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The Mission needed to improve its work planning, and to ensure established Human Rights Due Diligence Policy procedures are complied with and reported cases of human rights violations are investigated in a timely manner
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) conducted an audit of the human rights programme in the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA). The objective of the audit was to assess the adequacy and effectiveness of the management of the human rights programme in MINUSMA. The audit covered the period from 1 July 2017 to 31 December 2019 and included a review of work planning and implementation.

The Human Rights and Protection Division (HRPD) needed to improve its work planning, ensure established Human Rights Due Diligence Policy (HRDDP) procedures are complied with, and ensure reported cases of human rights violations are timely investigated.

Despite the impact of COVID-19, the audit team was able to complete the audit due to good cooperation from MINUSMA management and staff. OIOS reviewed the revised methodology implemented by HRPD that allowed it to continue delivering on its mandate during COVID-19, and also reconfirmed that the risks covered in the audit, as well as the results and recommendations were still valid in the current environment.

OIOS made five recommendations. To address issues identified in the audit, MINUSMA needed to:

- Implement an annual work plan for HRPD, including for its units and regional offices, that considers risks to effective mandate implementation, and has specific, measurable outputs and targets that are monitored and reported on;
- Remind responsible staff to comply with established HRDDP procedures; and actively monitor compliance with the conditions established by non-United Nations security forces receiving support;
- Robustly monitor all reported cases of human rights violations to ensure they are recorded in the designated database and proper action is taken to investigate them within established timeframes; and include in staff e-performance target timelines for recording and investigating human rights violations and monitor staff performance accordingly;
- Regularly follow up with Mission personnel to ensure the mandatory on-line course on human rights is completed; and
- Inform and sensitize implementing partners on United Nations standards of conduct prohibiting sexual exploitation and sexual abuse and ensure that written confirmation of acceptance of the standards are received.

MINUSMA accepted the recommendations and has initiated action to implement them.
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Audit of the human rights programme in the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali

I. BACKGROUND


2. Security Council resolutions 2364 (2017), 2423 (2018) and 2480 (2019) mandated MINUSMA to: promote and protect human rights; and monitor, document, investigate and report on abuses and violations of human rights and of international humanitarian law, including all forms of sexual and gender-based violence committed against women and children in Mali. MINUSMA was also required to assist the Malian authorities in promoting human rights in the areas of justice and reconciliation and in bringing to justice those responsible for serious abuses and violations of human rights and humanitarian law.


4. HRPD is headed by a Director at the D-1 level who reports to the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Political (DSRSG-Political). The Director also reports to the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and serves as the representative of the High Commissioner in Mali. HRPD had six Units, namely, Planning and Programme, Capacity Building and Technical Cooperation, Transitional Justice, Investigation, Human Rights Due Diligence Policy (HRDDP), and Reporting. There are also five regional offices in Mopti, Gao, Timbuktu, Kidal and Menaka.

5. The Division had 79 authorized posts comprising 26 international and 34 national staff, and 19 United Nations volunteers. For the Division’s programmatic activities, HRPD is jointly funded by MINUSMA and OHCHR. The MINUSMA’s approved operating budgets of HRPD for the three years ending in 2019/20 were $1.21 million, $1.52 million, and $1.30 million, respectively. OHCHR provided $187,500, $105,090, and $168,000 for the corresponding periods.

6. Comments provided by MINUSMA are incorporated in italics.

II. AUDIT OBJECTIVE, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

7. The objective of the audit was to assess the adequacy and effectiveness of the management of the human rights programme in MINUSMA.

8. This audit was included in the 2020 risk-based work plan of OIOS due to the operational and reputational risks related to the implementation of MINUSMA’s human rights programme.

9. OIOS conducted this audit from January to June 2020. The audit covered the period from 1 July 2017 to 31 December 2019. Based on an activity-level risk assessment, the audit covered higher and medium risk areas in the human rights programme of MINUSMA, which included: work planning and implementation.
10. The audit methodology included: (a) interviews with key personnel, (b) review of relevant documentation, (c) analytical review of data, and (d) testing of 1,028 human rights cases recorded in the OHCHR database between 1 July 2017 to 31 December 2019.

