTERNAL OVERSIGHT SERVICES - BUREAU DES SERVICES DE CONTRÔLE INTERNE

INTERNAL AUDIT DIVISION - DIVISION DE L'AUDIT INTERNE

TO: Mr. Ashraf Jehangir Qazi  
A: Special Representative of the Secretary-General  
United Nations Mission in Sudan

DATE: 3 September 2008

FROM: Dagfinn Knutsen, Director  
DE: Internal Audit Division, OIOS



REFERENCE: IAD: 08- 01698

SUBJECT: **Assignment No. AP2008/632/01 - Audit of the implementation of quick impact projects in UNMIS**  
OBJET: **UNMIS**

1. I am pleased to present the report on the above-mentioned audit.
2. In order for us to close the recommendations, we request that you provide us with the additional information as discussed in the text of the report and also summarized in Annex 1.
3. Please note that OIOS will report on the progress made to implement its recommendations, particularly those designated as high risk (i.e., recommendations 1, 2, 5, 7, 9 and 10) in its annual report to the General Assembly and semi-annual report to the Secretary-General.

cc: Mr. Kiplin Perkins, Director of Mission Support, UNMIS  
Mr. Farid Zarif, Chief of Staff, UNMIS  
Ms. Sam Barnes, OIC, Civil Affairs Division, UNMIS  
Ms. Apollonia Tiliti, OIC-Budget Office, UNMIS  
Mr. Swatantra Goolsarran, Executive Secretary, UN Board of Auditors  
Ms. Maria Gomez Troncoso, Officer-in-Charge, Joint Inspection Unit Secretariat  
Mr. Jonathan Childerley, Chief, Oversight Support Unit, Department of Management  
Mr. Seth Adza, Operations Review Officer, Department of Field Support  
Mr. Byung-Kun Min, Programme Officer, OIOS

---

## INTERNAL AUDIT DIVISION

---

### FUNCTION

*“The Office shall, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Financial Regulations and Rules of the United Nations examine, review and appraise the use of financial resources of the United Nations in order to guarantee the implementation of programmes and legislative mandates, ascertain compliance of programme managers with the financial and administrative regulations and rules, as well as with the approved recommendations of external oversight bodies, undertake management audits, reviews and surveys to improve the structure of the Organization and its responsiveness to the requirements of programmes and legislative mandates, and monitor the effectiveness of the systems of internal control of the Organization” (General Assembly Resolution 48/218 B).*

---

### CONTACT INFORMATION

**DIRECTOR:**

Dagfinn Knutsen, Tel: +1.212.963.5650, Fax: +1.212.963.2185,  
e-mail: [knutsen2@un.org](mailto:knutsen2@un.org)

**DEPUTY DIRECTOR:**

Fatoumata Ndiaye, Tel: +1.212.963.5648, Fax: +1.212.963.3388,  
e-mail: [ndiaye@un.org](mailto:ndiaye@un.org)

**CHIEF, PEACEKEEPING AUDIT SERVICE:**

Eleanor T. Burns, Tel: +1.917.367.2792, Fax: +1.212.963.3388,  
e-mail: [burnse@un.org](mailto:burnse@un.org)

---

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **Implementation of quick impact projects in UNMIS**

The Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) conducted an audit of the implementation of quick impact projects (QIPs) in the United Nations Mission in the Sudan (UNMIS). The overall objective of the audit was to determine whether: (i) quick impact projects were planned and implemented in compliance with the approved guidelines; and (ii) the implemented projects have served their intended purposes to establish and build confidence in the Mission for effective mandate implementation. The audit was conducted in accordance with the International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing.

The Mission did not have an effective oversight mechanism at Mission headquarters to ensure QIPs are implemented in a timely manner and have met the intended project objectives. Over the last three budget periods, the Mission only implemented 50 per cent of approved projects and had to cancel 63 projects and leave open 79 delayed projects. The lack of a unit dedicated to manage QIPs full-time and the capacity of implementing partners to implement projects have led to delays ranging from 8 to 21 months to complete projects. Successfully completed projects were not widely publicized to the local population to improve UNMIS image and its relationship with the local community.

