



---

# **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO THE IRAQI OFFICES OF THE INSPECTORS GENERAL**

---

**FOURTH QUARTER - 2012  
PROGRESS REPORT # 4  
S-NEAIR-11-GR-138**

**IMPLEMENTED BY THE UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (UNDP)**

**FUNDED BY THE UNITED STATES - DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

**OCTOBER - DECEMBER 2012**

## **Table of Contents**

<b>1. ACTIVITIES DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. BACKGROUND TO THE PROJECT</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3. PROGRESS ACHIEVED IN 4TH QUARTER 2012 AS PER THE PROJECT WORK PLAN</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4. EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>ANNEX I - Concept Paper: IGs Study Tour</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>ANNEX II - Agenda: Project Board Meeting, 20 November 2012</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>ANNEX III - Minutes of Meeting: Project Board Meeting, 20 November 2012</b>	<b>21</b>

## 1. Activities during the Reporting Period

### Output 1: The role of IGs is strengthened within their ministries

- Activity 1.1 Share knowledge among IGs and the decision making level to ensure common understanding of their respective mandates as stipulated by relevant laws, policies and regulations*
- Activity 1.2 Develop performance evaluation protocol and tools*
- Activity 1.3 Provide technical support for the implementation of Codes of Conduct for Public Officials (in line with Civil service laws and codes)*
- Activity 1.4 Develop governance and performance indicators*

1) A TOR to hire a consultancy firm for Activities 1.1-1.4 is under process by procurement.

- Activity 1.5 Provide technical support for institutionalizing the IG Association*
- Activity 1.6 Assess the need for provincial OIGs*

2) Two TORs related to activities 1.5 and 1.6 have been advertised two times during the reporting period. There were no qualified candidates among the applicants. The ToR related to activity 1.5 is being re-advertised and the estimated starting date is end of February 2013.

### Output 2: IGs and their staff demonstrate improved technical skills and capacity

- Activity 2.1 Develop Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)*

1) A TOR to hire a consultant has been advertised, the estimated starting date is late 1st Quarter 2013.

- Activity 2.2 Provide training on strategic planning and performance management*

2) Kleif & Samman (K&S) has been contracted on 25 June 2012 to undertake the majority of activities related to Output 2. Specifically, K&S is to provide the following services related to Output 2:

- Activity 2.3 Conduct technical training sessions for technical staff*
- Activity 2.4 Develop a training manual for new staff*
- Activity 2.5 Address gender differential issues, responsive programming and budgeting*
- Activity 2.6 Conduct training sessions on public asset management*
- Activity 2.7 Conduct workshops for investigators on advanced investigative skills*
- Activity 2.9 Conduct needs assessment on IT Forensic Audits*
- Activity 2.10 Develop ToT and Certification*

The main focus of activities, during this reporting period, was as follows:

**The development of training manuals:**

The first drafts of the training manuals were received November 2012. The training manuals include 34 topics divided into the following:

1. Inspection (8 topics)
2. Investigation (7 topics)
3. Audit (15 topics)
4. Performance Review (2 topics)
5. General Topics

A presentation was given on 4 December to present the different topics, training methodology, and the trainers engaged to conduct the upcoming training.

Furthermore, during the reporting period, a Training Committee has been established for the purpose of reviewing and endorsing the training materials. The Committee includes the following members:

- Dr. Nawar Al-Zubaidi, Inspector General, Authority of Property Estate Resolution
- Dr. Jasem Al-Atwani, Inspector General, Ministry of Environment
- Dr. Jaffar Hamoudi, Inspector General, Shiite Endowment

**Upcoming trainings:**

Due to the difficulties to identify a training venue for the duration of 18 months, a change in the approach of training has been considered. The new approach entails the development of training of trainers (TOT) with an anticipated need identified as 320 participants selected from the different OIGs in the areas of audit and inspection followed by administrative investigation and performance evaluation. The estimated time for the completion of the ToT is 100 working days. Upon the completion of the ToT, training will be delivered to the rest of the OIGs staff in the different ministries. The ToT trained staff will assist in the delivery of the training. This methodology will ensure:

- The shortening of the training period timeline;
- Providing the trained ToT staff with both the know-how and practical experience;
- Facilitating the sustainability of efforts and the continuous transfer of skills and knowledge after the completion of the project.

In connection with the upcoming ToT training, a draft pre-established criterion has been identified to select the 320 participants accordingly. It has been agreed to seek the approval of the Training Committee on the selection criteria during their first meeting anticipated to take place at the beginning of January 2013.

The completed Trainee's registration forms have been entered into the database. All OIGs have submitted their nominations except for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Furthermore, a Web Management System (WMS) has been established to manage the upcoming training and it will be used as a monitoring and transparency tool for quality assurance. Stakeholders will be able to access the WMS and retrieve all relevant information related to the conducted training. The following functions and information are included in the WMS:

- Management and monitoring of training activities;
- Registration of participants;

- Training activities: training information including schedules, materials, topics, attendance, exam results, evaluation, etc.;
- Training archive;
- Feedback;
- Bio of trainers;
- Trainers and trainees evaluation reports and comments;
- Daily attendance record and reports

#### **IT Forensic Audit Assessments:**

Fourteen IG Offices were visited and IT Forensic Audit Assessments completed. . A draft IT Audit Assessment Report has been developed and it is anticipated to be finalized in Quarter 1 2013.

