

**UNITED NATIONS OFFICE FOR PROJECT SERVICES
(UNOPS)****INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT****23 November 2020**

PROJECT NAME:	UNOPS_SLD_MOH_001
PROJECT NUMBER:	SLD 89605
COUNTRY:	MYANMAR
AUDITOR:	BDO LLP
PERIOD SUBJECT TO AUDIT:	1 MARCH 2014 TO 19 OCTOBER 2020

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
Management's comments	5
Operational overview	6
Detailed assessment	7
Annex I - Definitions	8

Acronyms and abbreviations

IAASB	International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board
IAIG	Internal Audit and Investigations Group
IP	Implementing Partner
IPSAS	International Public Sector Accounting Standards
MoHS	Ministry of Health and Sports
NSP	National Strategic Plan
OC	Operations Centre
PC	Project Centre
RO	Regional Office
SLD	Second Line Drugs
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
US\$	United States Dollars

Executive summary

The engagement context

From 6 to 24 July 2020, the Internal Audit and Investigations Group (IAIG) of the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS), through BDO LLP (“the audit firm”), conducted an audit of the project ‘UNOPS_SLD_MOH_001’ (“the project”) (oneUNOPS project ID 89605), which is implemented and managed by UNOPS Myanmar. The audit firm was under the general supervision by IAIG in conformance with the International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing.

The project reported expenditure amounting to US\$ 7,229,118 during the period from 1 March 2014 to 19 October 2020.

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 issued by the IAASB and UNOPS internal audit practices, and in consideration of the requirements of International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS).

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, “The assessed governance arrangements, risk management practices and controls were adequately established and functioning well. Issues identified by the audit, if any, are unlikely to affect the achievement of the objectives of the audited area”. 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.
UNOPS_SLD_MOH_001		1 March 2014 to 19 October 2020	89605
Financial statement		Statement of non-expendable property	
Amount US\$	Opinion	Amount US\$	Opinion
7,229,118	Unmodified	-	Not applicable

Table 2: Internal control rating summary for project

Rating summary by functional area		
Functional area	Rating	
Project management	Satisfactory	
Finance	Satisfactory	
Procurement and supply chain	Satisfactory	
Human resources	Satisfactory	
General administration	Satisfactory	
Overall rating of internal control	Satisfactory	

Key issues and recommendations

The audit did not raise any issues or recommendations.

Management's comments

Not applicable.

Signed:



Robert Waters
Partner
BDO LLP

23 November 2020

Operational overview

The Ministry of Health and Sports of Myanmar (MoHS) was assisted by UNOPS in managing Global Fund grants of \$358 million over a seven-year period (2011-2017). UNOPS is currently assisting MoHS in managing Global Fund grants of \$251 million for the continuation of the Global Fund programme implementation in Myanmar, over a three-year period (2018-2020). The grants from the Global Fund aim to improve access to prevention, care and treatment for HIV, TB and malaria.

The goal is to further reduce HIV transmission and HIV-related morbidity, mortality, disability and social and economic impact. Additional resource was required to fill the National Strategic Plan (NSP) funding gap that was not covered by external resources. MoHS agreed to contribute funds towards achieving the NSP goal from 2014 onwards. UNOPS as a Global Fund Principal Recipient (GF-PR) was procuring antiretroviral (ARV) drugs and other commodities under the Global Fund grants, and MoHS engaged UNOPS as their Procurement Agent for the procurement of commodities under the MoHS contribution.

The project is on-going and is expected to be completed by the end of 2020.

The audit team extends its appreciation to the management and staff members of UNOPS office in Myanmar for their full cooperation during the audit.

Detailed assessment

The audit did not raise any issues or recommendations.

Annex I - Definitions

Standard audit ratings for overall performance of internal control system

Effective 1 January 2017, the internal audit services of UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF, UNOPS and WFP adopted harmonized audit rating definitions, as described below. IAIG assesses the entity under review as a whole as well as the specific audit areas within the audited entity:

- (a) satisfactory (effective),
- (b) partially satisfactory (some improvement needed),
- (c) partially satisfactory (major improvement needed), and
- (c) unsatisfactory (ineffective).

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 (effective)	The assessed governance arrangements, risk management practices and controls were adequately established and functioning well. Issues identified by the audit, if any, are unlikely to affect the achievement of the objectives of the audited entity/area.
Partially satisfactory (some improvement needed)	The assessed governance arrangements, risk management practices and controls were generally established and functioning, but need some improvement. Issues identified by the audit do not significantly affect the achievement of the objectives of the audited entity/area.
Partially satisfactory (major improvement needed)	The assessed governance arrangements, risk management practices and controls were established and functioning, but need major improvement. Issues identified by the audit could significantly affect the achievement of the objectives of the audited entity/area.
Unsatisfactory (ineffective)	The assessed governance arrangements, risk management practices and controls were either not adequately established or not functioning well. Issues identified by the audit could seriously compromise the achievement of the objectives of the audited entity.

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.