### UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME Office of Audit and Investigations



#### **PERFORMANCE AUDIT**

OF

#### **UNDP GHANA**

# COMMUNITY RESILIENCE THROUGH EARLY WARNING (CREW) (Nationally Implemented Project No. 72067)

Report No. 1413

**Issue Date: 29 January 2015** 



## Report on the audit of UNDP Ghana Community Resilience through Early Warning (Project No. 72067) Executive Summary

The UNDP Office of Audit and Investigations (OAI) conducted a performance audit of the UNDP Ghana Community Resilience through Early Warning (CREW) project (Project No. 72067) from 20 October to 12 November 2014. Performance auditing is an independent examination of a programme, function, operation, project, or the management systems and procedures of an entity to assess whether the entity is achieving economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the employment of available resources. The objective for this audit was to examine whether the CREW project was being managed effectively and efficiently in order to achieve its intended objectives. For assessing the audit objective, the audit focused on the following main audit questions:

- (a) Is the project proposal providing the best response to the country's needs as identified in the Country Programme Document, in terms of early warning and contribution to the resilience of local communities?
- (b) Does UNDP ensure that the project design is realistic and allows for the efficient and effective achievement of expected outputs?
- (c) Is the initial implementation of the project on track in order to safeguard that project outputs will be achieved?

The audit covered the project lifecycle starting from its inception in November 2012 to its implementation up to October 2014. Due to delays in project implementation, the project duration that originally spanned from 1 December 2012 to 31 December 2015 had been extended for one year, until 31 December 2016. Given that the project had not ended by the time of the audit, the purpose of the audit was to make an early assessment and provide feedback to the project in order to allow corrective actions to be taken where needed for the rest of the implementation process.

#### **Overall audit rating**

OAI assessed the management of the CREW project as **partially satisfactory**, which means, "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/project." This rating was mainly due to shortcomings in the project design relating to the lack of coordination with other early warning system initiatives, lack of focus on communication of warnings, and lack of measures for scaling up and sustainability of project outcomes. Further weaknesses were noted in the project's justification, as no baseline and gap analysis were carried out before designing the project, no alternative project designs were envisaged, and budget estimates were not well founded. Finally, oversight and control was not carried out, as foreseen, in order to ensure effectiveness and efficiency of project implementation.

#### **Key recommendations:** Total = $\mathbf{3}$ , high priority = $\mathbf{1}$

The three recommendations aim to ensure the following: (a) achievement of the organization's strategic objectives (Recommendations 1 and 2); (b) effectiveness and efficiency of operations (Recommendation 3);

For high (critical) priority recommendations, prompt action is required to ensure that UNDP is not exposed to high risks. Failure to take action could result in major negative consequences for UNDP. The high (critical) priority recommendation is presented below.

### United Nations Development Programme Office of Audit and Investigations



With regard to the question "Does UNDP ensure that the project design is realistic and allows for the efficient and effective achievement of expected outputs?" the following issue was noted:

The project was designed by the Country Office without support from UNDP Headquarters, which had experience with similar projects. The project document did not sufficiently establish links with other projects in Ghana that were related to early warning systems. The project document did not sufficiently address the communication of warnings to local communities, long-term maintenance or the safeguarding of equipment. Finally, the project document did not sufficiently explain how scaling up of the project outcomes would be achieved.

Recommendation: Revise and complement the project document in order to reflect changes made to the initial plan. In doing so, the Country Office should seek guidance and support from UNDP Headquarters, in particular from the Directorate of Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction within the Bureau for Policy and Programme Support. The revised project document should define actions needed to coordinate with other early warning system-related projects in Ghana, and reinforce developing coordinating mechanisms for early warning. It should also develop provisions and plans for maintenance and safeguarding of project equipment, and develop an exit strategy for scaling up the project outputs by also linking the CREW project with other early warning system-related projects and initiatives in Ghana.

#### **Good practices**

The audit identified several good practices that may support empowering local communities, developing capacities at the national level and coordination of project implementation. In particular, consultative meetings that were held at regional and local levels for identifying the project pilot sites supported the involvement of local communities. Further, locating the Project Management Unit within the national agency for disaster management may facilitate knowledge transfer. Finally, establishing a multi-agency working group may support inter-agency coordination.

#### Management comments and action plan

The Resident Representative accepted all of the recommendations and is in the process of implementing them. Comments and/or additional information provided have been incorporated in the report, where appropriate.

Issues with less significance (not included in this report) have been discussed directly with management and actions have been initiated to address them.

Helge S. Osttveiten

Office of Audit and Investigations