



INTERNAL AUDIT DIVISION

REPORT 2014/070

Audit of civil affairs activities in the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti

Overall results relating to the effective management of civil affairs activities in the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti were initially assessed as partially satisfactory. Implementation of three important recommendations remains in progress

FINAL OVERALL RATING: PARTIALLY SATISFACTORY

24 July 2014
Assignment No. AP2013/683/06

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
I. BACKGROUND	1
II. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE	1-2
III. AUDIT RESULTS	2-7
A. Programme management	2-4
B. Regulatory framework	4-7
IV. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	7
APPENDIX I Management response	

AUDIT REPORT

Audit of civil affairs activities in the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti

I. BACKGROUND

1. The Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) conducted an audit of civil affairs activities in the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH).
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 mandate of MINUSTAH required the Mission to support the Government of Haiti's efforts to build institutional capacity and extend state authority at all levels by strengthening state institutions. The Civil Affairs Section (CAS) was established to ensure the achievement of this mandate, and to foster relationships with local communities. CAS was also responsible for the management of quick-impact projects (QIPs) which were small scale, rapidly-implementable projects, of benefit to the local population.
4. CAS was headed by a Chief at the D-1 level and it had 109 authorized posts comprising 41 international staff, 51 national staff and 17 United Nations volunteers. The budgeted staffing cost of the Section for the financial year 2012/13 was \$5.1 million. MINUSTAH also implemented 177 QIPs costing \$7.6 million in 2011/12 and 138 QIPs costing \$5.1 million in 2012/13.
5. Comments provided by MINUSTAH are incorporated in italics.

II. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

6. The audit was conducted to assess the adequacy and effectiveness of MINUSTAH governance, risk management and control processes in providing reasonable assurance regarding the **effective management of civil affairs activities in MINUSTAH**.
7. The audit was included in the OIOS 2013 risk-based work plan because of the reputational risks of not implementing the MINUSTAH mandate to support the Government of Haiti's efforts to build institutional capacity and strengthen state institutions.
8. The key controls tested for the audit were: (a) programme management; and (b) regulatory framework. For the purpose of this audit, OIOS defined these key controls as follows:
 - a. **Programme management** - controls that provide reasonable assurance that there is sufficient programme management capacity to achieve the civil affairs mandate, and a system exists to manage and report on the achievements of civil affairs activities.
 - b. **Regulatory framework** - controls that provide reasonable assurance that policies and procedures: (i) exist to guide the management of civil affairs activities and quick impact projects; (ii) are implemented consistently; and (iii) ensure the reliability and integrity of financial and operational information.

9. The key controls were assessed for the control objectives shown in Table 1. Certain control objectives shown in Table 1 as “Not assessed” were not relevant to the scope defined for this audit.

10. OIOS conducted the audit from September 2013 to January 2014. The audit covered the period from 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2013. OIOS conducted site visits to 4 of 10 regional locations in Haiti where civil affairs activities and QIPs had been implemented.

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

III. AUDIT RESULTS

12. The MINUSTAH governance, risk management and control processes examined were initially assessed as **partially satisfactory** in providing reasonable assurance regarding the **effective management of civil affairs activities in MINUSTAH**. OIOS made four recommendations to address the issues identified. MINUSTAH provided support to: reinforce public infrastructures; assist the Government of Haiti in its efforts to build institutional capacity; and strengthen state institutions at national and local levels. MINUSTAH also implemented several QIPs for the benefit to the local population. However, MINUSTAH needed to improve: (a) planning and monitoring of civil affairs activities against established timelines and targets; and (b) the process of selection, approval and monitoring of QIPs, as well as the visibility of projects implemented.

13. The initial overall rating was based on the assessment of key controls presented in Table 1. The final overall rating is **partially satisfactory** as implementation of three important recommendations remains in progress.

