



INTERNAL AUDIT DIVISION

REPORT 2016/076

Audit of engineering activities in the United Nations Interim Security Force for Abyei

Overall results relating to the effective management of engineering activities were initially assessed as unsatisfactory. Implementation of three critical and one important recommendations remains in progress

FINAL OVERALL RATING: UNSATISFACTORY

20 July 2016

Assignment No. AP2015/635/02

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
I. BACKGROUND	1
II. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE	1-2
III. AUDIT RESULTS	2-7
Regulatory framework	3-7
IV. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	7
ANNEX I Status of audit recommendations	
APPENDIX I Management response	

AUDIT REPORT

Audit of engineering activities in the United Nations Interim Security Force for Abyei

I. BACKGROUND

1. The Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) conducted an audit of engineering activities in the United Nations Interim Security Force for Abyei (UNISFA).
2. In accordance with its mandate, OIOS provides assurance and advice on the adequacy and effectiveness of the United Nations internal control system, the primary objectives of which are to ensure (a) efficient and effective operations; (b) accurate financial and operational reporting; (c) safeguarding of assets; and (d) compliance with mandates, regulations and rules.
3. The Engineering Section is responsible for providing all engineering services in UNISFA including: planning, designing, constructing and/or maintaining and refurbishing buildings and physical infrastructure including roads, airports and utility plants. As at 31 December 2015, the status of the 28 engineering projects (7 in-house and 21 outsourced) planned for the period from 1 January 2013 to 31 December 2015 was: 9 completed; 9 in progress; 8 not yet started; and 2 cancelled. These projects included construction and maintenance of staff and contingents' accommodation and ablution units, guard and telecommunication towers, perimeter walls for the Abyei Headquarters, roads, airports, aprons and wells.
4. The Engineering Section was headed by a staff at the P-4 level who reported to the Chief, Service Delivery Services and supported by 49 approved posts comprising 24 international staff, 6 United Nations volunteers and 19 national staff. The 2014/15 and 2015/16 budgets for the Section were \$28.3 million and \$36.5 million respectively and expenditures for the same period were \$11.6 million and \$4.8 million respectively.
5. Comments provided by UNISFA are incorporated in italics.

II. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

6. The audit was conducted to assess the adequacy and effectiveness of UNISFA governance, risk management and control processes in providing reasonable assurance regarding the **effective management of engineering projects in UNISFA**.
7. The audit was included in the 2015 risk-based work plan of OIOS because of the operational and financial risks relating to engineering projects.
8. The key control tested for the audit was regulatory framework. For the purpose of this audit, OIOS defined this key control as one that provides reasonable assurance that policies and procedures: (a) exist to guide the operations of the Engineering Section; (b) are implemented consistently; and (c) ensure the reliability and integrity of financial and operational information.
9. The key control was assessed for the control objectives shown in Table 1.

10. OIOS conducted this audit in February and March 2016. The audit covered the period from 1 January 2013 to 31 December 2015 and included review of the feasibility studies, planning, execution, and monitoring of in-house and outsourced projects related to the construction and refurbishment of roads, camps and airstrips.

11. OIOS conducted an activity-level risk assessment to identify and assess specific risk exposures, and to confirm the relevance of the selected key control in mitigating associated risks. Through interviews and analytical reviews, OIOS assessed the existence and adequacy of internal controls and conducted necessary tests to determine their effectiveness.

III. AUDIT RESULTS

12. The UNISFA governance, risk management and control processes examined were initially assessed as **unsatisfactory**¹ in providing reasonable assurance regarding the **effective management of engineering projects in UNISFA**. OIOS made seven recommendations to address the issues identified.

13. UNISFA needed to: (a) establish an effective governance mechanism to oversee the implementation of mid- and long-term infrastructure plans based on its mission support concept; (b) ensure that the light field engineering company included the required skill set to perform its mandated tasks; (c) integrate the military and civilian engineering components to ensure synergy in the use of engineering resources; (d) request and obtain prior approval from the Governments of Sudan and the Republic of South Sudan for the use of land for construction activities; (e) conduct formal needs assessment, feasibility studies and environmental impact assessment for each major project; (f) formally plan, track, monitor and report on its engineering projects; and (g) establish a central filing system and guidelines for staff to ensure appropriate standards for classifying, retaining and retrieving engineering project documents.

