

**UNITED NATIONS OFFICE FOR PROJECT SERVICES
(UNOPS)****INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT****27 February 2026**

Project name :	3R for conflict-affected communities GBV component
Project number:	23741-001
Country:	Ethiopia
Auditor:	BDO LLP
Period subject to audit:	8 July to 31 December 2024

Contents

Acronyms and abbreviations	3
Executive summary	4
Operational overview	7
Detailed assessment	8
Annex I - Definitions	15

Acronyms and abbreviations

IAASB	International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board
IAIG	Internal Audit and Investigations Group
IESBA	International Ethics Standards Board for Accountants
IPSAS	International Public Standard Accounting System
ISA	International Standards on Auditing
UN	United Nations
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
US\$	United States Dollars

Executive summary

The engagement context

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 ‘3R for conflict- affected communities GBV component’ (“the project”) (oneUNOPS project ID 23741-001), which is implemented and managed by the UNOPS Office in Ethiopia. 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 US\$ 1,518,795¹ during the period from 8 July to 31 December 2024. The donor who contributed to the project is the World Bank, through a donation from the International Development Association (IDA).

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).

¹ The financial statements show total project expenditure to the reporting date of 31 December 2024 of US\$ 16,629,234. Of this, US\$ 15,110,439 was incurred prior to the start of the reporting period for this audit, and audited previously, and so is out of scope for this engagement.

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 entity/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.	
3R for conflict-affected communities GBV component		8 July to 31 December 2024	23741	
Financial statement		Statement of non-expendable property		
Amount US\$	Opinion	Amount US\$	Opinion	
1,518,795	Unmodified	Nil	Unmodified	

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	
Information and Communications Technology	Satisfactory	
Overall rating of internal control	Satisfactory	

Key issues and recommendations

No audit issues or recommendations have been raised.

Signed:



BDO LLP

27 February 2026

Operational overview

The overall objective of this Agreement and Output is to improve access to multi-sectoral response services for Gender-Based Violence (GBV) survivors in selected conflict-affected communities in the Tigray region of Ethiopia.

- Respond to the multiple needs of GBV survivors to enable short- and medium-term recovery from violence.
- Strengthen the capacity of vulnerable people to cope with future shocks and stresses that may contribute to GBV incidence, including among others, those related to conflict and to the impacts of climate variability and change.
- Address drivers and risk factors that contribute to acceptance and perpetration of GBV that may be exacerbated by conflict, climate events, or other related checks.

The contract entered into force on 14 September 2022 for a period of 58.5 months, ending on 31 March 2027 for a total amount of US\$ 16,631,294. An amendment was signed on 14 October 2024 to adjust the closing date to 31 December 2024.

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

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
- (d) 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 Ethiopia 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.