



INTERNAL AUDIT DIVISION

REPORT 2020/051

Audit of quick-impact projects in the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

**The Mission needed to strengthen its
guidance and oversight over its quick impact
projects**

**10 December 2020
Assignment No. AP2019-620-11**

Audit of quick-impact projects in the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) conducted an audit of quick-impact projects (QIPs) in the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO). The objective of the audit was to assess the effectiveness of the management of QIPs in MONUSCO. The audit covered the period from 1 July 2018 to 31 May 2020 and included a review of: guidance and oversight; and project selection and management.

MONUSCO needed to strengthen its guidance and oversight over its QIPs.

OIOS made three recommendations. To address issues identified in the audit, MONUSCO needed to:

- Update its standard operating procedures to ensure that QIPs are reviewed, approved and implemented in a timely manner, including adequate oversight by the Project Review Committee and Mission leadership; and allocate necessary resources to conduct an annual evaluation of QIPs for lessons learned;
- Implement measures, such as well-defined criteria, to ensure that: the Project Review Committee and Quality Assurance Management Teams adequately review project proposals so that gender perspectives are fully considered, recurring projects are not approved, proposed project costs are adequate to achieve the project outcomes, and proposed projects have been shared and discussed with the United Nations Country Team members to avoid duplication; and
- Develop guidelines to assess and document the capacity and performance history of implementing partners and bar them in case of performance issues or misuse of funds; and establish a database containing all information necessary to ensure informed selection of implementing partners to improve the chances of successful project implementation.

MONUSCO accepted the recommendations and has initiated action to implement them.

CONTENTS

I. BACKGROUND	1
II. AUDIT OBJECTIVE, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY	2
III. AUDIT RESULTS	2-7
A. Guidance and oversight	2-3
B. Project selection and implementation	3-7
IV. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	7
ANNEX I	Status of audit recommendations
APPENDIX I	Management response

Audit of quick-impact projects in the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

I. BACKGROUND

1. The Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) conducted an audit of quick-impact projects (QIPs) in the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO).

2. QIPs are small-scale projects, not exceeding \$50,000 per project, but highly visible and to be implemented within six months. The purpose of QIPs is to promote acceptance of the mandated tasks of MONUSCO, build confidence in the peace process, and generate local support for the Mission. QIPs play a key role in strengthening the link between the Mission and local population to address the latter's immediate needs through projects.

3. MONUSCO's standard operating procedures (SOPs) for the management and administration of QIPs provide guidance on their selection and implementation. The MONUSCO Project Review Committee (PRC) was responsible for reviewing and approving project proposals in line with the Head of the Mission's strategic priorities, which included protecting civilians and restoring state authority. The Committee was also responsible for providing guidance and oversight to Mission personnel on effective planning, delivery and project evaluations. The Committee was chaired by the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General (DSRSG) for Protection and Operations and consisted of 10 members.

4. The Quality Assurance Management Teams (QAMTs) established at each field office reviewed and submitted project proposals to PRC. The heads of field offices managed the approved projects. They were supported by the Mission's project focal points in their offices who were responsible for coordinating project activities with implementing partners and monitoring and reporting their progress to the Mission's Programme Management Unit (PMU). During the audit period, 14 field offices managed between 1 to 12 projects, with an average budget of \$28,950, ranging from \$5,016 to \$50,000.

5. PMU was responsible for coordinating and supporting the identification and management of projects and facilitating disbursement of funds to implementing partners. The Unit consisted of a Chief at the P-3 level, reporting to the DSRSG, and four national staff. The QIPs budget was \$1.5 million for each of the financial years 2018/19 and 2019/20, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Budgets, expenditures, and status of QIPs from July 2018 to June 2020 (\$ million)

	<i>Budget</i>	<i>Expenditure</i>	<i>Approved projects</i>		
			<i>Approved</i>	<i>Completed</i>	<i>Ongoing/not started</i>
2018/19	\$1.50	\$1.48	60	60	--
2019/20	\$1.50	\$1.50	43	14	29
Total	\$3.00	\$2.98	103	74	29

Source: PMU records as at 31 August 2020

6. Comments provided by MONUSCO are incorporated in italics.

II. AUDIT OBJECTIVE, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

7. The objective of the audit was to assess the effectiveness of the management of QIPs in MONUSCO.
8. This audit was included in the 2019 risk-based work plan of OIOS due to operational and reputational risks related to QIPs.
9. OIOS conducted this audit from February to August 2020. The audit covered the period from 1 July 2018 to 31 May 2020. Based on an activity-level risk assessment, the audit covered higher and medium risk areas in the management of QIPs, which included: guidance and oversight; and project selection and management.
10. The audit methodology included: (a) interviews of key staff; (b) review of relevant documentation; (c) analytical review of data; and (d) site visits to 19 project sites in North Kivu and South Kivu.
11. The audit was conducted in accordance with the International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing.