To address the weaknesses noted, OIOS made the following major recommendations to UNMIS management:

- Ensure that the Project Review Committee evaluates the capacity of implementing partners to implement QIPs prior to recommending projects for the approval.
- Establish a dedicated team to manage and monitor QIPs.
- Ensure that the nominated project officers' roles and responsibilities are clear with regard to the monitoring of and reporting on the progress of QIPs implementation.
- Sign the Memorandum of Understanding with implementing partners after all supporting documents have been submitted to avoid delays in the transfer of funds and the start of projects.
- Coordinate with the Civil Affairs Division focal points for QIPs to ensure final payments are made only after confirmation that the project has been physically verified as completed.
- Follow up the status of implementation of delayed projects to decide whether to terminate them, and recover unspent balances.
- Publicize all completed QIPs through broadcasts and news bulletins to ensure high visibility to the local population.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Paragraphs
I. INTRODUCTION	1 – 6
II. AUDIT OBJECTIVES	7
III. AUDIT SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY	8
IV. AUDIT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
A. Project selection and approval process	9 – 12
B. Project implementation and monitoring	13 – 30
C. Physical inspection of projects by OIOS	31 – 38
D. Financing and accounting	39 – 47
E. Project visibility to local population	48 – 51
F. Record maintenance	52 – 55
V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	56
ANNEX 1 – Status of audit recommendations	

---

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) conducted an audit of implementation of quick impact projects (QIPs) in United Nations Mission in Sudan (UNMIS) from March to April 2008. The audit was conducted in accordance with the International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing.

2. The Report of the Panel on UN Peace Operations (Brahimi Report) (S/2000/809) recommended that a small percentage of a mission's first-year budget should be made available to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General (SRSG) to fund QIPs in its area of operations in direct support of the mission's mandate. This recommendation was supported by the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (A/C.4/55/6), stating that QIPs be extended beyond the first year of peacekeeping operations to establish and build confidence in the mission, its mandate, and the peace process, thereby improving the environment for effective mandate implementation.

3. In compliance with the recommendations of the Panel on UN Peace Operations and the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, QIPs implementation commenced with the establishment of UNMIS on 24 March 2005. Table 1 shows the approved funding and the number of projects planned and completed since the establishment of the Mission.

**Table 1: UNMIS quick impact project funding and amount spent**

Year	Budget (\$)	Expenditures (\$)*
2005-06	2,000,000	1,437,156
2006-07	2,000,000	1,967,656
2007-08	1,000,000	289,904*

\* As of March 2008

4. The General Assembly, in its resolution 61/276, decided that QIPs funding for the third year of a mission and beyond may be requested if there is a requirement for confidence-building activities, in which case a needs assessment should be conducted.

5. In its 2008/09 budget, UNMIS has again proposed a funding of \$1 million for QIPs, explaining that the continuation of QIPs will directly and visibly assist the Mission in the implementation, promotion and facilitation of the United Nations peace support effort in Northern and Southern Sudan.

6. Comments made by UNMIS are shown in *italics*.

## II. AUDIT OBJECTIVES

7. The main objectives of the audit were to determine whether:

(a) QIPs were planned and implemented in compliance with Mission and Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) guidelines; and

---

---

(b) Implemented projects have served their intended purposes to establish and build confidence in the mission for effective mandate implementation.

### **III. AUDIT SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY**

8. The audit covered QIPs approved and implemented during the budget period 2005/06, 2006/07 and 2007/08. The audit included review of QIPs planning and implementation structure and strategy, project documents, visits to ongoing and completed projects and interviews with UNMIS key personnel involved in the projects, implementing partners and beneficiaries.

### **IV. AUDIT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **A. Project selection and approval process**

9. A DPKO Policy Directive on QIPs which came into effect on 12 February 2007 provides the selection criteria for QIPs. Prior to this, UNMIS had issued Administrative Instruction No. 10/2006 on 16 August 2006, establishing the selection criteria and procedures for QIPs management and administration in the Mission. These guidelines were similar to the DPKO Policy Directive.

10. The main criteria established by UNMIS for project selection are as follows:

- (a) Highly visible projects which would enhance the relationship between UNMIS and the community, and have a potential for improving the overall image of the Mission;
- (b) Projects should benefit the community in which they are executed and should avoid the perception of benefiting individuals;
- (c) Reliable and experienced implementing partners should be available to implement the project on the ground; and
- (d) Total individual project cost should not exceed \$25,000.