11. Despite the impact of COVID-19, the audit team was able to complete the audit due to good cooperation from MINUSMA management and staff. OIOS reviewed the revised methodology implemented by HRPD, which allowed it to continue delivering on its mandate during COVID-19, and also reaffirmed that the risks covered in the audit, as well as the results and recommendations were still valid in the current environment.

12. The audit was conducted in accordance with the International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing.

III. AUDIT RESULTS

A. Work planning

There was a need to enhance the overall work planning of the human rights programme

13. To guide effective implementation of the Mission’s human rights programme, MINUSMA is required to establish strategic priorities and annual work plans that are monitored and reported on.

14. HRPD, in coordination with OHCHR, had developed its strategic priorities for the Mission’s human rights programme. The strategic priorities, which were included in its 2018-2021 strategic plan, were in line with MINUSMA’s mandate and included activities to strengthen: (a) rule of law and accountability for human rights violations; (b) early warning, prevention and protection of human rights in situations of conflict and insecurity; and (c) outcomes of international human rights mechanisms.

15. For the results-based budgeting (RBB) process for the three years ended in 2019/20, HRPD had translated its strategic priorities into work plans. The main planned activities included: (i) the provision of technical advice and support and capacity building to the Ministry of Human Rights and State Reform, the Constitutional Court and the National Human Rights Commission in promoting and protecting human rights; and (ii) providing support to strengthen and standardize the judicial system and justice institutions. Additionally, HRPD was a member of the MINUSMA working group on the constitutional review process to ensure human rights perspectives were considered in the host country’s constitution. It also held meetings with United Nations Country Team members to share information and advocate integration of human rights perspectives into their work.

16. Moreover, to continue its operations during the COVID-19 pandemic, the Division implemented a monitoring and investigation strategy, which allowed HRPD to continue delivering on its mandate in areas of fact-finding and investigation. There was also regular observation of the situation by teams from various human rights offices. Additionally, through its advocacy and support during this period, there was a reduction in congestion of detention centres as well as pardoning of prisoners by the President.

17. While HRPD progressed well in implementing its activities, there were shortfalls in completing some of its priority activities. For instance, (a) for special and in-depth fact-finding missions to document and verify allegations of serious human rights violations: in 2017/18, only 4 of the 12 planned activities were undertaken, although this was considerably improved in 2018/19 when 14 missions took place, which was more than the 12 that had been planned; and (b) for missions to assess support needed for civil society and national institutions in promoting and protecting human rights: in 2017/18 and 2018/19, only 3 of 12
and 0 of 12 planned activities were completed. HRPD informed that the deteriorating security situation in the central and northern regions of Mali had impacted the level of activities and missions it was able to conduct. HRPD also pointed to a high vacancy rate, with 14 of its 79 posts (18 per cent) vacant at the time of the audit. The recruitment process was ongoing, and as of March 2021, only three posts were vacant.

18. However, OIOS noted that not all units/regional offices had systematically prepared annual work plans as a mechanism to document priority tasks and to monitor and report on its outputs and accomplishments. For instance: (a) while two Units (Capacity Building and Technical Cooperation, and Reporting) had a work plan for 2019/20, there were none for the previous two years; and (b) the Transitional Justice Unit had work plans for 2017/18 and 2019/20 but none for 2018/19. Regional offices were also not systematically preparing work plans. Moreover, most of the work plans available generally included a list of activities to be undertaken without any measurable outputs, targets and timelines for implementation.

19. HRPD advised that work plans were not developed as Divisional leadership considered the work plan and related outputs in the RBB performance reports as sufficient. However, OIOS review of the related RBB documents noted that planned activities were not at a detailed enough level for the HRPD Director to properly monitor the work of all its units/regional offices to ensure priority tasks were completed in a timely manner, and planned accomplishments were properly reported on. Moreover, considering that the security situation in certain regions had impacted the level of missions that HRPD conducted, if a systematic risk assessment had been done as part of the planning process, with risks adequately analyzed and risk treatment plans developed, some of the shortfalls could have been addressed by alternative methods of working. This could have included MINUSMA seeking support from other stakeholders in the regions to assist in the gathering of necessary information; an approach that has now been incorporated in its COVID-19 remote working strategy.

