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Background

In 2020, UNDP was the Principal Recipient in 19 countries and two regional programmes and managed 31 Global Fund grants totalling $974.2 million.

The UNDP Office of Audit and Investigations (OAI) analysed the audit issues noted in the 2020 OAI audits of the Global Fund grants managed by UNDP as Principal Recipient and reviewed the status of implementation of audit recommendations as of 15 February 2021. OAI also identified the categories with recurring audit issues from the reports issued from 2017 to 2020.

Audit coverage

In 2020, six reports were issued pertaining to audits of Global Fund grants managed by UNDP as Principal Recipient. These six reports, one in Africa (South Sudan), two in Asia and the Pacific (Afghanistan and Fiji), two in the Arab States (Djibouti and Sudan), and one in Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (Kyrgyzstan), covered 18 Global Fund grants with total expenses of $90.3 million. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the audits in Fiji, Djibouti, and South Sudan were conducted remotely. Further details on these audits can be found in Annex 1.

Of the six reports issued, five were rated “partially satisfactory/some improvement needed” and one was rated “partially satisfactory/major improvement needed.”

The six audits reported a total of 24 audit issues and raised a total of 24 recommendations to address those issues, of which 11 recommendations (or 46 percent) were rated as high priority, meaning that “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 recurring issues noted in the six audit reports were weaknesses in the following:

- Procurement and supply management (inventory, quality assurance, and assets management)
- Programme management (project approval, implementation, monitoring and closure)
- Sub-recipient management (selection, assessment and contracting)

To strengthen the implementation of Global Fund grants, OAI issued audit recommendations to the Country Offices. The critical and important recommendations included the following:

- Strengthen procurement and supply management by:
  - ensuring that adequate and complete inventory records and warehouse management and distribution systems are maintained;

---

1. The two regional programmes covered another 14 countries in Southern Asia and Western Pacific.
2. Issues are considered as “recurring” when there are more than three issues and recommendations for a given audit area.
(b) timely performing and documenting all required quality assurance and controls; and
(c) defining clear mechanisms, roles, responsibilities and procedures for the receipt, recording, storage, distribution, disposal, and reconciliation of assets.

- Strengthen programme management by:
  (a) reprogramming unused funds and submitting reprogramming proposals for approval by the Global Fund in a timely manner;
  (b) improving monitoring activities and enhancing the data validation process through an effective mechanism for direct verification by the Principal Recipient with end users of the data; and
  (c) timely and efficiently processing of UNDP project closure activities, operationally and financially, and obtaining reimbursement from Sub-recipients for the pre-financed funds.

- Strengthen Sub-recipient management by:
  (a) completing capacity assessments of all Sub-recipients and implementing risk mitigation measures and action plans to address identified capacity gaps;
  (b) keeping up-to-date records of authorized signatories and verifying that FACE forms are appropriately signed and have the proper supporting documentation; and
  (c) recovering unspent advances and clearing outstanding cash advances.

**Implementation of audit recommendations**

In close cooperation with the Bureau for Policy and Programme Support, Global Fund/Health Implementation Support Team, OAI continuously monitors and follows up on the progress achieved by each Country Office in implementing audit recommendations.

As of 18 March 2021, the rate of implementation of 2020 audit recommendations was 66.9 percent as detailed in Section IV of this report.
I. Profile of Global Fund grants managed by UNDP as Principal Recipient

In 2020, UNDP was the Principal Recipient in 19 countries and for two regional programmes, it managed 31 Global Fund grants totaling $974.2 million. As Principal Recipients, UNDP Country Offices are required to implement the Global Fund grants according to the Framework Agreement, including the UNDP-Global Fund Grant Regulations signed between UNDP and the Global Fund.

Objectives and scope of the audits of Global Fund grants

In October 2016, UNDP and the Global Fund signed a Framework Agreement and formalized the risk-based approach for all OAI audits of the Global Fund. The Agreement stipulated that OAI independently plans audits, defines the risk model and undertakes audits of grants managed by UNDP as Principal Recipient, following its audit plans and in accordance with the standards followed by OAI.

The 2020 audits were conducted directly by OAI. The audits aimed to assess the adequacy and effectiveness of governance, risk management and control processes relating to the following areas and sub-areas:

(a) governance and strategic management (organizational structure, risk management, staffing and performance management, capacity development and transition strategy);
(b) programme management (project approval and implementation, monitoring and evaluation, grant closure);
(c) Sub-recipient management (selection, assessment and contracting, financial and programmatic activities);
(d) procurement and supply management (qualification and forecasting, procurement of health products, quality assurance of health products, procurement of other goods and services, supply management of medical products (inventory, warehousing and distribution), asset management, individual contractors); and
(e) financial management (revenue and accounts receivable, expenditure, reporting to the Global Fund, Fund Administrator role).