14. The initial overall rating was based on an assessment of the key control presented in Table 1. The final overall rating is **unsatisfactory** as implementation of three critical and one important recommendations remains in progress.

Table 1: Assessment of key control

Business objective	Key control	Efficient and effective operations	Accurate financial and operational reporting	Safeguarding of assets	Compliance with mandates, regulations and rules
Effective management of engineering projects in UNISFA	Regulatory framework	Unsatisfactory	Partially satisfactory	Partially satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
FINAL OVERALL RATING: UNSATISFACTORY					

¹ A rating of “**unsatisfactory**” means that one or more critical and/or pervasive important deficiencies exist in governance, risk management or control processes, such that reasonable assurance cannot be provided with regard to the achievement of control and/or business objectives under review.

Regulatory framework

There was a need for infrastructure planning and governance and oversight mechanism

15. The Departments of Peacekeeping Operations and Field Support (DPKO/DFS) Engineering Support Manual requires UNISFA to adequately identify and effectively address its infrastructure needs through mid-/long-term planning. Such infrastructure needs may include: roads, airports, landing pads and utility plants, as well as office and living accommodation needs of its personnel; and refurbishment of existing structures and/or construction of new ones. The DPKO/DFS Engineering Support Manual requires integration of the military and civilian engineering components.

16. During the period 1 January 2013 to 31 December 2015, UNISFA launched 28 projects including the construction and maintenance of staff and contingents' accommodation/ablution units, guard towers, perimeter walls for the Abyei Headquarters, roads, an airport and wells. However, interviews of staff, inspections of accommodations and camps for civilian and military personnel and review of project records indicated that UNISFA had not developed and implemented a plan to ensure that all of its infrastructure needs were identified and related projects were systematically monitored and implemented. Instead, UNISFA implemented engineering activities largely based on the Logistics Support Plan that was based on fragmentary military orders (referred to as FRAGOs), which did not match the Mission's approved budgets. For example, although the 2015/16 proposed budget had already been approved, FRAGO 12/25 dated 23 September 2015 required the Engineering Section to repair roads, prepare sites, construct two additional permanent camps and erect office and living accommodations for military observers.

17. The above resulted because:

- UNISFA had not implemented an effective governance mechanism to oversee the development of a mid-/long-term infrastructure plan. Although UNISFA had a Project Management Group, it did not convene during the audit period and did not implement a follow-up mechanism to ensure the finalization of the Mission's strategic concept of operations and related support concept, which constituted the foundation for its infrastructure plan. UNISFA did not have mission support concept and the latest concept of operations, dated 18 August 2011, was a draft prepared by DPKO/DFS at the start-up of the Mission and therefore did not reflect subsequent changes in operational requirements, including the increase in the number of military camps from 11 to 18.
- UNISFA lacked adequate resources to effectively support its engineering requirements. There were two vacancies in the Engineering Section and UNISFA had not complied with the requirement of the DFS/DPKO Engineering Support Manual to integrate its civilian engineering component with the light field engineering company deployed by the troop-contributing country to implement minor engineering tasks such as repairs of generators and air-conditioning units under self-sustainment. UNISFA stated that the company lacked the required skills and relied heavily on the civilian engineering component for its minor engineering tasks they were required to do.

18. Consequently, the Mission had not adequately identified or effectively addressed its infrastructure needs, and military and civilian staff were accommodated in substandard facilities. For example: (a) UNISFA accommodated 6 troops in a unit meant for 4; (b) allocated 150 troops to one ablution unit

meant for 30 persons; and (c) only 45 of the 200 accommodation units required for civilian personnel had been constructed. These conditions exposed staff to health and safety risks.

- (1) UNISFA should implement an effective governance mechanism to: oversee the development and implementation of a mid-/long-term infrastructure plan; and follow up with the relevant Mission components to ensure the finalization of the strategic concept of operations and related support concept that would constitute the foundation for the infrastructure plan.**

UNISFA accepted recommendation 1 and stated that it had: reconstituted its Project Management Group, which met regularly to oversee and monitor the implementation of the mid-/long-term infrastructure projects; and started preparing and reviewing daily infrastructure project reports. Recommendation 1 remains open pending receipt of evidence that the Project Management Group has followed up with the relevant Mission components to ensure the finalization of the strategic concept of operations and related support concept and that the support concept is used as the foundation for the Mission's infrastructure plan.