Table 1: Assessment of key controls

Business objective	Key controls	Control objectives			
		Efficient and effective operations	Accurate financial and operational reporting	Safeguarding of assets	Compliance with mandates, regulations and rules
Effective management of civil affairs activities in MINUSTAH	(a) Programme management	Partially satisfactory	Partially satisfactory	Not assessed	Partially satisfactory
	(b) Regulatory framework	Partially satisfactory	Partially satisfactory y	Not assessed	Partially satisfactory
FINAL OVERALL RATING: PARTIALLY SATISFACTORY					

A. Programme management

The Mission provided support for building institutional capacity and strengthening state institutions

14. The Department of Peacekeeping Operations/Department of Field Support (DPKO/DFS) Civil Affairs Policy Directive required civil affairs programmes in missions to support governments in

strengthening conditions and structures conducive to sustainable peace, as well as strengthen state institutions at all levels.

15. A review of documents, interviews and various reports on civil affairs activities indicated that MINUSTAH played an important role to redress, rebuild and support key government institutions in the aftermath of the 2010 earthquake. This included: (a) facilitating the construction of prefabs to host Parliament to assist in its reestablishment; (b) constructing two administrative blocks to house the Ministry of Interior and Territorial Collectivity; and (c) providing logistical and infrastructural support to the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of Agriculture and various other state institutions through implementation of QIPs.

16. CAS also assisted the Government in improving coordination mechanisms and assisted local authorities in developing and implementing financial and administrative management procedures. For instance, MINUSTAH: (a) assisted the Ministry of Interior in planning and preparing 140 municipal budgets; (b) was involved in regular dialogues with parliamentarians related to prioritizing reform bills on women reservation, decentralization, money laundering and anti-corruption; (c) facilitated a series of 118 town-hall meetings which brought together 8,540 people, including 1,910 women (22 per cent), to interact on various social issues; and (d) provided technical support to local administrations through training and on-the-job capacity building. OIOS concluded that MINUSTAH supported the Government in strengthening conditions and structures conducive to sustainable peace, as well as strengthening state institutions at all levels.

The Civil Affairs Section provided the required cross-mission representation

17. The DPKO/DFS Civil Affairs Policy Directive required CAS to represent and liaise with local actors on civil affairs operations and on other Mission activities. A review of weekly reports of three regions and site visits to four regional offices indicated that CAS represented Mission components at regional levels where other substantive components were not present. CAS facilitated dialogue between interested groups and assisted in resolving various types of conflicts. OIOS concluded that CAS was providing the required cross-mission representation in Haiti.

Work planning needed to improve

18. The DPKO/DFS Civil Affairs Handbook required annual work plans to map out civil affairs activities, including timeframes, regional priorities, use of resources and key indicators for measuring progress and impact.

19. CAS prepared annual work plans and reported its performance through the results-based budget process. A review of the work plans and result-based budget reports for the fiscal years 2011/12 and 2012/13 indicated that majority (90 per cent) of activities included in the 2011/12 work plan was repeated in the 2012/13 plan, and both work plans did not include all of the important activities being implemented. For example:

- MINUSTAH established a framework of cooperation in April 2008 between the Mission and the Ministry of Interior. However, this framework was still included as a key activity in both 2011/12 and 2012/13 work plans. CAS clarified that it had intended to update the framework during these years but had not accurately reflected this in the work plans;
- CAS did not include in its work plan activities to rebuild and reinforce public infrastructures and reinstate state institutions, which was their main focus after the 2010 earthquake. CAS agreed that changes to the Section's work plans were not sufficiently documented; and

- CAS included a goal in its 2011/12 and 2012/13 work plans to develop an action plan for strengthening 10 regional government representations. However, this goal was not achieved for both years due to the lack of funding. MINUSTAH, prior to including this activity in its work plans, did not ensure that funding would be available to implement the activity. CAS was of the view that this goal needed to be included, even though adequate funding had not been secured, as it was a goal of the United Nations Integrated Strategic Framework for Haiti.

20. Also, a review of 19 of the 96 activities included in the 2011/12 and 2012/13 CAS work plans indicated that measurable performance indicators were not included for eight activities. MINUSTAH did not develop indicators such as the number of trainings and workshops, town hall meetings and round table conferences to be organized and the number of communes to be covered. In addition, CAS work plan activities lacked timelines for achievement.

21. The above resulted as CAS did not have a formal process to prepare, monitor and update work plans to reflect past performances and to incorporate new activities and challenges. Consequently, CAS was not able to comprehensively measure and report on the accomplishments of the civil affairs programme against established targets and indicators.