III. AUDIT RESULTS

A. Guidance and oversight

There was a need to strengthen the guidance and oversight of QIPs

12. The Mission's SOPs on QIPs, which were developed in 2015, had not been updated to include the new and revised requirements issued by the Department of Operational Support (DOS) in 2017. These included, among others, the need to: establish an annual working schedule of PRC, submit quarterly status reports to Mission leadership, and consider gender perspectives in project selection (dealt with later in the report).
13. PRC did not have an annual work schedule, and for 2019/20, it only started reviewing project proposals in November 2019. Although PRC held additional five meetings between December 2019 and May 2020 and approved 43 projects, these approvals came late, with the first QIP only starting in February 2020. Also, PRC's focus at meetings was on reviewing project proposals but did not spend time providing guidance on QIPs to those responsible for implementing them or discussing their status. Therefore, the Committee provided limited oversight, even though PMU prepared quarterly status reports. Status reports were also not submitted to Mission leadership for review and appropriate action. Moreover, although required by the SOPs, PMU did not conduct an annual evaluation of QIPs, which it attributed to insufficient resources. This led to missed opportunities to identify lessons learned and to make necessary improvements.
14. Additionally, a revised Mission procedure issued in January 2020 added more layers to the review and approval process of QIPs, including heads of sections/pillars, the Director of Mission Support, and the Mission's Legal Affairs Office. All QIP proposals had to be reviewed and approved by them before finalizing the memoranda of understanding (MOUs) between MONUSCO and implementing partners. OIOS was informed that these additional controls were introduced due to the increased delegation of authority given to the Mission. But these additional layers of review further delayed the process, and no timelines were established for their completion. In OIOS' view, these additional reviews may result in inefficiencies, outweighing the benefits of QIPs, which are small, low-value projects to be implemented expeditiously. After the audit, MONUSCO informed that its leadership was reviewing the MOU clearance

process as part of the review of the delegation of authority roll-out in MONUSCO. As a review is currently underway, OIOS did not make a recommendation at this time.

15. For the Mission to fully realize the benefits intended from QIPs, its SOPs must be up-to-date, and PRC must implement adequate oversight procedures to ensure that projects are implemented in a timely manner. The current process resulted in projects not being completed within the budget period. For instance, as of August 2020, for the budget period 2019/20 (ending June 2020), only 14 projects had been completed, 25 were ongoing, and 4 had not started.

(1) MONUSCO should: (a) update its standard operating procedures to ensure that quick impact projects (QIPs) are reviewed, approved and implemented in a timely manner, including adequate oversight by the Project Review Committee and Mission leadership; and (b) allocate necessary resources to conduct an annual evaluation of QIPs for lessons learned.

MONUSCO accepted recommendation 1 and stated that an update of the SOPs on QIPs incorporating the requirements of DOS was underway and expected to be circulated by the end of January 2021. MONUSCO also stated that it would allocate the necessary resources to hire a consultant to perform the evaluation of QIPs to strengthen the design, monitoring and evaluation of programmatic funding. Recommendation 1 remains open pending receipt of: the updated and approved SOPs; evidence of enhanced oversight of the QIPs programme by PRC and Mission leadership; and a copy of the evaluation of the QIPs programme.

Action was being taken to incorporate QIP responsibilities into staff work plans

16. To ensure accountability for performance, staff involved in the planning, implementation and/or evaluation of QIPs should have this included in their e-performance work plans. OIOS' review of a sample of 9 out of the 39 e-performance work plans of QIPs focal points showed that their QIP responsibilities were not included in their work plans. However, during the audit, heads of offices/sections were instructed to include QIPs responsibilities in the related staff members' e-performance work plans. In view of the action being taken by the Mission, OIOS did not make a recommendation on this issue.

The Mission recently trained and provided guidance to focal points

17. Staff with QIPs responsibilities need to have adequate training to perform the functions effectively. However, at the time of the audit, only 2 of the 39 focal points had attended any relevant training. To address this, in September 2020, the Mission provided training to 33 QIP focal points on project selection and management, including data analysis and interpretation, report writing, project monitoring and evaluation. In addition, the Mission recently provided guidance on using a checklist for submitting project proposals and funds disbursement requests. In view of the action taken, OIOS did not make a recommendation on this issue.