- (2) UNISFA should implement procedures to ensure that the light field engineering company includes the required skill set and performs its mandated tasks.**

UNISFA accepted recommendation 2 and stated that it had provided a five-day training to all the technical personnel of the contingent including the light field engineering company on the basics of electrical, generator, heat ventilation and air condition maintenance, and water and sanitation or plumbing repairs. UNISFA also stated that it had identified key personnel from the contingent and the light field engineering company for extra field training. Based on the action taken by UNISFA and OIOS review of evidence provided, recommendation 2 has been closed.

- (3) UNISFA should integrate the military and civilian engineering components based on an assessment of the skill set of the light field engineering company to ensure synergy in the use of engineering resources available within the Mission.**

UNISFA accepted recommendation 3 and stated that the civilian and military engineering components had started working closely in carrying out engineering activities in the Mission and the light field engineering company under the management of the Force Engineer Adviser met weekly with the Chief Engineer to allocate and monitor tasks. Based on the action taken by UNISFA and OIOS review of evidence provided, recommendation 3 has been closed.

Engineering projects were either delayed or not implemented

19. The DPKO/DFS Engineering Support Manual requires UNISFA to implement its construction projects within timeframes established in the relevant plans.

20. OIOS review of 28 construction project files, correspondence between the Governments of Sudan and the Republic of South Sudan and the United Nations Procurement Division, and an interview with the Chief Engineer indicated that UNISFA did not start 7 projects on schedule in 2013/14 including the maintenance of roads, construction of foundations and installation of 10 water tanks. UNISFA was also delayed in implementing 7 other projects for periods ranging from one to three years such as the construction of a chain-link fence at Athony Airfield and the camp at UNISFA Headquarters.

21. The above resulted because UNISFA did not take effective actions to ensure compliance with the provisions of the Status of Forces Agreement, which requires the Mission to send communications signed by the Head of Mission to the Governments of Sudan and South Sudan to request and obtain prior approvals from these Governments for the use of land to construct camps or other premises for the conduct of the operational and administrative activities of the Mission. Therefore, the Government of Sudan did not permit UNISFA to mobilize materials and personnel for its construction activities. For example, mainly because UNISFA did not request and obtain the prior approvals, the Government of Sudan: refused to permit UNISFA to mobilize materials for the construction of perimeter wall for the UNISFA Abyei Headquarters; did not issue visas to contractor personnel; and stopped the construction of roads and fence around the Athony Airport. These actions caused delays in completing construction projects and in commissioning the Athony Airfield, hampering the implementation of the Mission's mandate.

(4) UNISFA should, in future, send communications signed by the Head of Mission to the Governments of Sudan and South Sudan to request and obtain prior approvals from these Governments for the use of land to construct camps or other premises for the conduct of the operational and administrative activities of the Mission.

UNISFA accepted recommendation 4 and stated that it would endeavour to seek written approval for the use of land from local authority prior to constructing camps. Recommendation 4 remains open pending receipt of evidence that UNISFA has sought prior government approvals for the use of land to construct camps or other premises.

There was a need for adequate feasibility studies for construction projects

22. The DPKO/DFS Engineering Support Manual and guidelines for governance of major construction projects in field missions require UNISFA to conduct feasibility studies, needs assessment and environmental assessments related to every engineering project to: clarify the operational necessity of the project; identify appropriate site/land and related legal requirements for their use; identify interested parties such as local communities and government authorities; and identify the environmental impact and possible mitigating measures. UNISFA is also expected to prepare detailed drawings of construction work to be performed and bills of quantities for each project; establish performance targets with respect to timelines and costs for each project; and monitor actual material and labour usage against the bills of quantities for each project.

23. A review of the records for all the 28 projects initiated between 2013 and 2015 and interviews of Mission management including the Chief Engineer indicated that UNISFA did not have evidence of feasibility studies, needs assessments and environmental impact assessments for any of the 28 projects. UNISFA explained that it had conducted feasibility studies and needs assessments; however, due to a shortage of staff, it did not document these assessments.