(1) MINUSMA should implement an annual work plan for the Human Rights and Protection Division, including for its units and regional offices, that considers risks to effective mandate implementation and has specific, measurable outputs and targets that are monitored and reported on.

MINUSMA accepted recommendation 1 and stated that HRPD will ensure all thematic units and field offices adequately and systematically prepare work plans for each fiscal year and comply with the Division’s overall work plan. Recommendation 1 remains open pending receipt of copies of annual work plans of HRPD units and field offices that adequately consider risks to their implementation.

B. Programme implementation

There were gaps in the implementation of the human rights due diligence policy

20. HRDDP requires all United Nations entities to ensure that support to non-United Nations security forces is provided in a manner that is consistent with the purposes and principles as set out in the Charter of the United Nations, and is compliant with and promotes respect for international humanitarian, human rights and refugee law.

21. MINUSMA had established an HRDDP Unit, responsible for analyzing data and conducting a risk assessment of those requests received. The results were subsequently presented to an HRDDP Task Force, which was chaired by the Director of HRPD. The Task Force was responsible for evaluating the risks/benefits in providing the support and making recommendations for decision-making by either the DSRSG-Political or the SRSIG, depending on the sensitivity of the issue. When the support request is approved by the Mission, it is provided subject to certain conditions to ensure that beneficiaries commit to
respecting human rights and informing the Mission of any violations arising after its approval. Mission components were required to monitor and report to the HRDDP Unit on whether the conditions were being complied with.

22. The type of support requested of MINUSMA from non-United Nations security forces was mainly for the provision of equipment, construction of facilities, fuel, and rations. During the audit period, 109 requests were made. A review of a sample of 30 requests noted:

- Due to an oversight, two requests (costing a total of $355,900) were submitted to the HRDDP Unit for review more than one year after the support had been provided. The requests included providing training to national forces to upgrade their operational capabilities. Based on this audit finding, OIOS reviewed all 42 quick impact and trust fund projects approved in the audit period that involved non-United Nations forces as implementing partners or beneficiaries of projects. It was noted there was a further 10 projects that had not undergone the HRDDP review process. At the time of the audit, these projects were either completed or in progress.

- Due to lack of proper follow-up by the HRDDP Unit and inadequate due diligence by some Mission components, for 6 of the 30 requests there was no information on whether the beneficiaries were complying with the conditions established following the HRDDP review process. This was even after these six requests had been assessed as higher risk due to previously reported cases of alleged human rights violations by those beneficiary groups being provided the support.

23. Given the importance of HRDDP, there was a need for Mission leadership to further raise awareness among Mission components to ensure that established HRDDP procedures are systematically complied with. Insufficient due diligence prior to providing support and insufficient monitoring and reporting on whether conditions are being met may be interpreted as tacit acceptance of human rights violations that may be occurring, with a resultant adverse impact on the reputation of the United Nations.

(2) MINUSMA should: (a) remind responsible staff to comply with the established Human Rights Due Diligence Policy procedures; and (b) actively monitor compliance by non-United Nations security forces receiving support with the conditions established.

MINUSMA accepted recommendation 2 and stated that HRPD will enforce compliance with HRDDP, and the Mission’s leadership will monitor compliance by all concerned sections. Recommendation 2 remains open pending receipt of evidence that responsible staff have been reminded of the need to comply with HRDDP procedures, and compliance by beneficiaries with established conditions is properly monitored.

The recording and follow-up of reported cases of human rights violations were not timely dealt with

24. Once an incident is reported, the assigned Human Rights Officer (HRO) is expected to upload details of the alleged human rights violation case into the OHCHR database within four days of it being reported. It is then the responsibility of the HRO to investigate the case and periodically update its status in the database as the investigation progresses. Team Leaders are responsible for regularly monitoring cases and overseeing the process with the HRO. Once a case is complete, it is the responsibility of the Director or Deputy Director to approve its closure.