11. Table 2 shows the number and types of projects approved from fiscal years 2005/06 to 2007/08.

**Table 2: Breakdown of projects by category approved and funded by UNMIS**

Project category	Number of projects approved				%
	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	Total	
Education	26	36	24	86	30%
Community awareness	25	5	6	36	13%

Health	15	8	9	32	11%
Skills training	11	16	3	30	11%
Water and sanitation	7	12	10	29	10%
Multipurpose centers	3	21	3	27	10%
Renovation work (police/prisons)	7	12	5	24	8%
Road projects	8	2	0	10	3%
Agriculture	1	5	1	7	2%
HIV/AIDS	3	1	1	5	2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>286</b>	<b>100%</b>

12. Generally, the project selection and approval process were done by UNMIS in compliance with the established criteria and procedures.

## **B. Project implementation and monitoring**

### Project implementation

13. The timeframe stipulated under UNMIS guidelines for the implementation of QIPs was within a period not exceeding three months from the date the first installment of 80 per cent of project cost was disbursed to the implementing partner. DPKO Policy Directive on QIPs emphasizes that the entire project management cycle including project identification, review and approval, financial disbursement, and evaluation should be completed quickly and without prejudice to good practice in project management.

14. OIOS' analysis of QIPs approved for implementation over the last three budget periods is shown in Table 3. For the period 2005/06, 106 projects were approved and 94 projects representing 89 per cent were completed. For the period 2006/07, 118 projects were approved out of which only 49 projects representing 42 per cent were completed. For the current budget period 2007/08 ending on 30 June 2008, 62 projects were approved out of which only one was completed as at 1 June 2008.

**Table 3: QIPs implementation status as of 1 June 2008**

<b>Budget period</b>	<b>Number of Projects:</b>			
	<b>Approved</b>	<b>Completed</b>	<b>On-going</b>	<b>Cancelled</b>
2005-06	106	94	3	9
2006-07	118	49	63	6
2007-08	62	1	13	48
<b>Total</b>	<b>286</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>63</b>

15. OIOS also analyzed the time taken to complete projects, calculated from the date the first installment was released to the implementing partner to the date the project was completed. The analysis was done based on the relevant dates in respect of 91 projects completed under the 2005/06 budget and 24 projects completed under the 2006/07 budget made available to OIOS (details are shown in Table 4).



**Table 4: Analysis of time taken to complete QIPs**

<b>Time taken to complete the project from the date first installment made</b>	<b>Number of completed projects (2005/06 budget)</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Number of completed projects (2006/07 budget)</b>	<b>%</b>
1 to 3 months	8	9	4	17
4 to 6 months	7	7	7	29
7 to 9 months	19	21	4	17
10 to 12 months	39	43	3	12
13 months and above	18	20	6	25
<b>Total</b>	<b>91</b>		<b>24</b>	

16. Table 4 shows that 90 per cent and 80 per cent of projects for budget year 2005/06 and 2006/07 respectively did not meet the timeline of three months for project completion. Analysis was not done for budget period 2007/08 because only one project was completed out of 62 approved. On average, it took the implementing partners 8 months and in some cases 21 months to complete the projects. Three projects that started 24 months ago were still ongoing at the time of the audit.

17. OIOS observed that most of these projects were approved by the Heads of Office through their Local Project Review Committee (PRC) in the sectors. The Project Officers, who prepared the feasibility study and recommended to the local PRC to consider and approve projects, seldom visited the project site to ascertain progress of work and or review the causes of project delays and report, accordingly. OIOS further observed that, the Mission did not have a well-structured and functioning oversight board or Project Review Committee (PRC) at the Mission Headquarters level to ensure effective and efficient management of QIPs Mission-wide. The lack of an actively functioning oversight board resulted in the Mission not being able to monitor and take immediate remedial actions on many projects that have been delayed from 8 to 21 months.

18. The Mission explained that the main reason for the poor project implementation was the lack of competence and capacity of the implementing partners. However, the relevant PRC that approved the projects did not evaluate the capacity of the implementing partner. As a result of project delays, the Mission had to cancel 63 projects that were approved during the last three budget periods leading to the under-utilization of financial resources approved for QIPs. For the current budget period which ends on 30 June 2008, the under-utilization was 71 per cent due to the cancellation of 48 projects out of 62 approved projects.