24. The lack of formal feasibility studies, needs assessments and environmental impact assessments impacted on the Mission's ability to: identify available sites/land for construction activities in a timely manner; accurately determine the operational necessity and size of infrastructure such as the airport and the parking apron and anticipate possible reactions of local communities and interested parties of the disputed Abyei region to the projects planned to be implemented and take appropriate measures; and assess the related environmental impact and mitigating measures. Consequently:

- UNISFA constructed a military camp in Gok Machar with a capacity for 200 personnel, but later received approval from government authorities to accommodate only 50 personnel in the camp because the government did not want a large foreign military presence at that location. As

a result, UNISFA had to expand another camp in Kadugli to accommodate an additional 150 personnel.

- The Mission budgeted to construct 200 civilian staff accommodation units in the UNISFA Abyei Headquarters, but could only construct 45 units due to unavailability of space at the site. This resulted in substandard living conditions for civilian staff.

(5) UNISFA should implement measures to ensure that adequate and formal needs assessments, feasibility studies and environmental impact assessments for each major project are conducted and approved by a senior management group.

UNISFA accepted recommendation 5 and stated that it would prepare a standard report format to include needs assessment, feasibility study and environmental impact study for all future projects. Recommendation 5 remains open pending receipt of evidence showing that UNISFA has conducted formal needs assessment, feasibility studies and environmental impact assessments for each major project.

Need to establish a system to ensure accurate costing of projects

25. The DPKO/DFS Engineering Support Manual required the Engineering Section to maintain records of engineering activities including project budgets and actual costs, planned and start dates of projects, planned and completion dates, details of change orders and progress reports on project implementation. The Manual also required the Section to track and monitor the implementation of engineering projects and prepare related reports.

26. A review of the records for all seven in-house engineering projects valued at \$15.5 million initiated between 2013 and 2015 indicated that the Engineering Section did not: maintain any form of records with summaries of project costs and was therefore unable to determine the actual costs of UNISFA projects; and have evidence related to its monitoring of these seven projects.

27. UNISFA indicated that it did not have adequate staff to manage its engineering projects as they had experienced difficulties recruiting a professional staff against a GTA post and one P-3 post that had been vacant for more than two years. As indicated above, the staffing situation of the Engineering Section would improve with the integration of the military and civilian engineering components. However, the audit results also indicated that UNISFA did not maintain a system for recording engineering activities including project budgets and actual costs, planned and start dates of projects, planned and completion dates, details of change orders and progress reports on project implementation. The Galileo system had a project estimation and cost tracking module, which could have been used to monitor the status of projects, including estimation of labour, materials and actual cost through work orders.

28. As a result, UNISFA did not effectively monitor projects to ensure their timely completion within approved resources. This posed the further risk of financial loss and reduced capacity of the Mission to implement its mandate.

(6) UNISFA should implement a system to facilitate the planning, tracking, monitoring and reporting of engineering projects.

UNISFA accepted recommendation 6 and stated that it had started: monitoring and tracking engineering projects using daily progress reports to capture daily project activities; and preparing a report on the construction status of all major projects and contractors work. Based on the action

taken and documentation provided by UNISFA, recommendation 6 has been closed.

Inadequate filing and archiving system

29. The United Nations archiving and record management policy requires UNISFA to keep project documents for at least five years after termination, settlement or completion of a project.

30. A review of the files and records maintained for 21 outsourced and 7 in-house construction projects initiated between 2013 and 2015 and interviews with the Chief Engineer and engineering project team members indicated that UNISFA did not maintain files for 15 outsourced and all 7 in-house projects and the files for the other 6 outsourced projects did not contain essential documents such as designs and technical specifications, environmental and social impacts, planned scope of work and progress reports. This was because UNISFA management did not dedicate sufficient attention to ensure project records were adequately maintained in an appropriate central filing system.

31. As a result, there was a lack evidence to show accountability for resources used in implementing projects and that UNISFA had adequately monitored the implementation of the projects.

(7) UNISFA should establish and implement a central filing system and procedures to ensure appropriate standards for classifying, retaining and retrieving engineering project documents.

UNISFA accepted recommendation 7 and stated that the Engineering Section had identified a focal point who had started managing and updating all engineering project files. Recommendation 7 remains open pending receipt of evidence that UNISFA has implemented a central filing system and procedures for classifying, retaining and retrieving engineering project documents.

IV. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

32. OIOS wishes to express its appreciation to the management and staff of UNISFA for the assistance and cooperation extended to the auditors during this assignment.