25. OIOS review of information in the database noted that it was incomplete and outdated. For instance, 468 of the 1,496 (30 per cent) cases that had been recorded in weekly situation reports had not been input into the OHCHR database. These cases reported serious crimes and human rights violations such as murder,
attacks on villages, kidnapping, arbitrary arrest, and illegal detention. Moreover, a review of the 1,028 cases in the OHCHR database noted that all of them were input on average two months after the incident was reported. Additionally, as shown in Chart 1: (a) there were 226 cases still at the preliminary information gathering stage, with 195 of them having been at that stage since 2018 and before; and (b) 768 cases at the investigation stage, with 330 of them having no work done on them since 2018. There was also no evidence that HROs and Team Leaders had taken any action to periodically review cases and take appropriate action to record reasons for the delay in proceeding with the investigation or proposing that they should be closed.

Chart 1: Status of 1,028 cases in the OHCHR database as at 30 June 2020

26. Only 34 cases were completed and closed by the relevant Team Leaders in the database. A review of these cases noted that 8 of them were closed without supervisory review by the Director or Deputy Director. There was also no evidence of any follow up actions such as handing over details of the concluded investigation to the Malian authorities for requisite action.

27. OIOS was informed that delays in updating the database and investigating cases was mainly due to poor staff performance. In OIOS opinion, it was also because Divisional leadership had not: implemented a procedure to periodically review reported cases and ensure they were recorded and dealt with accordingly; and developed work plans (as referred to in the previous section of the report) to ensure that HROs and Team Leaders were held accountable for completing their assigned tasks within reasonably established timelines. While delays in investigations are sometimes to be expected because of their complexity, logistical and access constraints and the volatile security environment in the country, Mission leadership needs to take action to minimize delays. With the passage of time the ability of HRPD to effectively investigate a case diminishes and may result in perpetrators not being held accountable.

MINUSMA should: (a) robustly monitor all reported cases of human rights violations to ensure they are recorded in the designated database and proper action is taken to investigate them within established timeframes; and (b) include in staff e-performance target timelines for recording and investigating human rights violations and monitor staff performance accordingly.

MINUSMA accepted recommendation 3 and stated that HRPD will do its utmost to ensure that all cases of human rights violations and abuses are well recorded in the database and the case manager makes the needed follow-up. Also, for concerned staff, proper recording and monitoring of human
Detention of individuals by the Mission was adequately coordinated and handled

28. MINUSMA established two temporary detention facilities in Gao and Timbuktu to hold persons suspected of committing crimes under Malian legislation and had adequately established procedures to be applied when an individual was detained.

29. During the audit period, a total of 15 individuals were detained by the Mission’s forces. OIOS review noted that MINUSMA procedures were properly followed, with HRPD having access to each detainee to interview them, and to assess the detention facilities conditions and whether their rights were being respected. HRPD also assisted in the handover of detainees to the Malian authorities within the established 48 hours period. OIOS concluded that there was adequate information sharing and coordination within the Mission and HRPD in the handling and processing of detainees.

Need to consistently prepare and issue annual public reports on the human rights situation in Mali

30. MINUSMA is required to publish annual and ad hoc public reports to inform and provide key national and international stakeholders contextual analysis of the human rights situation in Mali, as well as to communicate its strategies on its advocacy and support to the Malian State for them to conduct investigations to bring to justice alleged perpetrators of violations and abuses of human rights.

31. While HRPD had not issued an annual report on human rights situation in Mali since 2016, it had prepared and published six thematic and four ad-hoc reports covering specific events and issues such as the massacres that occurred in 2018 and 2019. It had also prepared Notes on Trends of Human Rights Violations and Abuses in Mali for which the information was collected in accordance with the methodology of OHCHR, and its monitoring and investigating strategy that was put in place in the current context of COVID-19. Such Notes had been widely shared with civil military and judicial authorities, and communications had also been addressed to various government Ministers requesting appropriate action to be taken.

32. While these were important publications, they did not provide a consolidated and comprehensive picture over an extended period to present the contextual analysis and trends of the human rights situation in Mali. However, as HRPD had already submitted to OHCHR a plan for the issuance of a public report during 2021, no recommendation is made.

The impact of the Mission’s capacity-building activities was not assessed

33. The Capacity Building and Technical Cooperation Unit of HRPD conducted 11 capacity-building workshops/trainings on human rights, humanitarian law monitoring and project management to media professionals, deposition takers, legal clinical facilitators, youth, and students. A total of 301 participants attended the workshops/trainings of which 231 were men and 70 were women.