B. Project selection and implementation

Project proposal review process needed to be strengthened

18. During the audit period, PRC approved 103 QIPs, which were in line with the Mission's strategic priorities of protecting civilians and restoring state authority. Additionally, due to the onset of COVID-19, a project was approved to support national authorities in mitigating the spread of the virus. This was in

addition to approval of other activities funded from the Mission's programmes and included supporting prison authorities and local police in implementing measures to combat the spread of COVID-19.

19. OIOS visited 19 projects completed in 2018/19 in North and South Kivu and held discussions with implementing partners and beneficiaries on the projects. Feedback was generally positive, and they stated that the implemented projects considered, to the extent possible, the needs of local communities. These projects included: (a) construction of a water supply station in an "SOS Children's Village" in Bukavu that provided potable water and reduced the time and effort to carry water from outside the village; and (b) construction of a court in Goma to improve working conditions and safety of detainees.

20. However, as explained below, additional attention was required to ensure that all projects were adequately reviewed prior to approval.

(a) Need to review a project awarded through a local non-government organization

21. Mission leadership approved a project to pay wages totaling \$80,000 to the Congolese Office des Routes (ODR), a government entity. This was approved because ODR was unable to pay local workers hired for the ongoing construction of a bridge in Osso. PRC approved a QIP for \$50,000, and the Office of the DSRSG for Protection and Operations funded the remaining \$30,000.

22. Since it was MONUSCO's general practice to not select governmental entities as implementing partners, ODR requested a local non-governmental organization (NGO) to act as the implementing partner and receive the funds for onward payment to ODR. The local NGO retained five per cent for administrative expenses. OIOS' visit to the construction site, review of financial records, and interviews with ODR officials and workers showed that:

- \$41,000 of the \$50,000 for the QIP was paid to the local NGO in May 2019. This was used to pay for workers' wages, rations for workers, ODR officials' salaries, tires for ODR vehicles, and the five per cent for the local NGO's administrative expenses.
- The remaining \$9,000 had not yet been paid at the time of the audit.
- During interviews, two workers stated that ODR paid them \$3 per day instead of \$9.80 per day as shown in ODR's supporting documentation. The Mission's project focal point did not independently verify the workers' wages but relied on financial reports provided by ODR.

23. MONUSCO stated that it approved the project due to an exceptional situation to support the completion of a strategic infrastructural project for which a significant investment had already been made. The revised draft SOPs would have appropriate provisions to ensure that such projects are not approved in the future.

(b) Need to enhance coordination with external partners

24. QAMTs and PRC are required to coordinate with external partners, including members of the United Nations Country Team (UNCT), in project selection and management to avoid duplication. OIOS visits to project sites showed that UNCT conducted similar projects in four sites, including the construction of buildings and the donation of health equipment and supplies. For instance, at the Goma Provincial Hospital where a MONUSCO QIP had built a waste incinerator facility at the cost of \$50,000, a UNCT member was building a larger shed to house another incinerator. According to the hospital staff, the UNCT member had planned to demolish the shed built by MONUSCO and relocate the incinerator donated by the Mission to the new shed. The original location was considered unsuitable because the noise from the

incinerator disturbed the patients in the admission room nearby. Better coordination may have resulted in a joint project, which could have led to better use of resources. Although PMU stated that it had shared information on the Mission's health projects with the UNCT member to avoid duplication, this process did not seem fully effective.

(c) Gender requirements were not adequately considered

25. The 2017 DOS guidelines require missions to allocate at least 15 per cent of the approved QIPs budget for projects promoting women's participation in the peace process or support of the Mission's mandate. However, none of the Mission's approved projects considered this requirement. The Gender Affairs Unit (GAU) was also not effectively involved in the QIP process to determine gender requirements and possible impact. According to GAU field staff in Goma and Bukavu, while the Unit received project proposals for review, they were often only received the day before the QAMT meeting, giving them insufficient time to review QIP proposals.