#### **Study Visit**

A draft concept paper for the study visit has been developed (Attached as Annex I). After conducting extensive research, it has been determined that the visit should target the US due to the similarity of the IGs system in the two countries. The Iraqi IGs will be able to take maximum benefit when they will visit IGs institutions in the US that has the same concept with multiplier effect potential. UNDP is currently identifying institutional best practice and contacts to initiate the process.

#### **Challenges**

Difficulties were encountered by the Prime Minister Coordinator's Office (PMCO) during the reporting period due to the misperception regarding UNDP's role as the implementer of the project vis-à-vis the PMCO's role as a coordinator. This caused considerable delay at the start of training and delayed the date of the Training Committee's meeting to review and approve the training manuals. UNDP took specific and risk management approaches to mitigate this problem including:

UNDP undertook two approaches to mitigate this problem:

1. Called for a Project Board meeting that included PMCO, two IGs, Anti-Corruption Coordinator's Office ACCO US Embassy, and UNDP. The meeting was held on 20 November 2012. The Agenda and the Minutes of the Meeting are attached as Annexes II and III.
2. Requested a meeting with Mr. Ali Al-Alaak, Secretary General for the Council of Ministers, Chairman of the Joint Anti-Corruption Council. A meeting with Mr. Al-Alaak was held on 10 December 2012 for the purpose of assisting in alleviating the obstacles encountered by the PMCO. The meeting was attended by Dr. Sabah Al-Husseini, PMCO, Ms. Noha Al-Agha, ACCO, Mr. Peter Batchelor, Mr. Emad Alemamie, and Ms. Jouhaida Hanano from UNDP. The meeting resulted in consensus on the establishment of the Training Committee by all parties who were present in the meeting.

## **2. Background to the Project**

The Offices of the Inspectors General (OIGs) were established on 5 February 2004 through Coalition Provisional Authority Order 57. The Inspectors General (IG) represented a new concept to the Iraqi institutional framework. Placed within each of the Iraqi Ministries, the IGs function is internal, yet as independent, oversight bodies. Order 57 establishes "independent Offices of Inspectors General to conduct investigations, audits, evaluations, inspections and other reviews in accordance with generally accepted professional standards" (Section 1) and provides that "each Iraqi ministry" should have one Office of Inspectors General (Section 2). IGs were also appointed to carry out the same functions in government institutions not linked to a ministry such as the Central Bank, the Commission of Media and Communication, Christian and other religion Endowments.

While the scope of work is considerably wide, IGs face a multitude of challenges at the policy and technical levels. These include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (i) In many ministries and government institutions which are not directly attached to a ministry, there remains a lack of clarity about the role of the IGs, their powers and functions, as well as the practical work arrangements between the IG and the Minister or public official/head of government institution. The lack of clarity in Order 57 regarding appointment and dismissal of IGs combined with the obvious interest that Ministers have in controlling the process, has sometimes led to the appointment of unqualified IGs on the basis of their relationships with the concerned Minister.
- (ii) In view of the sometimes hostile environment and the related risks that many IGs are exposed to, difficulties in attracting qualified candidates are often faced. Many of the OIG staff members presently do not possess the necessary professional skills and qualifications to carry out their functions and tasks expeditiously and effectively.
- (iii) IGs are often limited to acting in a passive manner, and/or only act on the basis of specific allegations. There is a view that IGs are not adequately empowered to refer suspicious or evidence to the highest degrees of administration of enforcement agencies.
- (iv) The IGs presently are not represented in the provinces. Thus a number of OIGs will need to extend their presence to the governorate level in order to adequately review certain government projects that are under implementation and accompany the new federal dispensation in governorates and municipalities.

The exclusive reporting line of the IGs to their line Minister blocks further action and transparency within the limit of their duty and mandate. It is viewed that the Prime Minister's Office should control the overarching steering mechanism of all IGs, and the devolution of powers to their line ministry be clarified by administrative or ministerial orders. The current legal framework fails to provide for coordination between the IGs, which has also quickly contributed to disparities in working methods. Efforts have been made to address these differences through the formation of an IG Coordination Committee that meets once a month which is headed by the Head of the Commission of Integrity. However, presently the Committee does not have official status and any decision it takes is therefor, non-binding.

In addition, the IGs lack several basic technical and policy tools to accomplish program reviews, including;

- (a) Methodology to conduct management performance evaluation, including measuring the efficiency, effectiveness, integrity and governance of the Ministries;
- (b) Up-to-date IT infrastructure and skills;
- (c) A clear reporting format with devolution of powers within their respective line ministry as well as a collaborative approach to other integrity institutions;
- (d) An institutional strategy and work-plan that includes the establishment of governance/provincial offices;
- (e) Performance indicators for IG staff;
- (f) IG staff do not possess the specific technical know-how required to enable them to evaluate the specialized work of the Ministries in a sound fashion, and there are several limitations (cost, security risks) in terms of securing such technical know-how: and
- (g) The limited opportunity to recommend corrective action for their line Ministry according to the ad-hoc regulations and legal system, or the further possibility to follow up on recommendations.

