

Case #: EMEC200706111647

HCC Case Completed (07/08/2007 02:22:39 PM)

Created by Edward Meck on 11/06/2007 04:47 PM

HCC Meeting Number: 0754

Agenda Number: 3

APPROVED BY PS Team:  
APPROVED BY YAVAR KHAN  
ON 18/06/2007 11:32 AM

**HEADQUARTERS COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS**

To: The Chairman Headquarters Committee on Contracts

From: Chief Procurement Division

Subject: New contract for Air Field Services in MONUC

Category of Presentation: New Procurement

Is it an LCC Recommended Case:  Yes  No

PS Case Number: XXXX-1039

Buyer: Edward Meck, Phone #: 7-8107

Responsible Requisitioning Officer: Azeem Malik, Phone #: 3-4615

Requisitioning Office: DPKO

Nature of Specifications: Generic

**Summary of Requirement:**

MONUC has an on going requirement for the provision of Air Field Services. The current contract with PAE/ESKO will expire on 30 September 2007. The new contract is for a base period of 18 months and two optional extension periods of 12 months each. A total of 3 different services i.e Air Terminal Emergency Crash and Rescue Services, Meteorology Services and Air terminal Security Service will be provided at 10 airfields.

Expression of Interest:  Yes  No

Number of Days Posted: 53

Number of Vendors who Responded: 12

Was this requirement subject to competitive bidding:  Yes  No

Method of Solicitation: Request for Proposal

RFP Number: RFPS-943

Date of Solicitation: 12/06/2006

Date of Closing: 11/08/2006

Closing date was Extended:  Yes  No

Please Explain why Closing Date was Extended:

To allow vendors sufficient time to develop quality proposals including the review and response to the Model Agreement which was provided OLA at the beginning of August 2006 and added to the RFP shortly thereafter.

Number of Vendors Invited 10 from 6 Countries.

Number of Vendors who Responded 5 from 5 Countries.

PS Analysis:

#### Introduction

1. This HCC presentation is a re-submission of part of requirements that were originally reviewed and approved at HCC/07/15 held on 13 February 2007, as Agenda Items 06 & 07. The requirements included (i) Air Terminal Ground Operations (ii) Passenger and Baggage Services (iii) Cargo Services (iv) Air Terminal Emergency Crash and Rescue Services (v) Remote Search and Rescue Service (vi) Meteorology Services (vii) Air Terminal Security Service and (viii) Fleet Maintenance Service, to replace contract PD/CO068/03 at MONUC. The services are to be provided to seven air fields: Kinshasa, Kisingani, Kalemie, Kananga, Mbandaka, Goma and Lumbumbashi, and three optional airfields: Kinshasa, Bunia and Bukavu.

2. Following receipt of proposals, vendors were requested to submit a BAFO to critically review prices. In the request for BAFO vendors were also requested to explicitly confirm their acceptance of the UN's right to split the award at its sole discretion in any manner and further affirm that the pricing quoted for each type of service for each airfield for each period of the contract would be valid both in whole or in part and in any combination as selected by the UN. All vendors provided BAFOs and confirmed their agreement to accept any split proposed by the UN.

3. Subsequently, a split award based on the type of service and the Best Value For Money principle was approved by HCC / Controller on 13/02/2007 (Ref. HCC/07/15 minutes attached hereto) to :

(i) PAE/ESKO for an NTE amount of \$35,813,579 over a period of 3.5 years for the provision of Air Terminal Emergency Crash and Rescue Services, Remote Search and Rescue Service, Meteorology Services and Air Terminal Security Service (HCC Agenda item 06); and

(ii) ENHAS for an NTE amount of \$23,718,577 over a period of 3.5 years for the provision of Air Terminal Ground Operations, Passenger and Baggage Services, Cargo Services and Fleet Maintenance Service (HCC Agenda item 07).

4. Subsequently Notification of Award was issued to both vendors who also both accepted their respective portions of the (split) award (see PAE/ESKO letter dated 27 February, 2007 submitted separately). Thereafter, individual draft contracts containing the details of the proposed split were sent to both vendors for review. At this stage, PAE/ESKO reversed their position and declined to accept the split award as proposed by the UN arguing that the split was **not operationally feasible** and was **not consistent with their proposal** [see PAE/ESKO letter dated 30 March 2007 submitted separately]. ENHAS accepted the split award and will provide the services awarded to them with effect from 1 October 2007 when the current contract expires.