### **Recommendation 1**

**(1) UNMIS Management should ensure that the respective Project Review Committee evaluates the capacity of implementing partners prior to recommending quick impact projects for the approval by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General.**

---

19. *UNMIS Management accepted recommendation 1 and stated that the evaluation of implementing partner's capacity will be part of QIP proposal documentation for QIP Review Committee's decision-making.* Recommendation 1 remains open pending submission of revised guidelines that requires the QIP Review Committee to conduct evaluation of implementing partner's capacity for project implementation.

Project monitoring

20. In February 2006, DPKO conducted a survey of practices in implementing QIPs in 10 peacekeeping missions. After which, DPKO published the good practices that emerged from the survey in a report titled "Survey of Practice: Quick Impact Projects in UN Peacekeeping Operations", which showed that the staffing of QIPs team was the key to the success of the programme. The nomination of full time QIPs staff in the mission was repeatedly stated as a good practice, which enables quality monitoring of projects that contributed to the strategic and efficient use of the QIPs fund.

21. In UNMIS, the implementation of QIPs has been partially managed by the Budget Section under the Mission Support Division and partially by the Civil Affairs Division (CAD) under the Office of the Principal Deputy SRSG. One civil affairs officer has been appointed as the focal point for QIPs at Headquarters level in Khartoum and one each in the respective sectors. Project officers are nominated by the CAD to visit the projects and provide feedback to the Budget Section for payment process. The nominated project officers are guided by the focal point for QIPs. The Budget Section maintains an Excel spreadsheet showing the project title, project type, implementing partner, amount approved and the status. Updating is done based on feedback received from the QIPs focal points.

22. OIOS observed that the Mission did not establish a full-fledged 'QIPs Team' to take charge of the monitoring and evaluation functions. Best practices recommend a minimum of three visits to the project locations:

- (a) First visit to determine the appropriateness of the project for the community and the capacity of the implementing partner to implement the project within the budgeted cost and time;
- (b) Second visit to determine whether the project had started and if not whether to recommend change of implementing partner or recover the fund advanced; and
- (c) Third visit to determine that the project has been physically completed before considering approval of final payment.

23. The Mission cited disproportionately high administrative cost as the main reason for not having a dedicated unit in charge of QIPs at Headquarters for Mission wide oversight responsibility. The Mission had instead revised the Administrative Instruction on QIPs and decided to enforce the new instructions

---

to remedy the root causes for the non-implementation of QIPs. In addition, the Mission had also decided that the overall monitoring/follow-up with focal points in the Sectors assigned to a staff member in the Strategic Planning Office under the Office of the Chief of Staff.

24. Interviews with CAD focal points for QIPs indicated that the poor performance of the QIPs programme was attributed mainly to inadequate monitoring. They added that inadequate monitoring was, in turn, caused by the assignment of project officer roles to UN Military Observers (UNMOs), UN Police Officers (UNPol) or civilian officers who volunteered to manage QIPs in addition to their regular duties. Some project officers regarded QIPs as an additional burden, not to be taken seriously. Most project officers were not proactive regarding their QIP responsibilities. As a result, CAD focal points had at times assumed project stewardship because staff have either rotated out of the Mission without doing any work, or have shown no initiative.

25. While OIOS appreciates the low monetary value of QIPs compared to the overall UNMIS budget, the successful implementation of QIPs can have a high impact in building the local population's confidence in UNMIS. In OIOS' opinion, therefore, in order to achieve this, dedicated resources should be made available to ensure QIPs are implemented more effectively.

#### **Recommendation 2**

**(2) The UNMIS Civil Affairs Division should ensure that nominated project officers are fully aware of their roles and responsibilities in the monitoring of and reporting on progress of quick impact projects assigned to them.**

26. *UNMIS Management accepted recommendation 2 and stated that with the revised Administrative Instructions on QIPs, the Sector Head of Office in cooperation with the sponsoring unit will ensure that nominated project officers are fully aware of their roles and responsibilities and also that their performance in regard to QIP management shall be assessed in their performance appraisal system (ePAS). Recommendation 2 remains open pending submission of the revised Administrative Instruction on QIPs.*

#### Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)

27. The DPKO directive provided that the QIPs programme shall be managed under the overall authority of the Head of Mission, who shall be responsible for ensuring that appropriate, effective and efficient mechanisms for QIPs management and for project selection and monitoring are established within the mission.

28. Although the Mission has already established guidelines on QIPs, there were no SOPs to regulate the timely and effective monitoring of projects, including the submission of progress reports on ongoing projects and project closure. Some projects have passed the 3-months duration but there were no progress reports to ascertain their status.