Since 2008, UNDP has been working with the Iraqi anti-corruption entities including the Inspectors General. UNDP has collaboratively assessed the needs of Inspectors General and their offices. UNDP

has also organized trainings seminars on anti-corruption and fraud detection awareness for the purpose of assisting the Inspectors General in improving internal auditing and enhancing institutional performance.

UNDP has involved the IGs in the UNDP anti-corruption programme, particularly with regard to Iraq's compliance with the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC). Training of Trainers was conducted from 14-18 February 2010 for representatives of all three oversight institutions including IGs on self-assessment analysis of legal, institutional and operational requirements to identify and minimize institutional corruption. Self-assessments were completed with the technical assistance of UNODC and the information was used in the development of the National Anti-Corruption Strategy. The role of the IGs on monitoring and evaluating the outcomes of the National Strategy has been clearly identified.

This project is designed to strengthen the capacity of Iraqi Inspectors General and their staff on managerial, operative, legal, administrative and technical levels. It is to strengthen the administrative capacity within their respective ministries and in collaboration with other integrity institutions. Realizing actions in capacity development, collaboration with other institutions and coordination within the OIGs will subsequently improve the ability of IGs to satisfy their legal obligations, thereby contributing to a reduction in corruption and other wasteful and criminal practices in Iraq.

The systemic approach to enhance levels of integrity, accountability and transparency in the Executive Branch of Government is intimately related to addressing public trust, restoring the rule of law, strengthening administrative and legal systems, as well as reforming the civil service for the general interest. The preventive, normative and corrective role of Inspectors General in preventing or investigating corrupt acts within the civil service and beyond in the public sphere, constitutes an important channel to restore credibility of the State. The empowered role of the IGs to take on these specific roles would assist to rebuild the societal pact of integrity and citizenship that has severely deteriorated and assist to reinforce the capacity of the State to deliver public services by increasing accountability and delivery on public expenses.

The duration of the project was agreed to be a three year period with an additional three months at the beginning for the necessary preparation required at the outset. The award was signed at the end of July 2011, with UNDP initiating the recruitment procedures for the project personnel. Short listed candidates were interviewed for the position of the Project Manager but unfortunately, were not of the calibre required for this project. Therefore, a second recruitment cycle was initiated in November 2011.

In late 2011, ACCO requested a revised annual work plans in line with the Grant Award and clarified that no activities were to initiate until such time. Approval was granted the next quarter, on 14 March 2012.

### 3. Progress Achieved in 4thQuarter 2012 as per the Project Work Plan

Objectives/Activities	Indicators	Target	Baseline	Data Source	Timeline
<p><b>1. The role of IGs is strengthened within their ministries</b></p> <p>1.1 Organize a workshop to bring together all Inspectors-General as well as senior ministry staff from all ministries and major independent agencies</p> <p>1.2 Develop performance evaluation protocol and tools.</p> <p>1.3 Provide technical support for the implementation of Codes of Conduct for Public Officials (in line with civil service laws and codes).</p> <p>1.4 Developing governance and performance indicators.</p> <p>1.5 Provide technical support for institutionalizing the IG Association</p> <p>1.6 Assess the need for provincial OIGs</p>	<p>i. Number and types of mechanisms in place within ministries for provision of ad-hoc and long term advice and expertise to strengthen the institutional framework required by the National Anti-Corruption Strategy, specifically in the area of prevention, improving the performance of the ministry and minimizing waste in public funds.</p> <p>ii. Number and types of policies, strategies and action plans in place in ministries reflecting internationally based codes of conduct and corruption indicators for accountability, integrity, transparency, and oversight of criminal justice, public, and private sector institutions.</p> <p>iii. Number of new partnerships structure between ministries, OIGs and other relevant</p>	<p>i. A minimum of five mechanisms established, including protocol for reporting mechanisms for inspection, administrative investigation, audition, and performance review, and protocol for communication.</p> <p>ii. A minimum of 10 policies, strategies and action plans established including Code of Conduct and corruption indicators for accountability, integrity, transparency, and oversight of criminal justice, public, and private sector institutions.</p> <p>iii. Two partnership structures established through a White Paper between the 34 OIGs and</p>	<p>i. No performance protocol is in place</p> <p>ii. Generic summary of Code of Conduct read by staff during recruitment to the government post. A law is in existence but has not been enacted; None.</p> <p>iii. No partnership structure in place.</p>	<p>i. Interviews with ministries to determine establishment of mechanism and written protocols provided.</p> <p>ii. Interviews with ministries to determine establishment of policies, strategies and action plans that support the use of internationally based standards.</p> <p>ii. Consultations with ministries, OIGs and relevant anti-corruption</p>	Q1 – Q4 2012



