

Module 3: Construction and Small Infrastructure Quiz

Multiple-Choice Questions 1-10

1. MONITUTOR “Works” box - what it really implies

Question: A Monitor selects “Works” for a €45,000 neighbourhood footpath project. The green MONITUTOR box appears with several construction-specific add-on questions. What is the best interpretation of this?

- The value is low, so the extra questions are optional and can be skipped.
- The tool automatically treats any works contract, even small ones, as higher-risk and unlocks extra checks on modifications, quantities/quality and subcontracting.
- It means the contract is part of a national “strategic infrastructure” list and must be reported to central authorities.

Correct answer: B

Why? In Step 1, choosing “Works” triggers the green MONITUTOR box regardless of contract value. That box exists because construction and small infrastructure are structurally higher-risk: risks of hidden modifications, substandard works, and irregular subcontracting are present even in small pavements and drainage jobs. The extra questions are not optional and have nothing to do with special national lists - they are there to systematically capture red flags in corruption schemes 1-3.

2. “No” v. “Can’t answer” on modifications

Question: The contract for a small bridge shows a signed document with a 12% value increase. The Monitor can see the addendum, but cannot access the portal where modifications should be published, and the buyer won’t confirm whether publication happened. What is the most accurate answer in Step 1 to “Is there a signed and published addendum?”

- Select “Can’t answer” and explain: “Signed addendum seen in file; publication could not be verified - portal inaccessible / no confirmation.”
- Select “Yes”, because a signed addendum exists in the paper file.
- Select “No”, because the authority refused to confirm publication, which proves non-compliance.

Correct answer: A

Why? The modification sub-question asks both: is there a formal addendum and is it visible in the official record (e.g. portal, registry). Here, the Monitor can see the signed document but cannot verify publication. That is exactly what “Can’t answer” is for: situations where part of the requirement is unclear or unverifiable. “No” would imply they know it wasn’t published; “Yes” would overstate certainty.

3. Late-named subcontractor already visible on site

Question: In a school playground project, the Monitor finds that SubcoPlay Ltd. appears in a signed addendum as a subcontractor, dated March. In the project Facebook photos, however, SubcoPlay's logo is already visible on equipment and workers' vests in January, before the addendum. What is the best corruption-risk interpretation?

- a. There is a risk of corruption scheme 3: a subcontractor appears to have been active on site *before* being formally named, suggesting the addendum might be legalising an already de facto subcontracting arrangement.
- b. It is only a corruption scheme 1 issue, because any addendum automatically means unjustified modifications.
- c. There is no risk; once the subcontractor is named in an addendum, timing does not matter.

Correct answer: A

Why? The training materials explain that “mystery companies” and late-named subcontractors are classic red flags for corruption scheme 3. Here, the timeline shows SubcoPlay acting on site before being officially listed. That suggests the addendum may be a retroactive cover for irregular subcontracting - a key CS3 pattern. CS1 may later be involved (e.g. value changes), but the core risk here is irregular (phantom) subcontracting.

4. What to log under the 3-item / >5% variance check

Question: A footpath and parklet project includes:

- 1,200 m2 paving
 - 25 benches
 - 35 new trees
- On site, the Monitor observes:
- Paving appears complete and of good quality
 - 25 benches installed
 - Only about 18-20 trees planted

Which is the best way to use the “3 items / >5% variance” part of the Step 2 ‘Works’ question?

- a. Focus on paving and benches only; trees are “minor” and can be ignored.
- b. Choose trees as one of the 3 items and record an estimated >5% under-delivery (e.g. “35 trees planned, ~19 observed”), as a red flag indicator for corruption scheme 2.
- c. Do not use this field because exact counts are hard; this should be left to engineers.

Correct answer: B

Why? The works add-on explicitly asks for up to 3 items where there is a visible variance >5%. Trees are highly visible and the under-delivery is obvious (roughly half missing). This is a textbook red flag example of corruption scheme 2: public money has paid for items that haven't been delivered in full. Monitors are not expected to be engineers; they are expected to make honest, rough estimates and document clear gaps.

5. Payments, schedule and corruption scheme 2

Question: A drainage canal project is ongoing. A signed modification legally extends the completion deadline by 90 days. At the time of the visit:

- Progress report: 60% of works complete

- Payment records: 90% of the contract value already paid
- On-site observation: progress matches roughly 60% completion
 - How should the Monitor use the “payments v. implementation” question?
- a. Mark “Yes, consistent” because a time extension was granted, so higher payments are normal.
- b. Mark “No” and explain: “90% of contract value paid; works visibly ≈60% complete - over-payment compared to progress despite extended deadline.”
- c. Mark “Can’t answer” because the time extension makes it impossible to judge the payments.

Correct answer: B

Why? The Step 2 payments question compares what has been paid with what is actually implemented, regardless of time extensions. Even if the deadline is legally extended (corruption scheme 1 can be fine), 90% payment for 60% visible completion is a classic red flag for corruption scheme 2: money is flowing faster than real progress. The Monitor must flag this mismatch clearly instead of hiding behind the modification.

6. Who blocked access?

Question: For a small bridge project, the Monitor schedules a site visit. On arrival, the contractor’s site manager says: “You can’t enter without written permission from the municipality, and they haven’t sent anything. Please leave.” The municipality does not respond to emails. How should the Monitor complete the follow-up text under “No site visit - why not?”