---

29. The lack of SOPs to regulate the activities of project officers in the sectors had contributed to the ineffective and inefficient management and monitoring of QIPs. Military and police officers who assume responsibilities as project officers need SOPs to guide them. This is particularly important due to the regular rotation of personnel. The Mission explained that SOPs are being drafted.

### **Recommendation 3**

**(3) UNMIS Management should expedite the finalization and implementation of standard operating procedures to provide guidance to all quick impact project officers and focal points.**

30. *UNMIS Management accepted recommendation 3 and stated that Standard Operating Procedures in the form of detailed revised Administrative Instructions for QIPs will be issued.* Recommendation 3 remains open pending submission of the revised Administrative Instructions for QIPs.

### **C. Physical inspection of projects by OIOS**

31. OIOS conducted physical inspection of 15 completed projects located in Juba (nine projects) and Wau (six projects) to determine whether they have been completed in accordance with the scope of work agreed in the MOU. OIOS observed that some of these projects were implemented without proper supervision, leading to late completion and poor workmanship:

#### Construction of Office for Women and Children Unit at Central Police Station in Juba

32. The project was sponsored by the Mission's UN Police – Sector I, Juba and the implementing partner was the Southern Sudan Police Service (SSPS). The project involved the construction of an office building, a cell for female and juvenile offenders, toilet facilities and bathrooms at a total cost of \$26,219. The project had been under construction for the past 18 months. The reason for the delay was the lack of funds to complete the project, which reflects poor planning and monitoring of project costs.

33. A second project was approved for SSPS and implemented by the Central Police Station to rehabilitate and improve the condition of the old cell in the police station. The project was budgeted at a total cost of \$23,626, out of which 70 per cent representing \$16,528 was released in March 2007 to the implementing partner. In breach of the MOU, the implementing partner used the fund to build two police offices in different locations in Kajo Keji and the other one in Morobo, near the Uganda border instead of the rehabilitation and improvement of conditions in the female cell as agreed in the MOU. The concerned PRC in Juba has written an official letter to the implementing partner on 1 April 2008 to seek explanation for this breach. This could have come to

---

light at an early stage if periodic visit to the project site had been conducted by the concerned project officer.

Provision of passenger shed at a market in Juba

34. A passenger shed was constructed at a cost of \$14,432 near the bus stop and a market. As the market grew, the bus stop was relocated; however, the shed remained in its original position and was completely taken over by hawkers. OIOS observed that no feasibility study and adequate assessment was conducted before the project was approved and implemented.

**Picture 1: Passenger shed near a bus stop and a market**



Rehabilitation for Kuajok Dispensary in Wau

35. The project was implemented by Kuajok Parish Catholic Church at a total cost of \$21,821 in the 2006/07 budget period, which had since not been completed. The incomplete building had been taken over by Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) in Wau.

**Picture 2: Incomplete dispensary taken over by IDPs**





---

### Momoi Kindergarten in Wau

36. This project was implemented by St. Anthony Parish in Brussere, Wau at an approved budget of \$25,000. An initial amount of \$17,500 was transferred to the implementing partner's bank account in March 2007 but the amount was not actually remitted to the implementing partner until August 2007 due to bureaucratic and inefficient local banking system in Wau. The implementing partner had not been able to complete the project as of the time of inspection in May 2008. Picture 3 shows the kindergarten still under construction.

**Picture 3: Incomplete kindergarten in Momoi, Wau**



### Construction of Community Resource Centre in Kuajok

37. The project was implemented by the Southern Sudan Relief and Rehabilitation Resource Centre in Kuajok (Government institution). The centre's director withdrew \$5,263 from the project fund in March 2007 but the project had not taken off. There were no follow-ups or appropriate report by UNMIS on the status of this project. OIOS was unable to get further details on the funds withdrawn by the centre's director.

#### **Recommendation 4**

**(4) UNMIS Management should follow up the status of the quick impact project relating to the construction of a community resource centre in Kuajok and the funds released to the implementing partner, the Southern Sudan Relief and Rehabilitation Resource Centre in Kuajok, and take appropriate action, e.g., blacklisting of the implementing partner for future QIPs and/or the recovery of funds disbursed to it, in case of any irregularity.**

38. *UNMIS Management accepted recommendation 4 and stated that the recommendation will be implemented by end of September 2008.*

---

Recommendation 4 remains open pending submission of the results and action taken with regard to the construction of a community resource centre in Kuajok.