(d) Recurring projects should not be approved

26. As QIPs are intended to quickly meet various beneficiaries' needs, recurring projects should be avoided. However, PRC had been approving each year since 2014 a QIP of \$50,000 for an international implementing partner to pay for participating artists' travel expenses and other fees. The Mission's Radio Okapi also participated in the event and distributed leaflets to the local population to sensitize and create awareness of the Mission's mandated activities. While this appears to be a good outreach activity for the Mission's Office of Public Information to participate in, QIP funds should not be routinely used for such activities, which could be financed by other means. The Mission stated that the activities had very positive returns for the community and youth, as it involved 34,500 participants and 810 volunteers. However, the Mission agreed to explore modalities of using outreach funds, rather than QIP funds, to continue these activities.

(e) Proposed project cost should be adequate to not compromise quality in project delivery

27. QAMTs and PRC are required to thoroughly examine project budget proposals to assess the adequacy of funding regarding the project's outputs. MONUSCO field staff stated that they preferred to propose low-cost projects to increase the annual number of projects. However, this approach seemed to compromise the quality of the project outputs. For example, a QIP was approved to build a wire mesh fence for Bukavu's central prison at the cost of \$25,348, even though wire mesh was prone to erosion. After implementing the project, the wire mesh fence started eroding, and a new project was proposed and approved by PRC for \$48,900 to construct a retaining wall to prevent additional erosion. Likewise, OIOS' visit to a project site showed that the water tank with connecting taps in Kibati, which was constructed at the cost of \$18,000, was of sub-standard quality. Beneficiaries were of the view that the project cost was insufficient to provide a water tank of proper quality.

28. To improve the impact of projects in the future, QAMTs and PRC need to conduct more rigorous review of project proposals to ensure that well-established criteria are developed and complied with. These should include: (a) systematic consideration of gender perspectives; (b) coordination with UNCT before project approval; (c) avoidance of recurring projects; and (d) provisioning of adequate funding to ensure proper quality.

(2) MONUSCO should implement measures, such as well-defined criteria, to ensure that: (a) the Project Review Committee and Quality Assurance Management Teams adequately review project proposals so that gender perspectives are fully considered, recurring projects are not approved, and proposed project costs are adequate to achieve the project

outcomes; and (b) proposed projects have been shared and discussed with the United Nations Country Team members to avoid duplication.

MONUSCO accepted recommendation 2 and stated that the guidance on QIPs for 2020/21 provided clear criteria for project selection including specific reference to gender requirements. This included that GAU be part of QAMTs and PRC would ensure appropriate gender consideration in project proposals and monitor their implementation. Also, a QAMT information sheet had been developed to ensure consideration of gender perspectives, non-recurrence of projects and adequacy of costs to outcomes. MONUSCO further stated that since the last PRC, it had been coordinating with the UNCT programme management team on QIPs proposed, and their recommendations and comments had been taken into consideration. The Mission would invite a representative from the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs to all PRC meetings for better linkage with humanitarian partners. Recommendation 2 remains open pending receipt of evidence of: (a) adequate reviews by PRC and QAMTs ensuring that gender perspectives are fully incorporated into the Mission's projects, recurring projects are not approved, and project costs are adequate to achieve project outcomes; and (b) adequate coordination between MONUSCO and UNCT members.

Need to maintain an adequate database and assess the capacity of implementing partners

29. PMU is required to develop and maintain a database on implementing partners, including assessments of their capacity to perform. This information should be available to those responsible for reviewing project proposals or selecting partners to implement projects. Information on partners' performance is also essential to ensure that poor performers are not selected for future projects.

30. PMU, while focusing on day-to-day coordination and support of operational issues for field offices and implementing partners, had not developed a comprehensive database of implementing partners. Instead, the Unit was using an Excel spreadsheet to store information on implementing partners, and the data maintained was limited to the name, location, business partner number and list of 25 barred implementing partners. Therefore, details such as contact information, legal registration, previous projects implemented, financial capacity, experience, and previous performance history were not available to share with QIP focal points and PRC when selecting implementing partners. Additionally, prior to approval, partners' financial and technical capacity to implement a project were not assessed and documented.

31. PMU did not also develop guidelines to assess and document the capacity and performance history of implementing partners and bar them for poor performance or misuse of funds. Over time, QIP focal points assessed 119 implementing partners' performance and recommended that 29 (24 per cent) partners not be selected for implementing future projects due to performance issues and misuse of funds. This number did not reconcile with the information in PMU's spreadsheet where it recorded that as of February 2020, 25 of the 119 implementing partners had been barred from being selected for future QIPs. Also, while none of the projects approved during the audit period was awarded to any of the barred implementing partners, there was no evidence to indicate that PRC reviewed and approved the barring of the implementing partners on the grounds of poor performance or misuse of funds.