(1) MINUSTAH should implement a formal annual work planning process to ensure that work plans include: (a) goals and activities to be implemented in the year; and (b) appropriate performance indicators and timelines to improve monitoring and reporting of achievements.

MINUSTAH accepted recommendation 1 and stated that its work plan for 2013/14 included clear goals and activities to be implemented, and it made further improvements to the 2014/15 work plan by incorporating quantifiable indicators of achievement and timelines. Based on the action taken by MINUSTAH, recommendation 1 has been closed.

B. Regulatory framework

Project Review Committees for quick-impact projects were constituted and they discharged their functions

22. The DPKO/DFS Policy on QIPs required the Head of Mission to establish a Project Review Committee (PRC) that was responsible for evaluating QIP proposals and for selecting and approving them. The policy also required that PRCs include representatives of relevant components of the Mission.

23. MINUSTAH decentralized the process of QIPs selection and accordingly PRCs were established in all 10 regions. Each regional PRC was headed by the respective chief regional officer and comprised of heads of different substantive components present in the regions. A review of 37 of the 315 QIPs implemented in the audit period indicated that there were procedures in place for the review and approval of QIPs by regional PRCs; albeit the process could have been better documented. Subsequent to the audit, MINUSTAH took action to improve the process of documenting the decision-making process.

24. OIOS concluded that PRCs were adequately constituted and projects were properly reviewed and approved prior to initiation.

Management, monitoring and evaluation of quick-impact projects needed to improve

25. The DPKO/DFS Policy on QIPs defined QIPs as small-scale and low cost (maximum of \$50,000) projects that were expected to be implemented within a period not exceeding six months from the date of the disbursement of the first installment.

26. A review of 315 QIPs initiated in fiscal years 2011/12 and 2012/13 indicated that the implementation of 113 projects (36 per cent) was delayed by an average of 98 days beyond the stipulated period of 180 days. These delays were due to: (a) a lengthy review and approval process; and (b) inadequate monitoring and site visits by project officers to review the status of projects during execution.

- (a) Administrative procedures for the review and approval of project proposals needed to be streamlined

27. MINUSTAH standard operating procedures for QIPs required a number of actions prior to initiating a QIP. A review of 37 projects indicated that 26 projects experienced delays of an average of 155 days from the date of receipt of proposals to the date of approval by the regional PRC. These delays mainly resulted as the clearance process for QIPs was not decentralized and was therefore not aligned with the establishment of regional PRCs. Also, although the Budget Unit was responsible for verifying appropriateness of administrative and budget procedures, a further review was conducted by the Office of Mission Support. The current process therefore, resulted in lengthy interactions between regions and headquarters prior to the approval and payment of first installments.

- (b) Projects were not adequately monitored

28. The DPKO/DFS Policy and Guidelines required project focal points to be responsible for monitoring and shepherding the progress of QIPs. Also, where possible, missions needed to allocate engineering expertise to review and provide technical support to projects. Focal points were responsible for monitoring implementing agencies for quality control purposes, and were expected to conduct monitoring and closure visits as well as prepare appropriate reports.

29. Almost 90 per cent of the 315 QIPs initiated during the audit period related to construction and rehabilitation of public buildings and other engineering works. However, the Engineering Section was not involved in conducting technical assessments of these projects, either during project execution or upon completion, to evaluate the quality of work performed and ensure that the work was in line with the agreed design and specifications. OIOS site visits to four completed construction projects indicated that two did not meet the planned design and specifications. For example: dimensions of a constructed police station had been altered from the initial design; and room sizes of a community center were different from what was originally planned. OIOS also observed poor workmanship in the community center, which resulted in water seeping through the roof. No action was taken by CAS and the concerned implementing agencies were paid the amounts contracted in their memoranda of understanding.

30. Additionally, field visits to 23 project sites showed that CAS did not adequately coordinate with implementing partners on the completion of joint projects. For instance:

- An implementing partner completed a QIP for the construction of a water tank totaling \$22,505 in October 2012. However, the tank could not be used by the local population because another implementing partner did not install the required connecting pipelines; and
- MINUSTAH implemented a QIP totaling \$46,121 to link an irrigation canal being constructed by the Government to adjacent ploughing lands. MINUSTAH completed the QIP in September

2012. However, the Government had not finished constructing the canal to ensure that it was linked to the water source. As a result, at the time of the audit, the canal could not be used by the local population.