#### **D. Financing and accounting**

39. The DPKO Policy Directive on QIPs provides that the Director of Mission Support shall be responsible for ensuring that expeditious administrative arrangements are in place within the mission to support QIPs.

40. The Mission has put in place procedures to control the financial aspects of project implementation. Payments are made in two tranches of 80 per cent and 20 per cent. The first tranche is paid immediately following the signing of the MOU with the implementing partner, and once this is accounted for, the remaining 20 per cent is paid to ensure the completion of the project.

41. OIOS selected 19 projects at random and analyzed the time lag between the signing of the MOU and the transfer of the first tranche to the bank account of the implementing partner. In 9 cases, the first tranche was made within a month of signing the MOU. In 9 other cases it took 2 to 6 months to make the fund transfer and in one case it took 9 months. The Finance Section pointed out that most of the delays were caused by the implementing partners' delays in submitting relevant supporting documents to process payments, such as the bank account to be opened by the implementing partner in order for the bank transfer to take place.

42. After the release of the first tranche, the implementing partner is responsible for ensuring project completion. The balance is paid following submission of a satisfactory progress report including original invoices for expenditures on the first tranche. MOUs signed with implementing partners also stipulate a condition that they shall submit to the SRSG monthly reports on the progress of the project, a project completion report at the end, and a financial statement of expenditures. Any unspent balance remaining upon the completion of the QIPs shall be returned to the Mission.

43. In most cases, the Mission has been complying with the above procedures whereby the second tranche of the project cost is paid only upon the submission of invoices to account for the first tranche. However, OIOS found three cases (as shown in Table 5) where although second installments were given based on invoices submitted by the implementing partners; the physical progress of the projects has not reached 100 per cent. The submission of invoices for materials purchased by implementing partners does not mean that the project has been completed. It still requires the relevant project officer to physically verify the status of the project before recommending final payment.

**Table 5: Projects not completed but final payments made**

<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Project cost (\$)</b>	<b>Date of first installment</b>	<b>Date of second installment</b>	<b>Status of project during audit visit in May 2008</b>
Rehabilitation of Kuajok dispensary,	21,821	Mar 2007	Dec 2007	Project incomplete; dispensary was not

Wau				operational. Building was being used as accommodation for homeless people
Rebuild Momoï kindergarten, Wau	25,000	Mar 2007	Dec 2007	Project incomplete and kindergarten not operational. There is need for windows, doors, flooring and plastering for the kindergarten to operate.
Provision of furniture to St. Vincent de Paul Basic School in Gumbo, Juba	26,032	Feb 2007	Oct 2007	The approved funding was to buy 140 tables; Only 70 were purchased.

### Recommendation 5

**(5) The UNMIS Office of Mission Support should sign Memorandum of Understanding with implementing partners only after all necessary supporting documents, including bank account information, have been received to avoid delays in transferring the first installment of project funds.**

44. *UNMIS Management accepted recommendation 5, but they did not provide any details on how the recommendation would be implemented. Recommendation 5 remains open pending submission of evidence for verification by OIOS that the Mission signs Memorandum of Understanding with implementing partners after receipt of all necessary documents.*

### Recommendation 6

**(6) The UNMIS Finance Section should coordinate with the Civil Affairs Division focal point for quick impact projects to ensure that final payments are made only after confirmation that the project has been physically verified and that the rate of implementation is in accordance with the agreed schedule.**

45. *UNMIS Management accepted recommendation 6 and stated that the Finance Section will coordinate with the relevant Project Officer and QIP Focal Points in the Sectors to ensure that final payments are made after confirmation of project's physical completion. Recommendation 6 remains open pending submission of evidence for verification by OIOS that final payments are made after the confirmation of its physical completion.*

### Monitoring of project funds

46. In respect of those projects that have received the first tranche, and where the projects have been delayed from 8 to 20 months, the Mission did not initiate inspections to determine the financial progress, i.e., the rate of implementation was in line with the expenditure of funds. There were 79 projects



---

which were still in-progress stage after the requisite three-month timeline. Without determining the status of projects, there is a chance that the first installment has simply been deposited in the implementing partners' bank account and has not been properly employed in project implementation. Alternatively, the funds could have been spent on other activities and not on the UNMIS targeted project. The need to physically verify projects periodically is essential.