32. Selection of unqualified or poorly performing implementing partners exposed the Mission to additional risks.

(3) MONUSCO should: (a) develop guidelines to assess and document the capacity and performance history of implementing partners and bar them in case of poor performance or misuse of funds; and (b) establish a database of implementing partners containing all the information necessary to ensure informed selection of implementing partners to improve the chances of successful project implementation.

MONUSCO accepted recommendation 3 and stated that guidance on assessment and unsatisfactory performance of implementing partners had been incorporated in the draft SOPs. The Mission also stated that it had developed an implementing partners database and was currently populating the database with all relevant information on implementing partners' capacity and performance history to improve the chances of adequate project implementation. The Mission would provide guidelines on managing the database after populating the database. Recommendation 3 remains open pending receipt of evidence that MONUSCO has developed and implemented: (a) guidelines to assess and document implementing partners' capacity and performance history, as well as the debarment process; and (b) a database of implementing partners containing all relevant information.

IV. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

33. OIOS wishes to express its appreciation to the management and staff of MONUSCO 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 quick-impact projects in the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical ¹ / Important ²	C/ O ³	Actions needed to close recommendation	Implementation date ⁴
1	MONUSCO should: (a) update its standard operating procedures to ensure that quick impact projects (QIPs) are reviewed, approved and implemented in a timely manner, including adequate oversight by the Project Review Committee and Mission leadership; and (b) allocate necessary resources to conduct an annual evaluation of QIPs for lessons learned.	Important	O	Receipt of: the updated and approved SOPs; evidence of enhanced oversight of the QIPs programme by PRC and Mission leadership; and a copy of the evaluation of the QIPs programme.	30 June 2021
2	MONUSCO should implement measures, such as well-defined criteria, to ensure that: (a) the Project Review Committee and Quality Assurance Management Teams adequately review project proposals so that gender perspectives are fully considered, recurring projects are not approved, and proposed project costs are adequate to achieve the project outcomes; and (b) proposed projects have been shared and discussed with the United Nations Country Team members to avoid duplication	Important	O	Receipt of evidence of: (a) adequate reviews by PRC and QAMTs ensuring that gender perspectives are fully incorporated into the Mission's projects, recurring projects are not approved, and project costs are adequate to achieve project outcomes; and (b) adequate coordination between MONUSCO and UNCT members.	31 December 2020
3	MONUSCO should: (a) develop guidelines to assess and document the capacity and performance history of implementing partners and bar them in case of poor performance or misuse of funds; and (b) establish a database of implementing partners containing all the information necessary to ensure informed selection of implementing partners to improve the chances of successful project implementation.	Important	O	Receipt of evidence that MONUSCO has developed and implemented: (a) guidelines to assess and document implementing partners' capacity and performance history, as well as the debarment process; and (b) a database of implementing partners containing all relevant information.	30 June 2021

¹ Critical recommendations address those risk issues that require immediate management attention. Failure to take action could have a critical or significant adverse impact on the Organization.

² Important recommendations address those risk issues that require timely management attention. Failure to take action could have a high or moderate adverse impact on the Organization.

³ Please note the value C denotes closed recommendations whereas O refers to open recommendations.

⁴ Date provided by MONUSCO in response to recommendations.

APPENDIX I

Management Response



INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

7 December 2020

Ref: MONUSCO-DMS-2020-01552

To: Ms. Eleanor T. Burns, Director
Internal Audit Division, OIOS

From: Leila Zerrougui
Special Representative of the Secretary-General
and Head of MONUSCO

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Leila", with several horizontal lines underneath it.

Subject: **Mission response to the Draft Audit Report on the audit of quick-impact projects in MONUSCO (Assignment No. AP2019/620/11)**

1. Your interoffice memorandum dated 04 November 2020 (Ref: OIOS-2020-01635) forwarding the Draft Audit Report on the audit of quick-impact projects in MONUSCO is acknowledged with thanks.
2. Attached please find the Mission's comments on the recommendations in the Draft Report for your consideration. Supporting documents will be provided to the Audit Team.
3. Thank you and best regards.

cc. Ms. Fatoumata Ndiaye, Under-Secretary-General Office of Internal Oversight Services
Mr. David Gressly, DSRSG, Protection and Operations
Ms. Nancee Oku Bright, Mission Chief of Staff
Mr. Ebrima Ceesay, Director of Mission Support
Ms. Alice Crowley, Senior Advisor ODSRSG for Protection and Operations
Mr. Daniel Maier, Senior Planning Officer
Ms. Wafaa Aznague, Programme Management Unit
Ms. Judith Atiagaga, Audit Focal Point