	<p>organizations on anti-corruption policy, technical enforcement and advocacy.</p> <p>iv. Number and quality of new corruption risk assessments undertaken within the ministries.</p>	<p>their respective ministries on one hand and with other oversight authorities on the other.</p> <p>iv. Two surveys undertaken within ministries result in OIGs are using indicators developed for accountability, transparency and integrity.</p>		<p>organization ensuring established White Paper covering their two partnership structures on anti-corruption policy, technical enforcement and advocacy.</p> <p>v. Published annual reports by OIGs indicating corruption risk assessment through surveys conducted in their respective ministries.</p>	
<p><b>Progress/activities during the period:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1.-1.4.: A ToR to provide services related to improving the relationship between the IGs and their respective Ministers is being processed by procurement.</li> <li>1.5.: The ToR for technical support for institutionalizing the IG Association has been readvertised.1.6.: The ToR for assessing the needs for provincial OIGs has been readvertised</li> </ul>					<p><b>Status</b></p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p>
<p><b>Planned Activities:</b></p> <p>a) The implementation of activities under this output early 2013.</p>					
<b>Objectives/Activities</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Data Source</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
<p><b>2. IGs and their staff demonstrate improved technical skills and capacity</b></p> <p>2.1 Develop Standard Operating Procedures</p> <p>2.2 Provide training on strategic planning and performance management</p> <p>2.3 Conduct technical training</p>	<p>i. Number and percentage of OIGs staff who have received training indicating enhanced knowledge / competence through pre and post training assessment questionnaire.</p>	<p>i. 1465 technical staff (100%) received technical training in their area of expertise on inspection, administrative investigation, auditing and performance evaluation.</p> <p>ii. Three tools kits</p>	<p>i Technical training has not been offered.</p> <p>ii None.</p>	<p>i. Pre and Post training evaluation will be conducted on the technical staff to measure change from before and after the training.</p> <p>ii Consultations to</p>	<p>Q1 2012 – Q3 2014</p>

<p><i>sessions for technical staff</i></p> <p><i>2.4 Develop a training manual for new staff</i></p> <p><i>2.5 Address gender differential issues, responsive programming and budgeting.</i></p> <p><i>2.6 Training sessions on public asset management of public officials</i></p> <p><i>2.7 Workshops for investigators on advanced investigative skills</i></p> <p><i>2.8 Study visits for investigators</i></p> <p><i>2.9 Forensics capacity needs assessment study</i></p> <p><i>2.10 ToT and Certification</i></p>	<p>ii. Number and type of new methodological tools developed by OIGs to generate quantitative data and statistical indicators on corruption, focusing on different forms of corruption.</p> <p>iii. Number and quality of statistical and analytical methodologies to profile corruption consolidated at the national level (standardized survey tools and core set of indicators on corruption).</p> <p>iv. Number of new surveys and financial reports on corruption, at national and regional level available in order to provide evidence and analyses for policy implementation and monitoring.</p>	<p>introduced on Integrity, Accountability and transparency</p> <p>iii. Two statistical and analytical methodologies taught with specific use on corruption quantifying level and type of corruption issues.</p> <p>iv. Integrity survey in the public sector and improved reporting procedures are adopted by the OIGs</p>	<p>iii None.</p> <p>iv None specific.</p>	<p>determine use of developed tool kit.</p> <p>iii. Training and system established for statistical analysis.</p> <p>iv. Consultations are held with OIGs to ensure surveys are conducted and publically available through OIGs websites and annual reports.</p>	
--	--	---	---	--	--

<p><b>Progress/activities during the period:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.2.: A ToR to provide training on strategic planning and performance management is being processed by procurement.</li> <li>• 2.3.: A concept paper has been developed on the design of the ToT Workshops.</li> <li>• 2.4.: A draft of the Training Manuals in the areas of Audit, Inspection, Administrative Investigation, and Performance Evaluation has been developed.</li> <li>• 2.5.: A separate topic on gender related issues is included in the training manuals.</li> <li>• 2.8.: A draft concept Note on a study tour for the IGs has been developed.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Status</b></p> <p>2.2. Ongoing</p> <p>2.3. Draft Concept Paper on the Design of the ToT – Completed – Q4 2012</p> <p>2.4. Draft of Training Manuals – Delivered - Q4 2012</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>2.8. Draft Concept Note on a Study Visit – Delivered - Q4</p>
---	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.9.: A draft of the IT Forensics Needs Assessment Study Report has been developed.</li> </ul>					2012 2.9. Draft IT Forensics Needs Assessment Study Report – Delivered – Q4 2012
<b>Planned Activities:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The approval of the training manuals by the Training Committee.</li> <li>b) The start of the ToT training in the areas of audit and inspection.</li> <li>c) Identify relevant institutions and initiate negotiations with potential IGs institutions in the US for the study tour.</li> <li>d) Finalization of the IT Forensic Audit Needs Assessment Report.</li> </ul>					
Objectives/Activities	Indicators	Target	Baseline	Data Source	Timeline
3. <b>IT infrastructure and skills enhanced</b>  3.1 <i>Carry out a need assessment for the development of IT based reporting tools based on existing software.</i> 3.2 <i>Provide technical support to develop standard IT requirements for the OIGs</i> 3.3 <i>Provide a secure communication /networking/information technology infrastructure, administrative support applications, and knowledge transfer</i>	i. Number and types of automated processes and reports generated using a single portal for easy reference to activities, initiatives, documents and tools on anti-corruption initiatives.  ii. Number of new software-based comprehensive performance assessment tools developed to assist IGs and other parties in reporting on their implementation of NACS and in identifying challenges in implementation and technical assistance needs.  iii. Number and quality of new benchmarks and good practices on anti-corruption legislations electronically disseminated within the	i Five automated reporting processes are used, these are: a. inspection, b. administrative investigation, c. audition d. performance review e. management  ii Three software assessment tools are used including electronic tracking, electronic content management and archiving in 26 of the OIGs.  iii Anti-corruption issues and legislations electronically circulated in 26 ministries by OIGs.	i None.  ii None  iii None.	i. Meetings are held to determine periodic reports are issued on time.  ii Interviews with OIG – IT personnel to determine establishment of mechanism and accurate tracking system  iii Training and system in place for internet /OIGs website, collection of good practice	Q1 2012 – Q2 2014