34. However, for 8 of the 11 workshops/trainings there was no information on how the subjects covered were identified and whether adequate consultation with the Malians had taken place beforehand. The Unit informed that topics were identified through informal consultations with institutions and civil society groups, as well as judgement of the staff in the Unit. These informal consultations, however, were not
documented. There were also no evaluations/feedback obtained from participants to further develop and redesign, if necessary, future capacity building activities. HRPD stated that they had been doing this but would ensure going forward that training needs assessments are done systematically before planning for and delivering planning activities. It also informed that it would continue to conduct post evaluations of activities and make the necessary adjustments as needed. Based on the actions being taken by HRPD, OIOS is not making a recommendation.

Mandatory human rights training needed to be completed

35. To be well equipped to protect and promote international human rights and humanitarian law in the host country, all MINUSMA personnel are required to complete the mandatory induction training and online human rights course.

36. During the audit period, HRPD provided over 300 induction training sessions to new Mission personnel covering the Mission’s human rights mandate as well as their responsibilities on protecting and reporting on human rights issues. However, a review of MINUSMA training records in Inspira noted that only 337 (20 per cent) of the 1,685 Mission personnel had completed the mandatory training course on human rights. The shortfall was because Mission management were not regularly monitoring compliance and issuing periodic reminders on the need to complete the training. As a result, Mission personnel may not be fully aware of their responsibilities in conducting their duties and abiding by international human rights and humanitarian law.

(4) MINUSMA should regularly follow up with Mission personnel to ensure all mission staff complete the mandatory on-line course on human rights.

MINUSMA accepted recommendation 4 and stated that HRPD focal points will regularly monitor the completion of the mandatory on-line course on human rights particularly for new arrivals. Recommendation 4 remains open pending receipt of evidence that there has been significant improvement in the number of staff who have completed the mandatory course in human rights.

Partners implementing human rights activities on behalf of the Mission were not informed of the requirement to comply with the United Nations standards of conduct

37. The Secretary-General’s Bulletin on special measures for protection from sexual exploitation and sexual abuse (ST/SGB/2003/13) requires United Nations entities entering into cooperative arrangements with non-United Nations entities or individuals to inform them of the required standards of conduct and receive written confirmation from them that they accept to comply with the established standards.

38. During the audit period, HRPD sponsored quick impact projects implemented by 18 civil society groups and institutions (implementing partners) working with MINUSMA to advance the protection of human rights. The projects included, for example, construction, rehabilitation and equipping of a multipurpose building, computer and information centers and libraries to create adequate conditions for promoting human rights. However, these partners had not been provided with a copy of the United Nations standards of conduct and HRPD had not implemented procedures to inform and sensitize partners on the standards. Inappropriate conduct by non-United Nations implementing partners working with MINUSMA could in fact lead to human rights violations and undermine the reputation of the United Nations.

(5) MINUSMA should implement procedures to inform and sensitize its implementing partners on the United Nations standards of conduct prohibiting sexual exploitation and sexual abuse and ensure that written confirmations of acceptance of the standards are received.
MINUSMA accepted recommendation 5 and stated that HRPD had started implementation has already started. To harmonize the approach, the Division will disseminate this recommendation widely at the Mission level. Recommendation 5 remains open pending receipt of evidence of the implementation of procedures to enhance implementing partners’ awareness and compliance with United Nations standards of conduct.