5. Considering that PAE/ESKO has declined to accept the award, the present submission seeks to request the Committee to recommend approval of the award for the services (with the exception of Remote Search and rescue) that were originally awarded to PAE/ESKO at HCC/15/07, to the next bidder; Patrick Defense Logistics for an NTE of \$18,654,384.

#### Background

5. All air field support services in MONUC are currently being provided by one vendor; PAE/ESKO under contract PD/CO068/03 which expired on 31 March 2007 and was extended to 30 September 2007. The new contracts with ENHAS and PAE/ESKO were supposed to commence on 1 st April 2007. However, due to the disagreements with PAE/ESKO regarding the split award, the current Contract PD/CO068/03 had to be extended to 30 September 2007, in order to avoid interruption of services. The existing contract has a clause that allows the extension of the contract for an additional period of six months, and there are sufficient funds (HCC NTE) to cover the extension. The new contracts will therefore commence on 1 October 2007.

6. Competitive bidding for the replacement Contract which is the subject of the present HCC presentation was conducted between June and August 2006. Four proposals were received from five vendors; (i) Entebbe Handling Services- ENHAS (Uganda), (ii) Equity Aviation (South Africa), (iii) Patrick Defense Logistics - PDL (Australia), (iv) PAE (USA) and (v) ESKO (MNC). PAE and ESKO submitted one bid as a joint venture.

7. The proposals from PAE/ESKO and ENHAS received the highest weighted overall scores 86.12 and 86.01 respectively, out of a maximum of 100 scores. PAE/ESKO submitted a proposal for all the required services, whilst ENHAS' proposal did not include Meteorology, Air Terminal Emergency Crash and Rescue and the Remote Search and Rescue Services. Patrick Defense Logistics' proposal covered all the required services and received an overall score of 67.09. Their proposal was evaluated as technically compliant, with the exception of Remote Search and Rescue Service and Fleet Maintenance Services which had scores below the minimum technical threshold. [See attached Commercial and Technical evaluation of Patrick Defense Logistics proposals as well as the previous HCC minutes for more detail.] The proposal from Equity Aviation covered all services required except for Meteorology Services, Air Terminal Emergency Crash and Rescue Services and Remote Search and Rescue Service. The proposal received a weighted overall score of 55.13 which rendered it minimally compliant [50 was the lowest pass score].

#### **Sequence of events**

8.(i) After receiving HCC/Controller approval for the award, PS issued a Notice of Award to PAE/ESKO on 26 February 2007. That notice clearly explained the split award and the particular services that had been awarded to that vendor.

(ii) On 27 February PAE/ESKO confirmed by fax the acceptance of the split award for the services awarded to them.

(iii) As a result of PAE/ESKO's acceptance of the split award, PS provided them a draft contract for review.

(iv) PAE/ESKO reviewed the draft contract and pointed out to PS, their concerns regarding costs that had not been included in the draft contract.

(v) PS then invited PAE/ESKO senior managers for a meeting to discuss the draft contract. In that meeting PAE/ESKO stated that they had realized that the split was operationally not feasible as some costs had not been included in the draft contract (see 9 below), and requested PS to revise the way the services had been split and awarded. PS stated that the award could not be changed and that the UN was only prepared to discuss operational issues. PS adopted this stance because all vendors had been informed about the possibility of a split award and PAE/ESKO had confirmed its acceptance of split award in writing.

#### **Reasons for disagreement**

9. PAE/ESKO argued that they had (i) allocated all the Project Management Office and station management costs as well as other direct costs to the Ground Handling Services and that 85 % of those costs were included in the ground handling Services for Kinshasa and Kisingani. They also stated that none of these costs had been included in the prices for those services that were awarded to them .i.e Air Terminal Emergency Crash and Rescue Services, Remote Search and Rescue Service, Meteorology Services and Air Terminal Security Service. According to PAE/ESKO, this meant that they would operate at a loss if they accept the split as proposed by the UN. (ii) They also stated that the entire aerodrome insurance and the performance bond was covered in the other direct costs for Kinshasa. (iii) Furthermore they argued that significant portions of the costs of staff housing and sustainment, mobilization, demobilization and contingent costs were included in the Air Terminal Operation Center.