31. The review of 37 QIPs indicated that QIP focal points prepared project closure reports but did not systematically conduct site visits and prepare evaluation reports in all cases. As a result, QIP closure reports did not always reflect the correct status of QIP implementation. For example, only 2 of 14 proposed solar lamp posts were installed at the designated location although the project closure report indicated that all lamps were installed.

(c) Assessments of beneficiary satisfaction and impact on confidence-building were not conducted

32. The DPKO/DFS Civil Affairs Handbook required missions to conduct an assessment of beneficiary satisfaction and confidence-building impact to determine whether project objectives were met. The Handbook proposed that this could be achieved through interviews with beneficiaries, focus groups or surveys.

33. CAS did not conduct assessments of the impact of QIPs on beneficiary satisfaction and confidence-building. As a result, MINUSTAH did not learn lessons to improve the QIPs programme and was unable to gauge the impact of QIPs on confidence-building and promoting local community satisfaction.

(2) MINUSTAH should streamline the process for approving quick-impact projects to ensure that the projects are initiated and implemented within required timelines.

MINUSTAH accepted recommendation 2 and stated that it had been advocating for the adoption of specific administrative and financial procedures for QIPs since 2012. However, implementation of projects was often hampered by external factors out of the Mission's control. It had strengthened regular information sharing mechanisms between various internal stakeholders to ensure early warning of possible delays. Recommendation 2 remains open pending receipt of evidence that action has been taken to reduce delays in initiating and implementing QIPs.

(3) MINUSTAH should implement measures to improve the implementation rate and quality of quick-impact projects through enhanced monitoring, including systematically conducting site visits, seeking technical input from the Engineering Section, improving coordination between entities responsible for implementing projects, and conducting assessments of beneficiary satisfaction.

MINUSTAH accepted recommendation 3 and stated that regional offices were instructed to conduct specific evaluations of the impact of each project for 2012/13, and training guidelines and templates were provided to QIP focal points. In addition, CAS would develop further measures to ensure effective monitoring of QIPs during the implementation phase. Recommendation 3 remains open pending receipt of evidence that action has been taken to improve the monitoring of QIPs and assessments of beneficiary satisfaction.

The visibility of quick impact projects needed to be improved

34. The DPKO/DFS Policy and Guidelines on QIPs required projects to be visible to the local population and appropriately publicized during their implementation and completion phases.

35. For 16 of 23 project sites visited, there were no visibility boards at project sites to inform the local population of the Mission's contribution to the local community. Also, interviews with QIP beneficiaries confirmed that they were not aware that MINUSTAH had funded the QIP. For example: (a) local beneficiaries at a project site credited the local Mayor for the installation of 10 solar lamps; and (b) the head of a local school assumed that a moving lamp post was donated by the departmental delegate. Moreover, in one QIP the name of the agency responsible for constructing the works was embossed on the water fountain without any indication that the project had been funded by MINUSTAH.

36. MINUSTAH had taken action and issued procedures to implementing partners on ensuring the visibility of MINUSTAH projects and up-dated the QIP guidelines to make visibility a mandatory step in the closure process of QIPs. However, these actions were not fully effective as QIP focal points did not always conduct site visits to review and evaluate projects and to ensure implementing partners complied with MINUSTAH QIP procedures.

(4) MINUSTAH should develop procedures for quick-impact project focal points to ensure adequate publicity of quick-impact projects. This could include, for example, erection of visibility boards in project sites and imprinting of the Mission's logo on donated items.

MINUSTAH accepted recommendation 4 and issued instructions on the visibility of QIPs and provided training to QIPs focal points. Implementing partners were required to ensure visibility of QIPs for up to 12 months after project completion. MINUSTAH also implemented procedures that required proof of adequate visibility to be submitted to CAS before processing of final installment to implementing partners. Recommendation 4 remains open pending receipt of evidence of actions taken to improve the visibility of QIPs.