	ministries and more widely			and consultation with OIGs to identify which are most relevant to their work.	
<b>Progress/activities during the period:</b>					<b>Status</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3: A ToR to undertake output 3 is being processed by procurement.</li> </ul>					Ongoing
<b>Planned Activities:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Output 3 to initiate.</li> </ul>					

#### 4. Expenditures

During 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter 2012 Department of State requested a revision in the expenditure layout which is reflected below from the quarter onward..

ACTIVITY	2012				2013				2014				Cumulative Cost
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
Programme			0	0									
Project Manager			57,155.20	67,380.05									
National Project Officer			12,481.54	12,478.59									
National Project Associate			160	11,315.85									
Technical Support International Consultant			0	0									
Training Contract Services			0	32,139.00									
Travelling			25,233.63	8,958.27									

Communication			20,920.64	661.11									
Monitoring and Evaluation			0	0									
Security			1,104.94	2,459.67									
Common Premises			414.37	531.99									
Other Running Operational Expenses			15,679.99	12,654.37									
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21,638</b>	<b>133,150.31</b>	<b>148,478.90</b>									

ANNEX

***ANNEX I - Concept Paper: IGs Study Tour***

***ANNEX II - Agenda: Project Board Meeting, 20 November 2012***

***ANNEX III - Minutes of Meeting: Project Board Meeting, 20 November 2012***



**United Nations Development Programme (UNDP-Iraq)**  
Provision of Technical Assistance to Iraq Offices of the Inspectors General

**Concept Paper<sup>1</sup>**

**IGs Study Tour**

**Background**

The capacity of Iraqi public institutions was weakened by the cumulative effect of decades of violence, sanctions, isolation and insecurity. Since 2003, they have also suffered as a result of the confusion brought by the establishment of new institutions and new rules governing the relationship between institutions. The Government of Iraq (GoI) has made progress in recent years in regaining control over territory and gradually improving security in most parts of the country. In March 2008, the GoI became a signatory to the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC), a commitment that was originally made in the International Compact with Iraq (ICI).

The necessity to clarify and enhance the role and mandate of the institution, as well as improve the capacity of the Inspectors General is viewed as a tool for a more systematic approach to combat corruption and inefficiency. It is expected that the planned study tour to the selected country will strengthening the capacity of the Offices of the Inspection General (OIGs) in Iraq.

The OIGs were established on 5 February 2004 through CPA Order 57. The Inspectors General (IG) represent a new concept to the Iraqi institutional framework. Placed within each of the Iraqi Ministries, the IGs function as internal, yet independent, oversight bodies. The IGs lack several basic technical and policy tools to accomplish programme reviews, including Methodology to conduct management performance evaluation (measuring the efficiency, effectiveness and Economy), integrity and governance of the Ministries. Therefore it has been planned to organize a study tour as an education visit outside Iraq to well established auditing, inspection and oversight agencies that have mandates and functions similar to the one of the IG. These visits for IGs staff will be to the selected country where similar standards/settings are already in place

---

<sup>1</sup> This concept paper was produced in the framework of the UNDP Technical Assistance to Iraq Offices of the Inspectors General (OIGs)/Output # 6. The parties involved in this activity are: the Government of Iraq (GoI), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) team and Samman and Co team.



### **Objectives of the Study Tour**

The proposed study tour aims to develop the Capacity of the Core Team of professionals who play a leadership role in the Capacity Development process. This education visit will target a group of IGs to exchange knowledge and learn more from other experiences. It also provides an opportunity for the selected IGs to deepen their understanding of OIG tasks and mandate.

The importance of having a study tour is to:

1. Explore the day to day activities of the OIGs and the IGs association, in the target country, their history, foundation, authorities, structure, tasks, mandates, resources and strategy for sustainability.
2. Provides tangible evidence on the work and the efforts that are being made by similar institutions towards promoting integrity and transparency within their Ministries.
3. Learn from international cases how to conduct administrative investigations into suspected violations of law, rules and regulations governing the operations of the Ministries.
4. Learn from international experiences how to detect and address internal flaws by alerting the line Minister and other related parties concerning any corrective action and/or need to follow up with criminal charges.

### **Outline of the study tour and project sites visit**

The dates of study tour are tentatively identified to take place during the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter of 2013 for a period of 15-20 days. The target country will be the United States where the concept of the Inspector General is also applied. UNDP will identify relevant institution(s) in the target country in order to start the arrangement for the visit.