10. PAE/ESKO further explained that they had not expected the UN to split the award the way it did. PAE/ESKO then proposed by letter dated 30 March 2007 four ways to make the award which would be acceptable to them but that would increase costs to the UN as follows (i) To split the contract award by airfield (increases costs by \$27,965,544); (ii) Split the services at each airfield as proposed by the UN but to include the management, administrative costs and other direct costs that had been left out (increases costs by \$30,225,960). (iii) To award The Air Terminal Ground operations, Emergency Crash Rescue Services, Air Terminal Security, Meteorology and Remote Search and Rescue service (increases costs by \$43,529,914; (iv) PAE/ESKO to provide all the services at a total cost of \$114,263,365 instead of \$35.813579 if the award is split as originally proposed by PS.

11. Based on these comments made by PAE/ESKO, PS requested ATS to re-confirm whether the split award as originally proposed by UN was indeed operationally feasible. ATS confirmed that the split was operationally feasible. ATS and PS's position is that none of the counter proposals submitted by PAE/ESKO are acceptable. See attached email communication between PS and ATS dated 18 and 23 May 2007.

12. PS sought the opinion of OLA by email on 2 April and 23 April followed by a meeting held on 3 May 2007, to establish if PAE/ESKO has any justified legal grounds to reject the split award as proposed by the UN; and whether the UN is entitled to cash the bid bond from PAE/ESKO. PS has not yet received the response from OLA despite several reminders.

Irrespective of the aforementioned outstanding response from OLA and since :

- PAE/ESKO has categorically stated in the meeting mentioned in 8 (v) above, that they were not prepared to enter into a contract on the basis of the split proposed by the UN, and
  - the options offered by PAE/ESKO in writing after the meeting by letter dated 30 March, 2007 are deemed unacceptable to the UN
- the only option available to the UN which prevents the disruption of services to the mission, is to award the contract to the next proposer, Patrick Defense Logistics for those services that had been envisaged to be awarded to PAE/ESKO, except for the Remote Search and Rescue Services [as Patrick Defense failed to meet the minimum score for the Remote Search and Rescue Service. ENHAS and Equity did not offer this service and PAE/ESKO is the only vendor whose proposal for Remote Search and Rescue Services had been rated technically acceptable. In light of this, DPKO recommended that this service should be re-bid as a separate requirement and

also advised that the mission has not been utilizing this service since its inception and that it is a new requirement when compared to the current contract.

14. Based on the above PS and ATS jointly recommend that Patrick Defense Logistics be awarded a contract for:

- (i) Air Terminal Emergency Crash and Rescue Services,
- (ii) Meteorology Services and
- (iii) Air Terminal Security Service

for a total amount of \$18,564,384 for a period of 3.5 years (18 months base period and 2 optional 12 months' extensions). The costs for the individual services are as detailed in the table below.

Patrick Defense Logistics	COST
Air Terminal Emergency Crash and Rescue Services,	\$14,498,730
Meteorology Services	\$ 3,057,522
Air Terminal Security Service	\$1,098,132
<b>TOTAL AWARD</b>	<b>\$18,654,384</b>

Is this a split award:  Yes  No

Currency: USD

Amount of the Award: 18,564,384.00  
on 11/08/2006

Exchange Rate 1.0000

Estimated USD: \$18,564,384.00

Name of the Vendor: PATRICK DEFENCE LOGISTICS (AUL, 19177)

Vendor Registration Status: Fully Registered

Country Name: AUL

Financial Rule which the Award is recommended:  
105.15(b) Qualified Most Responsive Proposal

Type of Review: REG

Entity: PK

HCC Meeting Number: 0754

Agenda Number: 3

Please select method: Regular

Meeting Location: FF-224

Is this a Walk-In case?  Yes  No

Please select HCC Meeting Date 27/06/2007 and Time: 10:00 AM

HCC Member: Iona Dixon/NY/UNO

Office: OPPBA

HCC Member: David Hananel/NY/UNO

Office: OLA

Office: DESA

HCC Member: Zoltan Nagy/NY/UNO

HCC Member: Zoltan Nagy/NY/UNO

Office: DESA

#### Minutes of the Meeting:

3.01 This case relates to a proposed contract award to Patrick Defense Logistics (Australia) for the provision of airfield services in MONUC for a period of 1.5 years with the option to extend the contract for two additional one-year terms for a total of 3.5 years, in the NTE amount of USD 18,564,384.00.