The scope of the audits of Global Fund grants included all activities related to the implementation of Global Fund grants by UNDP Country Offices.

A draft version of this consolidated report has been shared with the Bureau for Policy and Programme Support, Global Fund/Health Implementation Support Team, HIV, Health and Development Group, and their comments have been considered in the final report.

II. Overview of the audits

The Global Fund audit reports issued in 2020 covered 18 grants with total expenses of $90.3 million. Of the six reports issued, one was rated “partially satisfactory/major improvement needed”, and five were rated “partially satisfactory/some improvement needed”. 
III. Analysis of the audit issues raised

The audit recommendations related mainly to issues within procurement and supply management, programme management, as well as Sub-recipient management. A detailed analysis of the issues is presented below.

A. Procurement and supply management

Issue 1  Ineffective inventory management

The UNDP-Global Fund Agreement requires Principal Recipients to ensure that operating procedures and controls are put in place to prevent any diversion of health products within the supply chain, including the maintenance of a reliable inventory management system. The agreement requires the maintenance of sufficient inventories and that product expiry should be kept below the two percent World Health Organization threshold.

OAI noted weaknesses in the monitoring of inventory in Afghanistan, Djibouti, Kyrgyzstan, and Sudan, as follows:

- In Afghanistan, the warehouse management system was installed on a staff member’s laptop, thus limiting access and data backup rights to that sole user. This set-up could potentially yield to the loss of data and integrity.

- In Djibouti, the inventory control reports were incomplete and outdated. The TB inventory reports contained products that had expired between 2012 and 2018 and which should already have been disposed of. The Malaria 2019 year-end inventory did not record all products procured in 2019.

- In Kyrgyzstan, inventory records indicated that stock of pharmaceutical items had been fully depleted, and supplies had not been distributed. In addition, there were discrepancies between the inventory records and the Sub-recipient reports.

- In Sudan, there were expired and damaged lots valued at $200,000. There were 37 products, including medicines and laboratory items, that did not have stocks in the central warehouse. Stocks for five other products were depleted following expiry; only three of these five products had been planned for in the health procurement action plan but had not yet been procured.

OAI recommended that the Offices strengthen inventory and warehouse management by:

- ensuring that the warehouse management system is implemented with restricted administrative access and reducing the risk of dependence on a single staff member;

- maintaining adequate and complete inventory records and disposing expired inventory;

- timely recording the delivery notes in the Sub-recipient’s health products register and following up on reporting discrepancies; and

- establishing an effective mechanism to monitor the consumption and damaged/expired patterns for the inventory products, and adjusting the procurement and distribution plans to ensure sufficient stock.
Issue 2  Ineffective implementation of quality control

The ‘UNDP-Global Fund and Health Implementation Guidance Manual’ requires the preparation of an annual quality control testing plan for the supply chain, from initial receipt of the health products to delivery to health facilities. It also requires adequate storage space for products, sufficient inventory, and information collection systems to monitor consumption rates and prevent diversion, stock-outs, or expiration of products.

OAI noted weaknesses in the quality assurance of health products in Afghanistan, Djibouti, Fiji, and Kyrgyzstan, as follows:

- In Afghanistan, receiving reports for health products did not indicate that the minimum prescribed verifications were correctly performed or that the remaining shelf life of health products had been verified. There were no working documents showing how health procurement plans were used to define the sampling and testing plan in line with quality control testing obligations.

- In Djibouti, there was no timeline for the sampling in the quality control testing plan and did not have a monitoring mechanism to ensure that quality control was being conducted as planned or needed any adjustment. The Office had yet to receive quality control results for tests done in 2019. Furthermore, 76 percent of the products in stock had been distributed by December 2019 without undergoing quality control testing.

- In Fiji, there was no documentary evidence that the Office performed all required quality assurance verifications upon receiving health products. The required quality control tests for the batches of medicines received during the audit period had not been done even though the Office had received 39 batches of medicines as per its health procurement action plan. Furthermore, no medicines had been sampled for quality control testing either upon receipt in country or throughout the supply chain during the audit period.

- In Kyrgyzstan, the quality control plan for 2019 had not been implemented. The plan required testing of products upon arrival and within the supply chain, neither of which were completed.