IV. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

37. OIOS wishes to express its appreciation to the Management and staff of MINUSTAH for the assistance and cooperation extended to the auditors during this assignment.

(Signed) David Kanja
Assistant Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services

STATUS OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

Audit of civil affairs activities in the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti

Recom. no.	Recommendation	Critical ¹ / Important ²	C/ O ³	Actions needed to close recommendation	Implementation date ⁴
1	MINUSTAH should implement a formal annual work planning process to ensure that work plans include: (a) goals and activities to be implemented in the year; and (b) appropriate performance indicators and timelines to improve monitoring and reporting of achievements.	Important	C	Action taken.	Implemented
2	MINUSTAH should streamline the process for approving quick-impact projects to ensure that the projects are initiated and implemented within required timelines.	Important	O	Receipt of evidence that action has been taken to reduce delays in initiating and implementing QIPs.	July 2014
3	MINUSTAH should implement measures to improve the implementation rate and quality of quick-impact projects through enhanced monitoring, including systematically conducting site visits, seeking technical input from the Engineering Section, improving coordination between entities responsible for implementing projects, and conducting assessments of beneficiary satisfaction.	Important	O	Receipt of evidence that action has been taken to improve the monitoring of QIPs and assessments of beneficiary satisfaction.	August 2014

¹ Critical recommendations address significant and/or pervasive deficiencies or weaknesses in governance, risk management or internal control processes, such that reasonable assurance cannot be provided regarding the achievement of control and/or business objectives under review.

² Important recommendations address important deficiencies or weaknesses in governance, risk management or internal 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 MINUSTAH

STATUS OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

Audit of civil affairs activities in the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti

Recom. no.	Recommendation	Critical ¹ / Important ²	C/ O ³	Actions needed to close recommendation	Implementation date ⁴
4	MINUSTAH should develop procedures for quick-impact project focal points to ensure adequate publicity of quick-impact projects. This could include, for example erection of visibility boards in project sites and imprinting of the Mission's logo on donated items.	Important	O	Receipt of evidence of actions taken to improve the visibility of QIPs.	August 2014

¹ Critical recommendations address significant and/or pervasive deficiencies or weaknesses in governance, risk management or internal control processes, such that reasonable assurance cannot be provided regarding the achievement of control and/or business objectives under review.

² Important recommendations address important deficiencies or weaknesses in governance, risk management or internal 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 MINUSTAH

APPENDIX I

Management Response



TELEFAX TRANSMISSION

Outgoing fax msg no:		Page 1 of	
To:	Ms. Eleanor T. Burns Chief, Peacekeeping Audit Service, IAD, OIOS, UNHQ, NY	From:	Sandra Honoré Special Representative of the Secretary-General MINUSTAH
Fax no:	3-3388 (via email)	Fax no:	7-9080
Info:	Ms. Amy Wong (wong6@un.org) Mr. Iswari Bhattarai (bhattarai2@un.org)	Date:	30 June 2014
		Ref:	IAD: 13-683/06
Subject:	Assignment No AP2013/683/06 – Audit of Civil Affairs activities in MINUSTAH		

1. Reference is made to your memorandum of 28 May 2014 on the above mentioned subject, under cover of which you forwarded the OIOS overall results relating to the effective management of Civil Affairs activities in MINUSTAH.

2. Please find attached MINUSTAH's comments on the recommendations as requested.

Best regards.

Drafted by:	Cleared by:
K. Zillner, AA O/DMS	L. Duchesne, COS

Management Response

Audit of the Civil Affairs activities in the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical ¹ / Important ²	Accepted? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
1	MINUSTAH should implement a formal annual work planning process to ensure that work plans include: (a) goals and activities to be implemented in the year; and (b) appropriate performance indicators and timelines are established to improve monitoring and reporting of achievements.	Important	Yes	Chief of Civil Affairs	15/07/2014	(a), Since the audit, the Mission has made improvements in the 2013/14 workplan to take into account the recommendation in terms of clear goals and activities to be implemented and will apply such improvements in the upcoming 2014/2015 budget. (b), Performance indicators are measured through several tools by the Mission (result based budgeting (RBB), weekly synopsis, evaluation matrices, etc.) A copy of the 2014/2015 work plan has been provided to the Resident Auditors.