#### Deliberations

##### Background/Requirement

3.02 The Committee recalled that at Meeting No. HCC/07/15 held on 13 February 2007, it had recommended 2-way split contract awards for the provision of airfield services, in support to MONUC, for 18 months (plus 2 optional periods of 12 months each) from 1 April 2007 through to 30 September 2010, as follows:

- i). To a joint venture between Pacific Architects & Engineers Inc (USA) and ES-KO International (MON) ("PAE/ESKO"), in the total NTE amount of USD 35,813,579 and,
- ii) To Entebbe Handling Services Ltd (UGA) ("ENHAS") for the provision of airfield services, in support of MONUC, in the total NTE amount of USD 23,718,577.

3.03 The requirements included (i) Air Terminal Ground Operations (ii) Passenger and Baggage Services (iii) Cargo Services (iv) Air Terminal Emergency Crash and Rescue Services (v) Remote Search and Rescue Service (vi) Meteorology Services (vii) Air Terminal Security Service and (viii) Fleet Maintenance Service. The services are to be provided to seven air fields covering MONUC operations - Kinshasa, Kisingani, Kalemie, Kananga, Mbandaka, Goma and Lumbumbashi, and three optional airfields: Kindu, Bunia and Bukavu.

##### Events following HCC Recommendation

3.04 The Committee noted that following receipt of the approved recommendation, PS issued a Notice of Award to PAE/ESKO on 26 February 2007. That notice clearly explained the split award and the particular services that had been awarded to that vendor and that on 27 February PAE/ESKO confirmed by fax its acceptance of the split award for the services awarded to them.

3.05 The Committee also noted that draft contracts containing the details of the proposed split contracts were sent to both vendors for review and by letter dated 30 March 2007, PAE/ESKO reversed its position and declined to accept the split award as proposed by the UN arguing that the split was not operationally feasible and was not consistent with their proposal.

3.06 By way of background, the Committee was informed that vendors were requested to submit a BAFO to critically review prices. In the request for BAFO vendors were also requested to explicitly confirm their acceptance of the UN's right to split the award at its sole discretion in any manner and further affirm that the pricing quoted for each type of service for each airfield for each period of the contract would be valid both in whole or in part and in any combination as selected by the UN. All vendors provided BAFOs and confirmed their agreement to accept any split proposed by the UN. Accordingly, the presentation reviewed by the Committee in February 2007 that formed the basis of its recommendation was based upon the results of the BAFO.

3.07 The Committee was informed that ENHAS accepted the split award and will provide the services awarded to them with effect from 1 October 2007 when the current contract expires. As PAE/ESKO has declined to accept the award, the submission before the Committee seeks to request approval of the award for the services (with the exception of Remote Search and rescue) that were originally awarded to PAE/ESKO at HCC/15/07, to the next bidder; Patrick Defense Logistics for an NTE of USD 18,654,384.

3.08 The Committee was also informed that PS invited PAE/ESKO senior managers for a meeting to discuss the draft contract. In that meeting PAE/ESKO stated that they had realized that the split was operationally not feasible as some costs had not been included in the draft contract and requested PS to revise the way the services had been split and awarded. PS stated that the award could not be changed and that the UN was only prepared to discuss operational issues. PS adopted this stance because all vendors had been informed about the possibility of a split award and PAE/ESKO had confirmed its acceptance of the split award in writing.

#### Reasons for disagreement

3.09 PAE/ESKO argued that:

(i) They had allocated all the Project Management Office and station management costs as well as other direct costs to the Ground Handling Services and that 85% of those costs were included in the ground handling Services for Kinshasa and Kisingani. They also stated that none of these costs had been included in the prices for those services that were awarded to them i.e., Air Terminal Emergency Crash and Rescue Services, Remote Search and Rescue Service, Meteorology Services and Air Terminal Security Service. According to PAE/ESKO, this meant that they would operate at a loss if they accept the split as proposed by the UN.

(ii) The entire aerodrome insurance and the performance bond were covered in the other direct costs for Kinshasa.

(iii) Significant portions of the costs of staff housing and sustainment, mobilization, demobilization and contingent costs were included in the Air Terminal Operation Center.

3.10 PAE/ESKO further explained that they had not expected the UN to split the award the way it did. PAE/ESKO then proposed by letter dated 30 March 2007 four ways to make the award acceptable to them but that would increase costs to the UN as follows:

#### PS Position

3.11 The Committee noted that if PAE/ESKO conditions are to be accepted the cost to the UN would increase as follows:

(i) To split the contract award by airfield (increases costs by USD 27,965,544);  
(ii) Split the services at each airfield as proposed by the UN but to include the management, administrative costs and other direct costs that had been left out (increases costs by USD 30,225,960).