### **Participants in the Study Tour**

1. Approximately 15/33 selected IGs
2. Participant(s) from UNDP (TBD)
3. Facilitator Interpreter

### **Roles and Responsibilities**

#### *Consultant*

1. Prepare the study tour's concept paper.
2. Maintain contact and negotiations with targeted institutions in the US and facilitate the conclusion of an agreement with them.
3. Finalize the study tour agenda in coordination with the IG Institution in the receiving country.
4. Secure, organize, provide scheduling of meetings with counterparts institutions and the logistics services including accommodation for the personnel who could be accompanying the OIG group.

5. Develop a worksheet which presents the role and responsibilities of each participant in the study tour.
6. Hold an Orientation Meeting with the selected participants before the visit in Baghdad. The meeting will supply the participants with details about the objective of the visit, the country they will visit, the travel supplies needed and the requirements needed from each participant at the end of the visit.
7. Supervise and manage the execution of the study tour.
8. Document the visit details
9. Prepare the study tour's completion report including the evaluation, the lessons learned and the recommendations.

#### *UNDP*

1. Prepare a list of candidates nominated to participate in the study tour.
2. UNDP will be responsible for organizing all the logistics for participants from OIGs (including visa, booking flight tickets, accommodation, interpreter and local transportation).
3. Conclude an agreement with the institution(s) to be visited in the US.

#### **Expected results**

It is anticipated that the activity will result in a deeper understanding of the IGs of their tasks, mandate, service, challenges and opportunities. Specifically, the lessons learnt during the visit will contribute to the formulation of a unified and developed system and programs in the OIGs in Iraq under the order 57/2004 and help to guide the efforts towards prioritization of OIGs responsibilities so that related programmes can be adequately supported with the devolved resources.

#### **Activities**

The programme will include interactive presentations, group activities, selected readings and visits to the relevant departments and institutions, with the aim of facilitating comprehensive exchange and awareness of issues such as international trends in auditing, inspection and oversight agencies that have mandates and functions similar to the one of the IGs.

The integration of new areas, such as ICT and citizenship and human rights principles will also be tackled.

#### **Outputs**

The expected outputs of the study tour are:

- A report of the study tour to the US.
- Evaluation report of the Study tour results.

#### **Risks**

- Visa Issuance.
- Time management during the visits.
- Commitment by the receiving party to the agreed arrangements.

- Selection of the relevant participants.
- Language barrier.

The most relevant country is the United States as it has a similar IGs concept. A sponsor from the United States is essential to have in order to get the required invitation letters that are necessary for issuing the visas.

**Other Related Issues**

Further meetings between UNDP and BDO are needed to agree on a well -defined approach and schedule for the following issues, while finding a sponsoring institution(s) from the US side;

- Number of participants.
- Duration of the study visit.
- Potential sponsoring institution from the US side.
- Location of the study visit within the US.
- Schedule and agenda.
- Program side of the visit.
- Logistic side of the visit.
- Expected challenges.



United Nations Development Programme  
برنامج الأمم المتحدة الإنمائي في العراق

**Agenda**

**Project Board Meeting**

**Providing Technical Assistance to the Offices of the Inspectors General in  
Iraq**

**Tuesday 20 November 2012**

	<b>AGENDA</b>
10:00-10:20	Welcoming remarks and opening speech <i>Peter Batchelor, Country Director, UNDP Iraq</i>
10:20-10:40	Presentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The progress of project activities and achievements to date</li><li>- Challenges</li><li>- Planned activities</li></ul> <i>Jouhaida Hanano, IGs Project Manager, UNDP Iraq</i>
10:40-11:40	Discussion
11:40-12:00	Recommendations Future steps Next Project Board Meeting
	<b>CLOSURE</b>

**Minutes of the Project Board Meeting  
“Providing Technical Assistance to Offices of Inspectors General  
in Iraq”**

**Tuesday 20, November 2012**

A Board Meeting was held for the project “Providing Technical Assistance to Offices of Inspectors General in Iraq” on 20<sup>th</sup> of November 2012 at 10:30 am at the UNDP compound.

The meeting was attended by the following representatives from the Government of Iraq (beneficiaries), the US Government (donor) and the UNDP (implementing agency);

- 1- Mr. Adil Muhsin Abdullah, Coordinator, Prime Minister’s Coordinator for Oversight Affairs.
- 2- Mr. Sabah Al Hussein , Office of Prime Minister’s Coordinator for Oversight Affairs
- 3- Mr. Hameed Al-Zaidi, Inspector General, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs
- 4- Mr. Hasan Al-Igeeli, Inspector General, Iraqi Commission for Broadcast and Transmission
- 5- Ms. Barbara Bootes, Coordinator, Anti-Corruption Coordinator’s Office, US Embassy, Baghdad
- 6- Mr. Owen Jimmy Clarke, Anti-Corruption Program Manager, US Embassy, Baghdad
- 7- Ms. Salwa Lewis, ACCO BB Cultural Advisor
- 8- Ms. Noha Alagha, ACCO Bi-lingual Bi-Cultural Advisor
- 9- Mr. Shihab Jameel, ACCO Interpreter/ Translator
- 10- Mr. Peter Batchelor, Country Director, UNDP Iraq
- 11- Mr. Emad Alemamie, Anti-Corruption Programme Manager, UNDP Iraq
- 12- Ms. Jouhaida Hanano, Project Manager, Offices of the Inspectors General (OIGs), UNDP Iraq
- 13- Mr. Amir Abbas , Project Officer , Offices of the Inspectors General (OIGs), UNDP Iraq