#### **Recommendation 7**

**(7) The UNMIS Office of Mission Support should coordinate with the Civil Affairs Division focal point for quick impact projects to follow up on the status of the projects to determine whether or not to terminate a project and recover the unspent balance in line with the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding signed with the implementing partner.**

47. *UNMIS Management accepted recommendation 7 and stated that the Office of Mission Support will coordinate with QIP Project Officers and Focal Points in Sector/HQ on decisions to terminate projects as necessary and ensure the recovery of unspent balance.* Recommendation 7 remains open pending submission of evidence for verification by OIOS that projects not implemented after the three month period are evaluated for termination and recovery of unspent funds.

#### **E. Project visibility to local population**

48. In the report titled "Survey of Practice: Quick Impact Projects in UN Peacekeeping Operations", most of the missions surveyed commented that a crucial dimension of the QIP programme is its visibility and its association with the mission in the minds of the local communities. In some missions, opening ceremonies were held upon completion of projects to officially hand over the project to the beneficiaries and local media were invited to cover the events. The Public Information Office was also invited to report on completed projects in their weekly press conferences and monthly news bulletin.

49. UNMIS completed 144 projects within the past three fiscal years. OIOS did not find evidence that the completed projects were officially handed over with opening ceremonies and publicized as appropriate to the local population. OIOS further observed that the 16 completed projects visited were not visible to the local population as projects funded under the QIPs programme, except for one project in Juba (passenger shed) that had the words "QIP BY UNMIS" painted on the top sides of the shed (as shown in Picture 4).

**Picture 4: Example of UNMIS QIP visible to local community**



**Recommendation 8**

**(8) The UNMIS Office of Mission Support in coordination with the Civil Affairs Division should ensure the erection of signboards to indicate that ongoing and completed projects are funded by the UNMIS quick impact projects programme.**

50. *UNMIS Management accepted recommendation 8 and stated that the Office of Mission Support will coordinate with QIP Project Officers and Focal Points in Sector/HQ to ensure implementation. Recommendation 8 remains open pending submission of evidence for verification by OIOS that signboards have been erected in respect of ongoing and completed QIPs funded by UNMIS.*

**Recommendation 9**

**(9) The UNMIS Civil Affairs Division in coordination with the UNMIS Public Information Office should ensure that all completed quick impact projects are handed over to the beneficiaries with adequate media coverage and public opening ceremonies, and publicized by the Public Information Office through its broadcasts and news bulletins to ensure that quick impact projects are highly visible to the local population.**

51. *UNMIS Management accepted recommendation 9 and stated that the Sector Head of Office, QIP Project Officers and Focal Points will coordinate with the Public Information Office to ensure media coverage when completed projects are handed over to the beneficiaries. Recommendation 9 remains open pending submission of evidence for verification by OIOS that all completed quick impact projects are handed over to the beneficiaries with adequate media coverage and public opening ceremonies.*

---

## **F. Record maintenance**

52. Mission procedures for the management and administration of QIPs indicated that project officers shall establish and maintain case files and actively follow progress through periodic personal visits to project sites. The case file shall include copies of project proposals, the approved committee minutes, the MOU, correspondence with organizations that submitted proposals, correspondence with the executing agency, reports about periodic inspections; minutes of meetings held, progress reports issued by the executing agency, and the project completion reports. Upon completion of the QIP, the project officer shall forward the complete case file to the Director of Mission Support.

53. OIOS observed that the filing system for QIPs was inadequate. None of the 90 projects OIOS tested had individual project case files. According to CAD, a QIPs database was being used before, however, technical problems emerged which were not resolved and resulted in the discontinuation of the database. All available records were attached to payment vouchers and archived in the Finance Section.

54. According to CAD focal points for QIPs, the main reason for non-maintenance of project case files by the respective project officers was the lack of commitment to fulfill their QIPs responsibilities.

### **Recommendation 10**

**(10) The UNMIS Civil Affairs Division should ensure that complete case files are maintained by the respective project officers and that completed case files are submitted to the Director of Mission Support for archiving.**

55. *UNMIS Management accepted recommendation 10 and stated that the Sector Head of Office, QIP Project Officers and Focal Points will ensure that complete case files are maintained by the respective project officers and also hard copies of files kept at Strategic Planning Office under the Office of the Chief of Staff. Recommendation 10 remains open pending submission of evidence for verification by OIOS that QIP case files are properly maintained by Project officers and the Strategic Planning Office.*

## **V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

56. We wish to express our appreciation to the Management and staff of UNMIS for the assistance and cooperation extended to the auditors during this assignment.

