



INTERNAL AUDIT AND INVESTIGATIONS GROUP

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE FOR PROJECT SERVICES (UNOPS)

INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT

4 September 2015

PROJECT NAME:	SMALL GRANTS PROGRAMME (SGP) – OPERATIONAL PHASE 5
PROJECT NUMBER:	00078647
COUNTRY:	ARMENIA
AUDITOR:	MOORE STEPHENS LLP
PERIOD SUBJECT TO AUDIT:	1 JANUARY 2011 TO 30 JUNE 2014

Contents

Acronyms and abbreviations	3
Executive summary	4
The engagement context	4
Audit objectives	4
Audit scope	4
Audit rating	4
Key issues and recommendations	5
Annex I - Definitions	7

Acronyms and abbreviations

BU	Business Unit
CBA	Community-based Adaptation
CBO	Community-based Organization
CO	Country Office
COA	Chart of Account (Atlas)
COB	Country Operating Budget
CPMT	Central Programme Management Team
CPS	Country Programme Strategy
DOA	Delegation of Authority
ERP	Enterprise Resource Planning (Atlas)
FTA	Fixed-Term Appointments
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GLJE	General Ledger Journal Entry
ICF	Internal Control Framework
LOA	Letter of Agreement
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
MOSS	Minimum Operating Security Standards
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NAO	(UNOPS) North America Office
NC	National Coordinator
NFP	National Focal Person
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NHI	National Host Institution
NSC	National Steering Committee
OP	Operational Phase
PA	Programme Assistant
PO	Purchase Order (Atlas)
PRINCE2	Projects In Controlled Environments 2
REQ	Requisition (Atlas)
RR (Res. Rep.)	Resident Representative
SC	Service Contracts
SOP	Standard Operating Procedures
SGC	Small Grants Cluster (The UNOPS NAO SGP team)
SGP	GEF Small Grants Programme
SSA	Special Service Agreement
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDSS	United Nations Department of Safety and Security
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services

Executive summary

The engagement context

From 27 to 31 October 2014, the Internal Audit and Investigations Group (IAIG) of the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS), through Moore Stephens LLP (“the audit firm”), conducted an audit of Small Grants Programme (SGP), Operational Phase 5 (OP5) in Armenia, (Project ID 00078647) (“the project”), which is implemented and managed by UNDP SGP Office in Armenia on behalf of the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The audit firm was under the general supervision of IAIG in conformance with the International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing.

The project reported expenditure amounting to USD 1,172,249 during the period from 1 January 2011 to 30 June 2014. This project was funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF).

The UNOPS-Small Grants Cluster (SGC), in conjunction with the Central Programme Management Team (CPMT), adopted a risk-based approach to form the audit plan, through which the SGP Armenia programme was selected to be audited.

Audit objectives

The overall objective of the audit was to assess the management of the project operations to obtain reasonable assurance towards the achievement of the project objectives. The areas of focus included:

- a) Effective, efficient and economical use of resources;
- b) Reliability of reporting;
- c) Safeguarding of assets; and
- d) Compliance with applicable legislation.

The purpose of the audit was to provide reasonable assurance that:

- a) Client/donor contributions and project expenditure are properly accounted for;
- b) Project expenditure was incurred in accordance with the contribution agreement, and is supported by adequate documentation; and
- c) The related financial statements prepared by UNOPS for the year under review present a fair view of the operations.

In particular, the audit firm provided an overall assessment of the operational and internal control systems that are in place for the management of the project so that related transactions are processed in accordance with UNOPS policies and procedures to achieve the project’s objectives.

Audit scope

The audit firm conducted the audit in accordance with International Standards on Auditing and UNOPS internal audit practices, and in consideration of the requirements of United Nations System Accounting Standards (UNSAS), for the project period up to 31 December 2011, and International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS), for the project period from 1 January 2012.









Audit rating

Based on the audit report and corresponding management letter submitted by the audit firm, IAIG assessed the management of the project as **satisfactory** which means, “Internal controls, governance and risk management processes were adequately established and functioning well. No issues were identified that would significantly affect the achievement of the objectives of the audited party”. The details of the audit results are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1: Summary results of the financial audit

Project title		Period	Project no.
Small Grants Programme – Operational Phase 5, Armenia		1 January 2011 – 30 June 2014	00078647
Financial statement		Statement of non-expendable property	
Amount USD	Opinion	Amount USD	Opinion
1,172,249	Unqualified	6,839	Unqualified

Table 2: Internal control rating summary for project

Rating summary by functional area		
Functional area	Rating	
Grant management	Satisfactory	
Database management	Satisfactory	
Country Operating Budget management	Satisfactory	
Atlas processes	Satisfactory	
Financial management	Satisfactory	
Human resources	Satisfactory	
Document and asset management	Satisfactory	
Overall rating of internal control	Satisfactory	

Key issues and recommendations

No audit findings have been raised.

Signed:



Mark Henderson

Partner

Moore Stephens LLP

4 September 2015

Annex I - Definitions

Standard Audit Ratings for overall performance of internal control system

The harmonized rating system being applied by the internal audit services of UNICEF, UNFPA, WFP, UNDP and UNOPS effective 1 January 2010 is based on the following principles:

There are three categories:

- (a) satisfactory,
- (b) partially satisfactory, and
- (c) unsatisfactory.

The elements of the rating system take into account the audited office's internal control system, risk management practices, and their impact on the achievement of office objectives.

The definitions of the ratings are, as follows:

Standard Rating	Definition
Satisfactory	Internal controls, governance and risk management processes were adequately established and functioning well. No issues were identified that would significantly affect the achievement of the objectives of the audited party.
Partially Satisfactory	Internal controls, governance and risk management processes were generally established and functioning, but needed improvement. One or several issues were identified that may negatively affect the achievement of the objectives of the audited entity.
Unsatisfactory	Internal controls, governance and risk management processes were either not established or not functioning well. The issues identified were such that the overall objectives of the audited entity could be seriously compromised.

Categories for priorities of audit recommendations

The audit observations are categorized according to the priority of the audit recommendations and the possible causes of the issues. The categorized audit observation provides a basis by which the UNOPS country office management is to address the issues.

The following categories of **priorities** are used:

Categories	Definition
High	Prompt action is considered imperative to ensure that UNOPS is not exposed to high risks (that is, where failure to take action could result in critical or major consequences for the organization).
Medium	Action is considered necessary to avoid exposure to significant risks (that is, where failure to take action could result in significant consequences).
Low	Action is considered desirable and should result in enhanced control or better value for money.

Possible causes

The following categories of **possible causes** are used:

- **Guidelines:** absence of written procedures to guide staff in performing their functions;
 - Lack of or inadequate corporate policies or procedures
 - Lack of or inadequate RO/OC/PC policies or procedures
 - Inadequate planning
 - Inadequate risk management processes
 - Inadequate management structure
- **Guidance:** inadequate or lack of supervision by supervisors;
 - Lack of or inadequate guidance or supervision at the RO/OC/PC level
 - Inadequate oversight by Headquarters
- **Resources:** insufficient resources (funds, skill, staff) to carry out an activity or function;
 - Lack of or insufficient resources (financial, human, or technical resources)
 - Inadequate training
- **Human error:** Un-intentional mistakes committed by staff entrusted to perform assigned functions;
- **Intentional:** intentional overriding of internal controls;
- **Other:** Factors beyond the control of UNOPS.

List of functional areas

The following categories of **functional areas** are used:

- Project management
- Finance
- Human resources
- Procurement and supply chain
- General administration (which includes asset management)
- Information and communications technology