(Signed) Eleanor T. Burns
Director, Internal Audit Division
Office of Internal Oversight Services

STATUS OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

Audit of engineering activities in the United Nations Interim Security Force for Abyei

Recom. no.	Recommendation	Critical ¹ / Important ²	C/ O ³	Actions needed to close recommendation	Implementation date ⁴
1	UNISFA should implement an effective governance mechanism to: oversee the development and implementation of a mid-/long-term infrastructure plan; and follow up with the relevant Mission components to ensure the finalization of the strategic concept of operations and related support concept that would constitute the foundation for the infrastructure plan.	Critical	O	Receipt of evidence that the Project Management Group has followed up with the relevant Mission components to ensure the finalization of the strategic concept of operations and related support concept and that the support concept is used as the foundation for the Mission's infrastructure plan.	Not provided
2	UNISFA should implement procedures to ensure that the light field engineering company includes the required skill set and performs its mandated tasks.	Important	C	Action taken	Implemented
3	UNISFA should integrate the military and civilian engineering components based on an assessment of the skill set of the light field engineering company to ensure synergy in the use of engineering resources available within the Mission.	Critical	C	Action taken	Implemented
4	UNISFA should, in future, send communications signed by the Head of Mission to the Governments of Sudan and South Sudan to request and obtain prior approvals from these Governments for the use of land to construct camps or other premises for the conduct of the operational and administrative activities of the Mission.	Critical	O	Receipt of evidence that UNISFA has sought prior government approvals for the use of land to construct camps or other premises.	31 December 2016
5	UNISFA should implement measures to ensure that adequate and formal needs assessments, feasibility	Critical	O	Receipt of evidence showing that UNISFA has conducted formal needs assessment, feasibility	31 July 2016

¹ Critical recommendations address critical and/or pervasive deficiencies in governance, risk management or control processes, such that reasonable assurance cannot be provided with regard to the achievement of control and/or business objectives under review.

² Important recommendations address important (but not critical or pervasive) deficiencies in governance, risk management or control processes, such that reasonable assurance may be at risk regarding the achievement of control and/or business objectives under review.

³ C = closed, O = open

⁴ Date provided by UNISFA in response to recommendations.

STATUS OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

Audit of engineering activities in the United Nations Interim Security Force for Abyei

Recom. no.	Recommendation	Critical ¹ / Important ²	C/ O ³	Actions needed to close recommendation	Implementation date ⁴
	studies and environmental impact assessments for each major project are conducted and approved by a senior management group.			studies and environmental impact assessments for each major project.	
6	UNISFA should implement a system to facilitate the planning, tracking, monitoring and reporting of engineering projects.	Important	C	Action taken	Implemented
7	UNISFA should establish and implement a central filing system and procedures to ensure appropriate standards for classifying, retaining and retrieving engineering project documents.	Important	O	Receipt of evidence that UNISFA has implemented a central filing system and procedures for classifying, retaining and retrieving engineering project documents.	Not provided

APPENDIX I

Management Response

Management Response

Audit of engineering activities in the United Nations Interim Security Force for Abyei

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical ¹ / Important ²	Accepted? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
1	UNISFA should implement an effective governance mechanism to: oversee the development and implementation of a mid-/long-term infrastructure plan; and follow-up with the relevant Mission components to ensure the finalization of the strategic concept of operations and related support concept that would constitute the foundation for the infrastructure plan.	Critical	Yes	Chairperson, Project Management Group	Implemented	The newly reconstituted Project Management Group meets regularly at least once a month for reviewing and monitoring the progress of mid-term and long term projects. In addition, for effective governance of projects, Engineering Section has a daily site report that logs all Project activities. This report is further summarized by the Joint Logistics Operation Centre into a concise Mission Support Division (MSD) daily report covering all major Infrastructure Projects. The same reports are shared with Service Delivery Services and the office of Chief Mission Support. Each project also has an Engineering focal point. Copies of Engineering site report, MSD reports, Construction Projects Status and Ablution distribution were provided to the auditors.
2	UNISFA should implement procedures to ensure that the light field engineering company includes the required skill set and performs its mandated tasks.	Important	Yes	Chief Engineer	Implemented	Under the direction of the Chief Mission Support, Engineering Section carried out training exercise of all the technical personnel of the Troop Contributing Country including the light field engineering. The personnel

¹ Critical recommendations address critical and/or pervasive deficiencies in governance, risk management or control processes, such that reasonable assurance cannot be provided with regard to the achievement of control and/or business objectives under review.