OAI recommended that the Offices strengthen their quality control processes by:

- ensuring that all required controls are performed at the reception of health products and are documented on receiving reports, documenting the justification for the sampling and testing plan for quality control of health products;

- developing and monitoring a quality control testing plan, which should include the timelines for drawing samples at different points in the supply chain, and actively following up with the laboratory regarding extended delays in receiving quality control test results; and

- ensuring the implementation of a quality control plan that is aligned to the procurement schedule and inventory monitoring, enabling the testing of pharmaceutical products prior to usage.

Issue 3  Inadequate management of assets

According to the ‘UNDP-Global Fund and Health Implementation Guidance Manual’, the physical verification of Sub-recipient assets should be completed at least annually. In addition, Article 5 of the Sub-recipient
agreement states that the Sub-recipient shall be responsible for the proper custody, maintenance and care of all Sub-recipient resources.

OAI noted inadequate controls over assets in Djibouti, South Sudan, and Sudan, as follows:

- In Djibouti, there was no year-end physical inventory count of Global Fund assets for 2019. Asset registries did not include the required relevant information. There were items that were assessed as non-functional but had yet to be disposed of. None of the field visit reports provided evidence of oversight of assets held by the Sub-recipients. There were assets, including cars and IT equipment procured in 2013 that had not been transferred to Sub-recipients.

- In South Sudan, seven vehicles with an acquisition cost of $347,000 and under temporary custody of the Sub-recipients had been missing since August 2016. No incident or police reports were made available by the Sub-recipients for the lost assets.

- In Sudan, the audit disclosed delays in the transfer of assets to the government implementing partner as well as in the distribution of health and IT equipment to beneficiaries. There were discrepancies between the warehouse records and the Office’s register.

OAI recommended that the Offices strengthen the management of assets by:

- establishing a complete and consolidated asset inventory register including all relevant information for proper monitoring, and timely disposing of the non-functional or obsolete assets;

- requesting detail incident and police reports of events leading up to the loss of assets under their custody, and determining liability for the loss of assets and recovering that loss from the liable party; and

- timely distributing assets to beneficiaries and requesting specific justification for all asset purchases including distribution plans supported by requests from the relevant government ministry.

B. Programme management

Issue 1 Delays in the reprogramming of unused funds

The ‘UNDP-Global Fund Health Implementation Guidance Manual’ provides that the Principal Recipient may undertake necessary budgetary adjustments to respond to programme realities. Adequate project monitoring allows for timely decision-making with regard to the utilization of grant funds. To optimize delivery, unused funds should be reprogrammed at the earliest possible moment.

OAI noted delays in the reprogramming of unused funds in Kyrgyzstan and Sudan, as follows:

- In Kyrgyzstan, the Office was not able to reprogramme a balance of $2,415,601 during the previous grant implementation period due to changes in the Global Fund’s financial rules that delayed the approval process by up to two months. In addition, as of October 2019, savings amounting to approximately $800,000 from the new grant implementation period was yet to be reprogrammed.
• In Sudan, a reprogramming proposal of unused funds for the HIV grant was submitted to the Global Fund on 10 December 2018. As of December 2019, and after several rounds of reviews, the reprogramming was yet to be approved. For the TB grant, the consolidated reprogramming request was yet to be sent for approval.

OAI recommended that the Offices improve their programme management by:

• reprogramming unused funds and submitting the request to the Global Fund in a timely manner for approval; and

• actively monitoring and taking necessary measures to optimize the absorption rate, including making efficient use of the Matching Fund.

Issue 2  Challenges with monitoring and data validation

The grant agreement between UNDP and the Global Fund states that the Principal Recipient is responsible for the overall monitoring and evaluation of grants and should carry out monitoring visits and verification of performance data reported by Sub-recipients.

OAI noted issues with the planning of monitoring visits and reliability of the data reported by Sub-recipients in Afghanistan and Kyrgyzstan, as follows:

• In Afghanistan, field visits were not consistently conducted as stipulated in the monitoring and evaluation plan. The ongoing uncertainty over security was the main challenge affecting the monitoring and evaluation schedule as well as conducting an independent verification of data collected.

• In Kyrgyzstan, a review of the monitoring and data validation processes disclosed that the Office had not yet established a verification mechanism with end users to provide assurance on the reliability of the data reported by Sub-recipients, including their utilization of health products.