(iii) To award The Air Terminal Ground operations, Emergency Crash Rescue Services, Air Terminal Security, Meteorology and Remote Search and Rescue service (increases costs by USD 43,529,914);

(iv) PAE/ESKO to provide all the services at a total cost of USD 114,263,365 instead of USD 35,813,579 if the award is split as originally proposed by PS.

3.12 While DPKO confirmed that the split award as originally proposed by UN was operationally feasible, DPKO and PS jointly considered that none of the counter proposals submitted by PAE/ESKO in their 30 March 2007 letter are acceptable.

3.13 PS sought the opinion of OLA by email on 2 April and 23 April followed by a meeting held on 3 May 2007, to establish if PAE/ESKO has any justified legal grounds to reject the split award as proposed by the UN; and whether the UN is entitled to cash the bid bond from PAE/ESKO. PS has not yet received at the time of preparing the presentation the response from OLA despite several reminders. Irrespective of the aforementioned outstanding response from OLA and since, PAE/ESKO has categorically stated in the meeting mentioned in 8 (v) above, that they were not prepared to enter into a contract on the basis of the split proposed by the UN, and the options offered by PAE/ESKO by

letter dated 30 March, 2007 are deemed unacceptable to the UN, the only option available to the UN without disrupting the services to the mission is to award the contract to the next proposer, Patrick Defense Logistics for those services that had been envisaged to be awarded to PAE/ESKO, except for the Remote Search and Rescue Services.

3.14 With respect to the Remote Search and Rescue Services, the Committee was informed that Patrick Defense failed to meet the minimum score. ENHAS and Equity did not offer this service and PAE/ESKO is the only vendor whose proposal for Remote Search and Rescue Services had been rated technically acceptable. In light of this, DPKO recommended that this service should be re-bid as a separate requirement and also advised that the mission has not been utilizing this service since its inception and that it is a new requirement when compared to the current contract.

3.15 The Committee queried the price differences between PAE/ESKO and Patrick Defense. PS replied that the difference is substantial. For the three line items proposed to be awarded to Patrick Defense in the amount of USD 18.6 million, the PAE/ESKO price was 33.5 million. DPKO explained that although Patrick Defense had scored less, its technical proposal was qualified and acceptable. The Committee recalled that the award to PAE/ESKO was based on the best value exercise.

3.16 The Committee queried if there is possibility that Patrick Defense may have missed something in its proposal that has been discovered by PAE/ESKO. DPKO replied that the requirements are the same and in fact PAE/ESKO is the incumbent and are fully aware of the scope of work. Patrick Defense had submitted a proposal that has been deemed to be technically acceptable. The Committee opined that while there may be issues related to service if the contract is awarded to Patrick Defense, the Organization will not suffer a financial disadvantage. PS and DPKO agreed.

#### Other Issues

3.17 The Committee was informed that following OLA's recent advice (received after preparation of the case presentation) to obtain, once more, explicit confirmation from PAE ES-KO confirming either their acceptance or non-acceptance of the split award as per PS letter dated 26 February 2007, PS has sent the letter with a deadline of 27 June 2007 to respond. Therefore, pending response from PAE/ESKO, PS requested withdrawal of the case presentation.

3.18 Noting the meeting is scheduled for 27 June (the deadline for response) and that PS would again request an urgent or a telephonic review, the Committee rather informed PS that it would continue on the deliberations and its recommendation, if any, would be contingent upon exhaustion of all available options to proceed with PAE/ESKO as originally recommended. PS agreed.

3.19 At the meeting PS advised that PAE/ESKO requested extension of one week for the response and that PS extended the deadline to close of business Friday 29 June 2007.

3.20 To a question from the Committee, DPKO and PS expressed their reservations on PAE/ESKO's acceptance of the award.

#### Recommendation

3.21 In the event the response from PAE/ESKO is unsatisfactory or the currently on-going negotiations with PAE/ESKO are unsuccessful, the Committee, unanimously recommended for approval the award of the proposed contract to Patrick Defense Logistics as presented in paragraph 3.01 above, pursuant to Financial Rule 105.15(b), [Appendix A, # 5]. As such, the Committee's recommendation is contingent upon the outcome of negotiations with PAE/ESKO and is being made at this time bearing in mind operational circumstances in the mission.