- a. Record that access was refused on site by the contractor’s representative, include date/time and quote the “no permission” reason, noting that the buyer did not answer requests.
- b. Simply write “No visit - municipality refused access”, because they didn’t reply.
- c. Leave the explanation blank; this is too politically sensitive to record.

Correct answer: A

Why? The Step 2 access explanation asks who refused entry and why, based on what actually happened. In this case, the person who physically blocked access was the contractor’s site manager, citing lack of written authorisation. The municipality’s silence is also relevant. Proper logging means naming the actor at the gate, the context (no written permission), and the unanswered requests - a clear description of the control weakness that could hide red flags show potential for corruption schemes 1-3.

7. Young supplier but good delivery?

Question: A €180,000 village street upgrade is awarded to “NewRoads Ltd.”, founded 8 months before contract award. In Step 1, the Monitor recorded this as a risk signal in the MONITUTOR box. In Step 2, however, the site visit confirms: quantities, quality and payments all match the contract, and no irregular subcontractors are observed. How should this combination be interpreted?

- a. The young company profile remains a recorded risk driver, but in this project the observed implementation does not show corruption scheme 1-3 problems; the case stays as a watchpoint, not a finding.

- b. The initial risk entry must be deleted, because good performance proves it was wrong.
- c. This automatically proves that all young companies are safe and should not be flagged in the future.

Correct answer: A

Why? Supplier profile checks (foundation date, MONITUTOR additional information box) capture risk drivers, not automatic corruption. A very young firm can either be a front or a legitimate newcomer. Here, Step 2 shows clean implementation: no unjustified modifications (CS1), no substandard works or over-payment (CS2), no phantom subs (CS3). So the risk signal stays in the record as context - but the case itself is not a corruption example. This nuance is exactly what was stressed throughout Module 3.

8. Supervision and conflict of interest

Question: A small retaining-wall project has a separate supervision contract with “SafeCheck Ltd.” Company registry shows that the same person owns 60% of both SafeCheck and the main contractor. Progress reports are signed only by SafeCheck, and they always state “no issues” despite visible defects on site. How should this situation be treated?

- a. As normal; using a specialised supervision company is always good practice.
- b. As a control weakness with conflict-of-interest risk, to be recorded in the MONITUTOR “additional information” box (linked to all three corruption schemes).
- c. Only as a red flag to corruption scheme 3 (irregular or phantom subcontracting), because supervision companies are effectively subcontractors.

Correct answer: B

Why? The supervision paragraph under “other contract provisions” and the MONITUTOR information box encourage Monitors to record links between firms and officials, and cases where supervision may not be independent. Here, the same owner controls both contractor and supervisor, and defects are ignored. This does not fit directly into a single corruption scheme, but it enables corruption scheme 1 (rubber-stamped modifications), corruption scheme 2 (accepting poor-quality works), and corruption scheme 3 (ignoring phantom subs). It is best captured as a conflict-of-interest control weakness.

9. Night works and “mystery company” evidence

Question: In a bus-lane project, the Monitor’s day-time visit shows only the main contractor’s logo on site. Later, residents share videos clearly showing another company’s logo on milling machines working at night, with date/time metadata. That firm is not listed as a supplier or subcontractor in Step 1. What should the Monitor do?

- a. Ignore the videos; only what is seen during official visits counts.
- b. Use the “mystery companies / observed implementers” field to log the unlisted firm’s name, where it was observed (night works in locals’ videos), and the date/time from the footage.
- c. Treat this as a red flag for corruption scheme 1 (unjustified contract modifications) only, because night works always imply hidden modifications.

Correct answer: B

Why? The “observed implementers not listed in contract” fields allow evidence from photos, reports, and other credible sources - not only what the Monitor personally saw. If residents’



videos clearly show an unlisted company performing works, that is a strong red flag for corruption scheme 3 (irregular or phantom subcontracting) evidence: a firm doing substantial contract work without being an approved supplier/subcontractor. It should be logged just like on-site observations; name, location, date/time, evidence type.

10. Modifications justified on paper, but missing on site

Question: A small flood-barrier project has a signed modification adding extra culvert capacity and raising part of the embankment, with a solid hydrological report attached. On paper, the justification looks strong. During Step 2 of the reporting template, the Monitor sees no raised embankment and no visible extra culvert, although the variation order has been fully paid. What is the best assessment?

- a. There is a corruption scheme 2 (substandard or undelivered works v. payment), and the Monitor should mark “No” to “Do on-site changes match signed, priced variation orders?” and describe the missing works.
- b. There is no issue; once a modification is well justified on paper, field checks are unnecessary.
- c. It is only a corruption scheme 1 (unjustified contract modifications) problem, because the justification was too detailed.

Correct answer: A

Why? Module 3 Part 3 stresses that modifications must be checked both on paper and on the ground. Here, the *paper story* is good: clear justification, proper variation order. The *field story* is not: the “extra” works are not actually there, even though they were paid. That is a classic red flag leading to corruption scheme 2: payment for works that have not been delivered. The correct use of the Step 2 modification follow-up is to mark “No” and describe which modified items are missing on site.