OAI recommended that the Offices enhance their monitoring activities and data validation process by:

• contracting of a qualified monitoring service provider to verify data in the provinces where access is restricted; and

• establishing an effective mechanism for direct verification by the Principal Recipient with end users of the data.

Issue 3  Inadequate management of the grant closure process

The ‘UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures’ stipulate that projects should be operationally closed in Atlas when the project period expires and that they should be financially closed within 12 months of operational closure.

OAI noted long delays in grant closures in South Sudan and Sudan, as follows:

• In South Sudan, there were five expired Global Fund grants recorded in Atlas that were flagged as ongoing. At a minimum, all grants should have been flagged as operationally closed and
should have been financially closed several years earlier. The Office did not provide grant
closure checklists for any of the grants, meaning that closure compliance from a UNDP
perspective was not pursued. Moreover, Sub-recipients had to refund the Office for rejected
expenditures and lost assets for which the Office reimbursed the Global Fund.

- In Sudan, the Global Fund approved in December 2017 the closure plan of the previous Malaria
grant. The closure plan was to be finalized by 30 September 2018. However, as of December
2019, the closure activities for the Malaria grant had yet to be finalized. In addition, three
projects created to manage the Malaria, TB, and HIV grants from 2015 to 2017 had yet to be
operationally and financially closed, more than two years after the end of their implementation
period.

OAI recommended that the Country Offices improve grant and project closure by:

- operationally and financially closing projects in Atlas, and obtaining reimbursement from Sub-
  recipients for the pre-financed funds; and

- implementing the remaining activities for the previous Malaria grant closure.

C. Sub-recipient management

Issue 1  Inadequate capacity assessments of Sub-recipients

The ‘UNDP-Global Fund and Health Implementation Guidance Manual’ requires UNDP Country Offices, as
Global Fund Principal Recipients, to conduct capacity assessments of Sub-recipients before the signing of
agreements and transfer of funds.

OAI observed inadequacies in the capacity assessments of Sub-recipients in Djibouti, Fiji, and Kyrgyzstan, as
follows:

- In Djibouti, the Office contracted six Sub-recipients for the two grants and conducted capacity
  assessments of five of them nine months after the signing of the Sub-recipient agreements. A
capacity assessment was not conducted for the remaining Sub-recipient. Although the Office
identified certain weaknesses through the capacity assessments and monitoring visits, a capacity
development plan for addressing them was not prepared.

- In Fiji, out of 18 Sub-recipients selected by the Office through direct programmatic engagement, no
capacity assessments were available for 2 Sub-recipients, and capacity assessments of 15 Sub-
recipients were outdated and/or did not meet the minimum requirements of the capacity
assessment tool.

- In Kyrgyzstan, the Office had not conducted a capacity assessment of the 13 government entities
and 9 NGOs using the standard Sub-recipient Capacity Assessment Tool prior to contracting them.
As a result, the Office did not develop a capacity development plan for its Sub-recipients.

OAI recommended that the Offices improve the capacity assessment of Sub-recipients by:

- preparing a comprehensive capacity development plan if capacity gaps are identified;
establishing and implementing risk mitigation measures and action plans to address any findings identified in the capacity assessments; and

- completing the assessments of Sub-recipients using the Capacity Assessment Tool and using the results to develop a capacity development plan.

Issue 2  Weaknesses in Sub-recipient financial monitoring

The ‘UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures’ provide guidance on effective and timely financial management and budget monitoring. Sub-recipients should agree with the Office on the budget and implementation modalities before the start of the project.

OAI observed weaknesses in financial monitoring activities in Fiji, as follows:

- Eight advance requests and financial reports submitted by Sub-recipients through FACE forms were not signed by authorized signatories. The record of authorized signatories for Sub-recipients was outdated.

- Requests for advances in excess of the amounts agreed in the work plans as well as reimbursement claims made after the deadlines were approved without proper justifications.

- Seven Sub-recipients did not maintain separate bank accounts as required under the signed Sub-recipient agreements. The use of non-dedicated bank accounts was not agreed to in writing and it was unclear what mitigating controls were in place.

OAI recommended that the Office improve controls over the monitoring of Sub-recipients’ financial activities by:

- keeping up-to-date records of authorized signatories and verifying that FACE forms are appropriately signed and have the required supporting documentation, including proper justifications for any deviations from the work plans; and

- documenting the reason why separate bank accounts are not maintained by Sub-recipients and implementing mitigating controls to reduce the risk of inaccurate reporting of funds utilization.