The meeting was opened by Mr. Peter Batchelor who welcomed everybody and pointed out the following issues:

- 1) The project “Providing Technical Assistance to Offices of Inspectors General in Iraq” provides direct services to the IGs and they are the direct beneficiaries.
- 2) The UNDP is open for discussion regarding issues related to the activities of the project, However the budget and management of the project are not subjects of discussion at this stage.
- 3) This project is based on UNDP direct implementation modality where UNDP is the implementer and has full responsibility for project management. The Project Management Team is accountable to UNDP and the Donor.
- 4) There is a need to reach an agreement on a coordination mechanism between UNDP and the Prime Minister’s Coordination Office for Oversight Affairs.

Dr. Adil Muhsin intervened and indicated that the Coordinator’s Office has two issues with this project. The first is the budget where 30% is allocated for project management and the second is the direct contact between UNDP and the OIGs bypassing the Coordinator’s Office. Dr. Muhsin highlighted that his office is not trying to take control of the project but rather to act as for the beneficiaries’ side that should have the word on what is useful for the IGs to avoid waste of time and efforts.

Mr. Batchelor clarified that this project has been agreed upon with the Government of Iraq, the US Government and UNDP. He explained also that salaries in all UNDP projects are calculated based on a salary scale set by the International Commission for Civil Servants that Member States agreed on and the GoI and the US Government are members to this agreement, UNDP has no control over this matter.

Mr. Batchelor indicated that in the light of this it will not be useful or constructive to open such a discussion at this stage as this issue has been determined and agreed upon with the GoI at an early stage. He added further that Iraq is a wealthy Member State and in the case additional financial support is needed, the Government should be approached to provide additional support through cost-sharing using the International Partnership Fund established by the Government of Iraq. Mr. Batchelor pointed out that he was present at the time of signing the project document with Mr. Ali Alaaq, Secretary General for the Council of Ministers, Chairman of the Joint Anti-Corruption Council and the issue of management costs has not been raised. Mr. Batchelor added further that during his work many projects have been discussed and signed with the GoI and such an issue has never been raised by the Iraqi side.

Mr. Peter Batchelor clarified the role of UNDP in this project and stated that there should be a distinction between management and coordination. The GoI agreed to give the project management and implementation role to UNDP but the management and implementation of this project will become difficult if the management of the project is questioned over every activity or decision made related to the management of the project. Such interference is not “coordination”, it is rather playing the role of the implementer which is solely UNDP’s role and which is clearly defined in the project document. Furthermore, such interferences have caused a delay in the start of certain activities which is ultimately not constructive for the beneficiaries.

Mr. Batchelor clarified further two ways for project implementation:

- Direct implementation (implemented by UNDP)
- National implementation (implemented by Iraq national institutions)

At the initial stage of developing this project, it has been agreed with the GoI on a direct implementation model and the purpose of having the UNDP implementing the project was to bring to the beneficiaries the international, American, UN expertise and experiences during the implementation cycle. Previous agreements with the GoI are being questioned here and it might be useful to address these issues through an official letter to Mr. Ali Alaaq to convene a joint meeting for the sake of clarifying these matters.

Dr. Adil Muhsin intervened by confirming that this project should continue under the condition of evaluating the work done. Dr. Muhsin added that he has no doubts in the faith of everybody who have been involved in the preparation of the project but he indicated that he is accountable in the case of reading that 30% of the project budget goes to project management.

Mr. Emad Alemamie clarified this matter by indicating that the grant is between the donor (the US) and the implementer (UNDP) and the GoI is not accountable for the budget of the project.

Mr. Hasan Al-Igeeli intervened asking to leave the issue of the project document and the reservations of the Coordinator’s Office aside and move on to discuss substantive issues related to the project activities -in particular how to choose the training committee for the purpose of reviewing the developed training manuals prior to the start of training. He added that the IGs might have some points to discuss related to the practical side of the project and suggested that coordination matters related to the project should go through the Coordinator’s Office.

Ms. Barbara Bootes commented that it has not been clear to ACCO that the Coordinator’s Office is the focal point for all the IGs; there have been many contradictions on that point.

Dr. Adil Muhsin asked UNDP whether they wish that coordination goes through their office or would they prefer to do it directly with the OIGs?

Mr. Hasan Al-Igeeli highlighted that this issue is not optional for the IGs, he added that the Coordinator's Office exists and UNDP has worked with them for a long time and this should continue through this project.

Mr. Emad Alemamie confirmed that over the past two years UNDP worked continuously with the Coordinator's Office for coordination purposes. For this project, page 29 of project document stipulates the role of the Project Board where the Coordinator's Office is a member of this Board. He added further that there is a difference between coordination and management. UNDP is committed to implement the project and has solely the management authority according to the agreement held between the GoI, the donor, and UNDP.

Dr. Adil Muhsin expressed that the previous negligence to the role of the Coordinator's Office could be tolerated under the condition that it does not occur again.

Mr. Peter Batchelor reiterated further the following points:

- The daily management of the project is the responsibility of UNDP;
- The role of the Project Board which includes all relevant stakeholders is to provide guidance and direction to the work of the project as stipulated in page 29 of the project document; and
- The need to enhance coordination between UNDP and the Coordinator's Office.