Management Response

Audit of quick-impact projects in the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical ¹ / Important ²	Accepted? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
1	MONUSCO should: (a) update its standard operating procedures to ensure that quick impact projects (QIPs) are reviewed, approved and implemented in a timely manner, including adequate oversight by the Project Review Committee and Mission leadership; and (b) allocate necessary resources to conduct an annual evaluation of QIPs for lessons learned.	Important	Yes	Programme Management Unit Manager	30/06/2021	(a) <u>Ongoing</u> : An update of the QIPs Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) is underway. The working draft (previously shared) incorporates the requirements promulgated by DPKO/DFS 2017 Policy ref. no.2017.16, and DPKO/DFS Guidelines ref. no. 2017.17. The updated SOPs are expected to be circulated by end January 2021. The expected circulation date has been postponed in order to revise the annexes and include further needed changes in the process. (b) <u>Ongoing</u> : The Mission will allocate the necessary resources to hire a consultant to perform the evaluation of QIPs which will be done as part of the overall strengthening of the design, monitoring and evaluation of programmatic funding.
2	MONUSCO should implement measures, such as well-defined criteria, to ensure that: (a) the Project Review Committee and	Important	Yes	Senior Advisor- O/DSRSG/	Implemented on 25 September 2020	(a) <u>Implemented</u> : The guidance on QIPs for 2020-21 provided clear criteria for project selection, including

¹ Critical recommendations address those risk issues that require immediate management attention. Failure to take action could have a critical or significant adverse impact on the Organization.

² Important recommendations address those risk issues that require timely management attention. Failure to take action could have a high or moderate adverse impact on the Organization.

Management Response

Audit of quick-impact projects in the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical ¹ / Important ²	Accepted? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
	Quality Assurance Management Teams adequately review project proposals so that gender perspectives are fully considered, recurring projects are not approved, and proposed project costs are adequate to achieve the project outcomes; and (b) proposed projects have been shared and discussed with the United Nations Country Team members to avoid duplication.			Programme Management Unit Manager		<p>on gender, incorporating specific reference to the requirement of 15% funding for projects that (i) support women's participation in the peace process or (ii) build women's participation and support in the Mission's mandate. In addition, in the revised SOPs, the Gender Affairs Unit will be part of the QAMT and PRC to ensure effective consideration of gender in projects, as well as part of project monitoring where possible to ensure IP compliance with gender requirements stipulated in the project proposal. In addition to the SOPs previously shared, the QAMT information sheet has been developed to ensure consideration of gender perspectives, non-recurrence of projects and adequacy of costs to outcomes, The QAMT information sheet is attached as annex 2.a.</p> <p>(b) <u>Implemented</u>: Following the guidance on QIPs for 2020-21, the Integrated Office (IO) has designated a representative to take part in the Project Review Committee (PRC) (memo attached as annex 2.b-1). Since the last PRC the IO have been coordinating with the UNCT Programme Management Team on the QIPs proposed for deliberation. Their recommendations and comments have</p>

Management Response

Audit of quick-impact projects in the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical ¹ / Important ²	Accepted? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
						been taken into consideration by field offices. Representatives from OCHA are invited to all PRC meetings for better linkage with humanitarian partners. Evidence of coordination and cooperation with the UNCT are attached as annex 2.b-2.
3	MONUSCO should: (a) develop guidelines to assess and document the capacity and performance history of implementing partners and bar them in case of poor performance or misuse of funds; and (b) establish a database of implementing partners containing all the information necessary to ensure informed selection of implementing partners to improve the chances of successful project implementation.	Important	Yes	Senior Advisor-O/DSRSG/ Programme Management Unit Manager	30/06/2021	<p>(a) <u>Implemented</u>: Guidance on reinforced assessment of implementing partners has been drafted and incorporated into the draft SOPs in both text and annex in the form of a strengthened partner assessment (attached as annex 3.a). Guidance on unsatisfactory performance was also included in the SOPs draft.</p> <p>(b) <u>Ongoing</u>: An Implementing Partner database in MS Access has been developed and is currently being populated with all relevant information to document implementing partners' capacity and performance history and improve the chance of adequate project implementation. This is expected to be fully populated by mid-December. Once it is completed, guidelines will be provided on how to manage the database and what information needs to be provided.</p>