#### HCC Recommendations:

In the event the response from PAE/ESKO is unsatisfactory or the currently on-going negotiations with PAE/ESKO are unsuccessful, the Committee, unanimously recommended for approval the award of

the proposed contract to Patrick Defense Logistics as presented in paragraph 3.01 above, pursuant to Financial Rule 105.15(b), [Appendix A, # 5]. As such, the Committee's recommendation is contingent upon the outcome of negotiations with PAE/ESKO and is being made at this time bearing in mind operational circumstances in the mission.

HCC Comments:

Abstract of bids:



PDL Cost Overview.pdf

Technical evaluation:



PDL Tech Eval - MONUC.pdf

Abstract of Informal  
Market Survey, if any:

Supporting Documentation:



Confirmation email from ATS.pdf



ATS email rebid RSRS.pdf



HCC-07-15 - minutes- Airfields.pdf

15/06/2007 at 5:45:36 PM - Track note by Matthias Meyerhans: due to 25 page limit on submission additional documentation will be provided to HCC by hard copy



(3)

Azeem Malik/United  
Nations@UNHQ-DPKO  
23/05/2007 09:57 AM

To Matthias Meyerhans/NY/UNO@UNHQ@UN-MAILHUB  
cc Ard Venema/NY/UNO@UNHQ, Edward  
Meck/NY/UNO@UNHQ, Paul Buades/NY/UNO@UNHQ,  
Serge Divounguy/United Nations@UNHQ-DPKO  
bcc  
Subject Re: MONUC airfield services [new contract]

Dear Matthias,

The issue of split award was discussed with PAE during the negotiations held with the bidder on 21 March 07. ATS would like to reconfirm that the the proposed split award is absolutely feasible. Such split of support services at airfields is being practised all over the world.

The technical evaluation of the bids including the one by PDL was submitted by LSD to PS on 20 September 2006 wherein PDL has been evaluated as technically compliant and feasible.

To avoid further delay it is recommended that case be presented to HCC at the earliest followed by contract negotiations with PDL for early finalization of the contract award.

BRgds,

Azeem

Matthias Meyerhans/NY/UNO@UNHQ

Matthias  
Meyerhans/NY/UNO@UNHQ  
18/05/2007 02:08 PM

To Serge Divounguy/United Nations@UNHQ-DPKO, Azeem  
Malik/United Nations@UNHQ-DPKO  
cc Edward Meck/NY/UNO@UNHQ, Ard  
Venema/NY/UNO@UNHQ, Paul Buades/NY/UNO@UNHQ  
Subject MONUC airfield services [new contract]

Dear both,

in view of the very limited progress concerning contract award for MONUC airfield services and based on the facts that:

- PAe has not accepted the split award as proposed by UN
- PAe's counter-offer, basically implying a different split, was not deemed acceptable to the UN [I understand this from briefing provided me by Edward]
- legal advice whether PAe is in breach of their obligations as per proposal is still outstanding
- the urgency of getting the new contract in place

PS intends to initiate a new HCC presentation to obtain HCCs approval to enter into contract with the next bidder [PDL] (i.e. offer providing second best value for money for the services offered).

In support of such new HCC presentation, we would require formal ATS comment to the issues raised by PAe in their attached letter [they basically claim that the envisaged award was not operationally feasible, etc etc - please see the letter for details]. In support of the new submission to the HCC, we would therefore also require explicit ATS confirmation that:

- the proposed split is operationally feasible
- the proposal submitted by the next bidder for these services [Patrick Defense Logistics] is technically and operationally feasible and acceptable.

Thanks for assigning priority to this  
best regards



Matthias Meyerhans  
Chief, Logistics and Transportation Section  
United Nations Procurement Service  
Room FF-254  
304 E. 45th Street  
New York, NY 10017  
Tel. +1-917-367-8124

This e-mail contains confidential and/or privileged information and is for the sole use of the intended recipient. It may not be disclosed by anyone other than the addressee. If you are not the intended recipient (or have received this e-mail in error) please notify sender by return e-mail and delete this e-mail and all attachments from your system.

----- Forwarded by Matthias Meyerhans/NY/UNO on 18/05/2007 01:52 PM -----



"Matthias Meyerhans"  
<meyerhans@un.org>  
18/05/2007 01:53 PM

To "Matthias Meyerhans" <meyerhans@un.org>  
cc  
Subject

This E-mail was sent from "prt-ff0257" (MP5500/DSm755).



Scan Date: 05.18.2007 13:53:07 (-0400) 20070519135307088.pdf