IV. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

39. OIOS wishes to express its appreciation to the management and staff of MINUSMA 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 the human rights programme in the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. no.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Critical1/ Important2</th>
<th>C/ O3</th>
<th>Actions needed to close recommendation</th>
<th>Implementation date4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MINUSMA should implement an annual work plan for the Human Rights and Protection Division, including for its units and regional offices, that considers risks to effective mandate implementation and has specific, measurable outputs and targets that are monitored and reported on.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Receipt of copies of annual work plans of HRPD units and field offices that adequately consider risks to their implementation.</td>
<td>31 December 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MINUSMA should: (a) remind responsible staff to comply with the established Human Rights Due Diligence Policy procedures; and (b) actively monitor compliance by non-United Nations security forces receiving support with the conditions established.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Receipt of evidence that responsible staff have been reminded of the need to comply with HRDDP procedures, and compliance by beneficiaries with established conditions is properly monitored.</td>
<td>31 December 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MINUSMA should: (a) robustly monitor all reported cases of human rights violations to ensure they are recorded in the designated database and proper action is taken to investigate them within established timeframes; and (b) include in staff e-performance target timelines for recording and investigating human rights violations and monitor staff performance accordingly.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Receipt of evidence of the implementation of a monitoring mechanism to ensure that HRPD records and investigates all cases of human rights violations and abuses within established timeframes and evaluates staff members’ performance against established target timelines.</td>
<td>31 December 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MINUSMA should regularly follow up with Mission personnel to ensure all mission staff complete the mandatory on-line course on human rights.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Receipt of evidence that there has been significant improvement in the number of staff who have completed the mandatory course in human rights.</td>
<td>31 December 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MINUSMA should implement procedures to inform and sensitize its implementing partners on the</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Receipt of evidence of the implementation of procedures to enhance implementing partners’</td>
<td>31 December 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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 MINUSMA in response to recommendations.
STATUS OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

Audit of the human rights programme in the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>United Nations standards of conduct prohibiting sexual exploitation and sexual abuse and ensure that written confirmations of acceptance of the standards are received.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>awareness and compliance with United Nations standards of conduct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Management Response

### Audit of the human rights programme in the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. no.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Critical1/ Important2</th>
<th>Accepted? (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Title of responsible individual</th>
<th>Implementation date</th>
<th>Client comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MINUSMA should implement an annual work plan for the Human Rights and Protection Division, including for its units and regional offices, that considers risks to effective mandate implementation and has specific, measurable outputs and targets that are monitored and reported on.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chief Human Rights and Protection Division (CHRPD)</td>
<td>31 December 2021</td>
<td>The Mission concurs with the recommendation. The Human Rights and Protection Division (HRPD) will ensure that all thematic units and field offices adequately and systematically prepare work plans for each fiscal year and comply with the entire Division's overall existing work plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MINUSMA should: (a) remind responsible staff to comply with the established Human Rights Due Diligence Policy procedures; and (b) actively monitor compliance by non-United Nations security forces receiving support with the conditions established.</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Special Representative to the Secretary General (SRSG) and Senior Leadership Team (SLT)</td>
<td>31 December 2021</td>
<td>The mission concurs with this recommendation. The HRPD shall enforce compliance with Human Rights Due Diligence Procedures. The Mission's leadership shall monitor compliance by all concerned Sections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MINUSMA should: (a) robustly monitor all reported cases of human rights violations to ensure they are recorded in the designated database and proper action is taken to investigate them within established timeframes; and (b) include in staff e-performance target timelines for recording and investigating human rights violations.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(CHRPD)</td>
<td>31 December 2021</td>
<td>The Mission concurs with the recommendation. The HRPD will do its utmost to ensure that all cases of human rights violations and abuses are well recorded in the database, and the case manager makes the needed follow-up. For concerned staff, this will be added to their annual individual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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 the human rights programme in the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. no.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Critical1/ Important2</th>
<th>Accepted? (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Title of responsible individual</th>
<th>Implementation date</th>
<th>Client comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>violations and monitor staff performance accordingly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>work plans as criteria for performance evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MINUSMA should regularly follow up with Mission personnel to ensure all mission staff complete the mandatory online course on human rights.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chief Integrated Mission Training Center (CIMTC)</td>
<td>31 December 2021</td>
<td>MINUSMA concurs with the recommendation. Training on human rights obligations is mandatory, along with 12 other mandatory training. MINUSMA, through its dedicated focal point, shall regularly monitor the completion of this training, particularly for the new arrivals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MINUSMA should implement procedures to inform and sensitize its implementing partners on the United Nations standards of conduct prohibiting sexual exploitation and sexual abuse and ensure that written confirmations of acceptance of the standards are received.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(CHRPD)</td>
<td>31 December 2021</td>
<td>The Mission concurs with the recommendation. The HRPD takes good note of this recommendation, and implementation has already started. To harmonize the approach at the Mission level, the HRPD will disseminate this recommendation widely.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>