² Important recommendations address important (but not critical or pervasive) deficiencies in governance, risk management or control processes, such that reasonable assurance may be at risk regarding the achievement of control and/or business objectives under review.

APPENDIX I

Management Response

Audit of engineering activities in the United Nations Interim Security Force for Abyei

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical ¹ / Important ²	Accepted? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
						<p>were trained on basics of Electrical, Generator, Heat Ventilation and Air Condition (HVAC) maintenance and Water and Sanitation (WATSAN) or plumbing repairs and Facilities Management Unit maintenance. The Engineering staff provided the Training course over five days with assistance from Joint Logistics Operation Centre and Force Headquarters. Key personnel from Troop Contributing Country (TCC) and Light Field Engineering (LFE) were identified and will be given extra field training. The basics of minor Engineering maintenance are demonstrated to the TCC technical staff and they are expected to implement these functions as per the Memorandum of Understanding. The participants were also awarded certificates.</p>
3	<p>UNISFA should integrate the military and civilian engineering components based on an assessment of the skill set of the light field engineering company to ensure synergy in the use of engineering resources available within the Mission.</p>	Critical	Yes	Chief Engineer	Implemented	<p>The civilian and military engineering components are working closely in carrying out engineering activities in the mission. Light Field Engineering (LFE) under the management of the Force Engineer Adviser meets weekly with the Chief Engineer to allocate assignments and tasks to the LFE. Their assignments are reflected in the daily reports and weekly briefings to the Force Commander. Currently, the main assignments given to LFE are road access repair, and construction</p>

Management Response

Audit of engineering activities in the United Nations Interim Security Force for Abyei

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical ¹ / Important ²	Accepted? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
						of new permanent camps in Goli, Marial achak and Dungap where Security of workers is an issue. Also LFE assist in the deployment of temporary Dry Season Camps. The Skilled Plant Operators of LFE are identified and used for earth moving and surface grading in the absence of other operators. Maintenance issues raised by the TCC and under the jurisdiction of the LFE and minor Engineering are logged and given special attention. An excel spreadsheet is maintained to monitor all repairs, maintenance and delivery.
4	UNISFA should, in future, send communications signed by the Head of Mission to the Governments of Sudan and South Sudan to request and obtain prior approvals from these Governments for the use of land to construct camps or other premises for the conduct of the operational and administrative activities of the Mission.	Critical	Yes	Head of Mission/Chief of Mission Support	31 December 2016	UNISFA will endeavor to seek written approval for the use of land from local authority prior to carry out constructing the camp.
5	UNISFA should implement measures to ensure that adequate and formal need assessment, feasibility studies and environmental impact assessment for each major project is conducted and approved by a senior management group to: clarify the operational necessity of the project; identify appropriate site/land and related legal requirements for the use of the land/site; identify interested parties such as local communities and government	Critical	Yes	Chief Engineer	31 July 2016	The system for conducting a need assessment for major projects already exists. In the past UNISFA need assessments, feasibility studies and environmental impact assessments for Projects were conducted by means of sites visits and meetings with local landowners, followed by meetings with the Senior Management Group and decisions were taken by Mission Support Division after discussions

Management Response

Audit of engineering activities in the United Nations Interim Security Force for Abyei

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical ¹ / Important ²	Accepted? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
	authorities; and identify the environmental impact and possible mitigating measures.					with all stakeholders prior to the solicitation. All future Projects will have a standard report format prepared in advance to include a needs assessment, feasibility study and environmental impact study. Engineering has incorporated these elements into previous contracts such as the Camp Services contract.
6	UNISFA should implement a system to facilitate the planning, tracking, monitoring and reporting of engineering projects.	Important	Yes	Chief Engineer	Implemented	Mission is currently monitoring and tracking engineering projects using a daily progress reports to capture daily project activities. Engineering has prepared a report on the construction status of all major projects and contractors work. The same report format will be used to track all future construction projects as they are implemented. Copies of Construction Projects Status and Daily Site reports were provided to the auditors.
7	UNISFA should establish and implement a central filing system and procedures to ensure appropriate standards for classifying, retaining and retrieving engineering project documents.	Important	Yes	Engineer	Implemented	Engineering Section nominated an Engineer as a focal point who now manages and updates all the Engineering Project filing system.