Mr. Batchelor added that there is a need to agree on a coordination mechanism between UNDP and the Coordinator's Office respecting each other's roles and responsibilities. The Project Board could be used to discuss other issues pertaining to the general direction of the project, but should not be concerned with management issues, or day-to-day coordination issues.

Following this discussion, Ms. Jouhaida Hanano delivered a presentation on the progress of project activities and achievements to date, challenges and planned activities. During the presentation the following comments were raised by the Board Members:

Dr. Adil Muhsin; we are in need of training for the new IGs and staff. We hoped that the Anti-Corruption Academy would have undertaken such training but unfortunately this was not the case.

Mr. Hasan Al-Igeeli indicated the importance of increasing the number of trainees.

Mr. Peter Batchelor clarified that there are three important points when conducting the Training of Trainers; choosing the candidates, ensure that they receive specialized training up to the standards and ensure that trained staff will conduct the training under the supervision of specialized experts.

Mr. Emad Alemamie reiterated that there is an urgent need to establish a training committee to review the training materials.

Mr. Hasan Al-Igeeli pointed out that this is a new approach in the project. Instead of conducting direct training to OIGs by the contracting company, the training will be conducted by the trained staff instead. In that case the training will not be in the required level that they wish to have.



Dr. Adil Muhsin added that there are 5000 employees in the OIGs and it will be useful to train at least 300 staff as trainers (using ToT methodology) and the company can deliver the training for the remaining 1400 staff. The trained trainers will in turn deliver further training to the remaining 5000 staff.

There has been a consensus among the Board Members to start with the ToT to train 320 staff and then the consultancy firm will move to train the rest of the OIGs' staff with the assistance of the staff trained as trainers.

Mr. Hameed Al-Zaidi highlighted that during the last meeting of the Project Steering Committee, there has been an agreement to establish a committee to regularly evaluate the training during the first three months of training and to present a report regarding this issue.

Mr. Peter Batchelor expressed that it is a good idea to have a training committee. This committee should be small in size (maybe 3 IGs) and report to the Coordinator's Office and UNDP. In addition, the committee will review and present recommendations regarding the training materials and he suggested that it should have a continual role to provide quality assurance for the training and the training materials during the project cycle. Mr. Batchelor clarified that this committee would be different from the Project Board. He suggested that UNDP, the donor and the coordinator's office should each submit 3 nominations, and then meet to agree on the 3 members of the training committee.

Dr. Adil Muhsin requested a clarification concerning the study visit as he appeared to be in opposition to this activity and was indicating to the IGs who were present at the meeting that the UNDP wants to send them on trips. Dr. Muhsin was inquiring on what is more beneficial to the IGs; to send them to other countries to see other experiences or to assess their current situation to identify gaps and needs in comparison to other countries?. Dr. Adil added that their ambition is to learn from other experiences and the international standards of OIGs work and duties. The aim of the study visit should be in line with the identified needs of the Iraqi OIGs to make use of study visit to bridge those needs.

Mr. Hameed Al-Zaidi indicated that the US Ambassador offered a study visit for the IGs to the US to be exposed to the OIGs work in the US. Mr. Al-Zaidi added that he ask the US Ambassador to arrange for IGs from the US to visit the OIGs in Iraq because the Iraqi experience is more complex. Mr Al-Zaidi indicated also that Iraq has been closed for many years and not exposed to any external experiences. In any case, any outside visit for Iraqis will bring benefits. He reiterated further the need for such educational visits.

Mr. Owen Jimmy Clarke mentioned that there is an academy for integrity and an academy for inspectors general in the US. Mr. Clarke was of the opinion that transferring such experiences will be useful for the IGs.

Based on that, Mr. Peter Batchelor asked the Coordinator's Office to organize a meeting of IGs to collect the views and needs of the IGs regarding the study visit and then meet with UNDP and the donor to discuss and agree on what is the best approach.

Mr. Emad Alemamie added that evaluating the capabilities of the OIGs is very important to compare that with international standards. Standard Operating Procedures (SoPs) for the Iraqi OIGs were developed, published, and disseminated.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations:**

At the end of the Project Board Meeting, the Board Members agreed on the following:

- The management structure as stipulated in the project document should be respected for the duration of the project.
- To develop Terms of Reference (ToR) for the establishment of a coordination mechanism between UNDP and the Coordinator's Office. UNDP will share a draft of the ToRs with the Coordinator's Office and then meet with the Coordinator's Office to finalize the TORs
- Nominating members for the training committee – UNDP, the donor and the Coordinator's Office will each nominate 3 IGs to be members of the training committee. A meeting will be held to agree on the 3 IGs who will be members of the training committee. Terms of reference for the training committee will also need to be agreed.
- During the next meeting of the Coordinator's Office with the IGs, the study visit will be discussed to gather the views of the IGs so that any possible study visit will be designed to meet the needs of the IGs
- UNDP and the Coordinator's Office will work together to design a self-assessment form for the OIGs to identify their needs and gaps.
- The next Project Board Meeting will be convened in January 2013.

The meeting was concluded at 13:30hrs.