OAI noted weaknesses in Sub-recipient financial management in Sudan, as follows:

- Unused advances of $29,000, from five government entities, had not been recovered since 2014. In addition, one United Nations agency had an unliquidated cash balance of $714,000 from advances received in June 2017.

OAI recommended that the Office recover the unspent advances from the five government entities by escalating the issue and clearing the outstanding cash advances from the concerned United Nations agency.
IV. Implementation of the audit recommendations

OAI, in close cooperation with the Bureau for Policy and Programme Support, UNDP Global Fund/Health Implementation Support Team, HIV, Health and Development Group, continuously monitors the progress achieved by UNDP Country Offices in implementing the audit recommendations made. Country Offices are required to report any progress made directly in the Comprehensive Audit and Recommendation Database System (CARDS) and to upload supporting documentation. This information is subsequently validated by OAI.

The data contained in this section of the report represents 24 audit recommendations included in six audit reports issued between 1 January and 31 December 2020 (see Figure 1). As of 18 March 2021, 10 of the 24 recommendations had been fully implemented.

Figure 1: Implementation rate of the recommendations in the 2020 Global Fund audits as of 18 March 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Office</th>
<th>Report No.</th>
<th>Issue Date</th>
<th>Total No. of Recommendations</th>
<th>No. of Outstanding Recommendations</th>
<th>No. of Outstanding Recommendations Over 12 months</th>
<th>Implementation rate As of 18-Mar-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>2099</td>
<td>14-Feb-20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>2189</td>
<td>25-Jun-20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji (Multi-country Office)</td>
<td>2239</td>
<td>23-Jul-20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>2058</td>
<td>08-Jan-20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>2229</td>
<td>06-Aug-20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>2055</td>
<td>02-Mar-20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Recurring audit issues from 2017-2020

OAI analysed the audit recommendations raised during the last four years to examine the areas where audit issues were most prevalent. The summary is displayed in Figure 2.
### Figure 2: Number of recommendations by audit category and the total recommendations per year (2017-2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit Category</th>
<th>2017 (10 reports)</th>
<th>2018 (8 reports)</th>
<th>2019 (5 reports)</th>
<th>2020 (6 reports)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>No. of Rec.</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>No. of Rec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement and supply management</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme management</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-recipient management</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial management</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Definitions of audit terms - ratings and priorities used in 2020

A. AUDIT RATINGS

Satisfactory
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
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/area.

B. PRIORITIES OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

High (Critical)
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.

Medium (Important)
Action is required to ensure that UNDP is not exposed to risks. Failure to take action could result in negative consequences for UNDP.

Low
Action is desirable and should result in enhanced control or better value for money. Low priority recommendations, if any, are dealt with by the audit team directly with the Office management, either during the exit meeting or through a separate memo subsequent to the fieldwork. Therefore, low priority recommendations are not included in this report.
## Annex 1: Global Fund grants audited in Country Offices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report No.</th>
<th>Country Office</th>
<th>Issue Date</th>
<th>Audit Period</th>
<th>Audit rating</th>
<th>Audited expenditure (in $ millions)</th>
<th>Global Fund Grants Audited</th>
<th>Number of issues/recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2055</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>28-Feb-20</td>
<td>1-Jan-18</td>
<td>Partially Satisfactory/MI</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>HIV 2, TB 1, HSS 1, HIV/TB 1, Malaria 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2058</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>8-Jan-20</td>
<td>1-Jan-18</td>
<td>Partially Satisfactory/Sl</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>HIV 2, TB 2, HSS 1, HIV/TB 1, Malaria 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2099</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>14-Feb-20</td>
<td>1-Jan-18</td>
<td>Partially Satisfactory/Sl</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>HIV 3, TB 1, HSS 1, HIV/TB 1, Malaria 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2189</td>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>25-Jun-20</td>
<td>1-Jan-19</td>
<td>Partially Satisfactory/Sl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>HIV 2, TB 1, HSS 1, HIV/TB 1, Malaria 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2229</td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>6-Aug-20</td>
<td>1-Jan-19</td>
<td>Partially Satisfactory/Sl</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>HIV 7, TB 3, HSS 3, HIV/TB 1, Malaria 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2239</td>
<td>Fiji (Multi-Country Office)</td>
<td>23-Jul-20</td>
<td>1-Jan-19</td>
<td>Partially Satisfactory/Sl</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>HIV 2, TB 1, HSS 1, HIV/TB 1, Malaria 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>18 4 4 1 5 4 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>