## STATUS OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

Recom. no.	Recommendation	Risk category	Risk rating	C/O <sup>1</sup>	Actions needed to close recommendation	Implementation date <sup>2</sup>
1	UNMIS Management should ensure that the respective Project Review Committee evaluates the capacity of implementing partners prior to recommending quick impact projects for the approval by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General.	Governance	High	O	Submission of revised guidelines that requires the QIP Review Committee to conduct evaluation of implementing partner's capacity for project implementation.	Not provided
2	The UNMIS Civil Affairs Division should ensure that nominated project officers are fully aware of their roles and responsibilities in the monitoring of and reporting on progress of quick impact projects assigned to them.	Compliance	High	O	Submission of the revised Administrative Instruction on QIPs.	Not provided
3	UNMIS Management should expedite the finalization and implementation of standard operating procedures to provide guidance to all quick impact project officers and focal points.	Compliance	Medium	O	Submission of the revised Administrative Instructions for QIPs.	31 Aug 2008
4	UNMIS Management should follow up the status of the quick impact project relating to the construction of a community resource centre in Kuajok and the funds released to the implementing partner, the Southern Sudan Relief and Rehabilitation Resource Centre in Kuajok, and take appropriate action, e.g., blacklisting of the implementing partner for future QIPs and/or the recovery of funds disbursed to it, in case of any irregularity.	Financial	Medium	O	Submission of the results and action taken with regard to the construction of a community resource centre in Kuajok.	30 Sept 2008
5	The UNMIS Office of Mission Support should sign Memorandum of Understanding with implementing partners only after all necessary supporting	Governance	High	O	Submission of evidence for verification by OIOS that the Mission signs Memorandum of Understanding with implementing partners after receipt of all necessary	Not provided



Recom. no.	Recommendation	Risk category	Risk rating	C/O	Actions needed to close recommendation	Implementation date <sup>2</sup>
	documents, including bank account information, have been received to avoid delays in transferring the first installment of project funds.				documents.	
6	The UNMIS Finance Section should coordinate with the Civil Affairs Division focal point for quick impact projects to ensure that final payments are made only after confirmation that the project has been physically verified and that the rate of implementation is in accordance with the agreed schedule.	Financial	Medium	O	Submission of evidence for verification by OIOS that final payments are made after the confirmation of its physical completion.	Not provided
7	The UNMIS Office of Mission Support should coordinate with the Civil Affairs Division focal point for quick impact projects to follow up on the status of the projects to determine whether or not to terminate a project and recover the unspent balance in line with the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding signed with the implementing partner.	Governance	High	O	Submission of evidence for verification by OIOS that projects not implemented after the three month period are evaluated for termination and recovery of unspent funds.	Not provided
8	The UNMIS Office of Mission Support in coordination with the Civil Affairs Division should ensure the erection of signboards to indicate that ongoing and completed projects are funded by the UNMIS quick impact projects programme.	Compliance	Medium	O	Submission of evidence for verification by OIOS that signboards have been erected in respect of ongoing and completed QIPs funded by UNMIS.	Not provided
9	The UNMIS Civil Affairs Division in coordination with the UNMIS Public Information Office should ensure that all completed quick impact projects are handed over to the beneficiaries with adequate media coverage and public opening ceremonies, and publicized by the Public Information Office through its broadcasts and news bulletins to ensure that quick impact projects are highly	Compliance	High	O	Submission of evidence for verification by OIOS that all completed quick impact projects are handed over to the beneficiaries with adequate media coverage and public opening ceremonies.	Not provided

Recom. no.	Recommendation	Risk category	Risk rating	C/O <sup>1</sup>	Actions needed to close recommendation	Implementation date <sup>2</sup>
10	visible to the local population. The UNMIS Civil Affairs Division should ensure that complete case files are maintained by the respective project officers and that completed case files are submitted to the Director of Mission Support for archiving.	Compliance	High	O	Submission of evidence for verification by OIOS that QIP case files are properly maintained by Project officers and the Strategic Planning Office.	Not provided

<sup>1</sup> C = closed, O = open

<sup>2</sup> Date provided by UNMIS in response to recommendations