¹ Critical recommendations address significant and/or pervasive deficiencies or weaknesses in governance, risk management or internal control processes, such that reasonable assurance cannot be provided regarding the achievement of control and/or business objectives under review.

² Important recommendations address important deficiencies or weaknesses in governance, risk management or internal control processes, such that reasonable assurance may be at risk regarding the achievement of control and/or business objectives under review.

Management Response

Audit of the Civil Affairs activities in the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical/ Important	Accepted? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
2	MINUSTAH should review and streamline the process for approving quick-impact projects to ensure that they are initiated and implemented within acceptable timelines.	Important	Yes	Chief of Civil Affairs and Head of Quick Impact Projects (QIP) Unit	31/07/2014	The Mission accepts this recommendation and hopes that the current regulatory control will not be in conflict with it. Since 2012, the Mission has advocated for the adoption of a specific administrative and financial procedure for QIPs. Implementation is often hampered by external factors out of the Mission's control. The increase on the project duration is a good step to reflect the reality in the field Department of Peacekeeping Operations/ Department of Field Support (DPKO/DFS) Policy Directive of 21 January 2013). More specifically, the Mission has strengthened regular information-sharing mechanisms between the various internal stakeholders in order to have early warning of possible delays. The Mission would like to point out that delays in the first disbursement after signature of the Agreement is not related to clearance, which is done prior to its signature, contrary to what is stated in item 31 of the Report.

Management Response

Audit of the Civil Affairs activities in the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical/ Important	Accepted? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
3	MINUSTAH should implement procedures to improve the implementation rate and quality of quick-impact projects through enhanced monitoring, including systematically conducting site visits, seeking technical input from the Engineering Section, improving coordination between entities responsible for implementing projects, and conducting assessments of beneficiary satisfaction.	Important	Yes	Chief of Civil Affairs and Head of QIP Unit	31/08/2014	The Mission acknowledges that monitoring of QIP projects should be increased. To this end, regional offices have been instructed to conduct specific evaluation of the impact of each project for the 2012/13 Fiscal Year. Trainings, guidelines and templates have been provided to QIP focal points. This includes an interview form for the Implementing Partner (IP) and the beneficiaries (in French and Créole). Additionally, since September 2013, an additional control mechanism was instituted requiring regional offices to submit the interview reports conducted with beneficiaries before processing the project closure request (<i>also refer to comment below on recommendation 4 on visibility</i>). The Mission will continue to develop additional measures to ensure effective project monitoring during the implementation phase. Specific arrangements at regional level have been put in place since 2008 to obtain technical assistance from Engineering Section (ES) not only for project assessment and first site visit but also for project monitoring. In March 2013, QIPs Unit integrated a National Engineer (NPO) in its team to help assist in project assessment and monitoring, complementing the work of regional engineers, in line with QIPs Police Directive of January 2013. The Mission states that although these mechanisms are largely implemented, there is a need for additional corrective measures to be taken to further smoothen the process.

Management Response

Audit of the Civil Affairs activities in the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical/ Important	Accepted? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
4	MINUSTAH should develop additional procedures for quick-impact project focal points to ensure adequate publicity of quick-impact projects. This could include, for example erection of visibility boards in project sites and imprinting of the Mission's logo on donated items.	Important	Yes	Chief of Civil Affairs and Head of QIP Unit	31/08/2014	The Mission acknowledges that the visibility of QIP projects could be improved. To that effect, it has introduced a number of measures to achieve this goal. During the audit reporting period, Implementing Partners were contractually obliged to ensure visibility of projects during the implementation phase and for one month after project closure. The procedure was further amended in March 2012 to include a specific and mandatory section on Mission's visibility related activities. Instructions on the importance of Mission's visibility have been circulated, QIPs focal points have been trained and examples of best practices have been presented and disseminated. Furthermore, in June 2013, the standard memorandum of understanding (MOU) has been modified extending the obligation to give visibility to 12 months after project completion. Furthermore, as of September 2013, no funds are reimbursed without proof of adequate visibility.