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1. Review Details

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Draft Report Date | : | 2016-09-26 |
| Due date for auditee comments | : | 10/6/2016 12:00:00 AM |
| Actual date of auditee comments | : | 10/8/2016 12:00:00 AM |
| Final Report Date | : | 10/8/2016 12:00:00 AM |
| Duration of Audit | : | 12 Days |
| Audit Coverage Period | : | 2016-09-28 TO 2016-09-30 |
| Auditee(s) | : | |  | | --- | |  | | mathi | | simbu | |
| Auditor(s) | : | |  | | --- | |  | | admin | |

1. Scope & Coverage

|  |
| --- |
| Planned scope : |
| sd |
| dffg |
| dfdsf |
| dsfdsfdsf |
| fgggggg |

#%SCOPETABLE%

|  |
| --- |
| Areas not covered / Limitations: |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

#%ISSUETABLE%

1. Key Facts & Figures (wherever applicable\*)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **S. No** | Particulars | **Value** |
| 1 | d | 1212 |
| 1 | 4 | 4 |
| 1 | df | dsf |

#%KEYTABLE%

**\**Based on the scope of Audit and areas of coverage.***

1. [Issues pending since last review](#ISSUES)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S.No | Observation, impact & report reference | Risk Rating | Reason for non-implementation with revised response | Responsibility  & Time line |
| 1 |  | high | FDGDFGDFGDG |  |
| 2 |  | high | dfg |  |
| 3 |  | high | dfg |  |
| 4 |  | high | ghjghj |  |
| 5 |  | high | dfg |  |
| 6 |  | high |  |  |
| 1 |  | high | FDGDFGDFGDG |  |
| 2 |  | high | dfg |  |
| 3 |  | high | dfg |  |
| 4 |  | high | ghjghj |  |
| 5 |  | high | dfg |  |
| 6 |  | high |  |  |

#%ISSUEPENDINGTABLE%

1. Pre-audit disclosure of discrepancies & status of action\*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S. No** | **Area of operation** | **Issue Identified** | **status** | **Expected date to complete** |
| 1 | FG | DFGDF | DFG | DFG |
| 2 | gh | fdg | fdg | dfg |
| 3 | dfgfdg | dfg | dfg | dfg |
| 4 | ghj | ghj | ghj | 2016-10-13 |
| 5 | dfgd | dfg | dfg | 2016-10-12 |
| 6 | fgh | fgh | fgh | 2016-10-20 |
| 1 | FG | DFGDF | DFG | DFG |
| 2 | gh | fdg | fdg | dfg |
| 3 | dfgfdg | dfg | dfg | dfg |
| 4 | ghj | ghj | ghj | 2016-10-13 |
| 5 | dfgd | dfg | dfg | 2016-10-12 |
| 6 | fgh | fgh | fgh | 2016-10-20 |

#%ISSUEIDENTIFIED%

*\* Based on declaration from auditee at Audit opening meeting*

1. Improvements observed

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S. No** | **Activity / Area of operation** | **Brief description of Improvement** | **Pre-implementation status** | **Implementation date** |
| 1 |  | DFGDF | DFG | DFG |
| 2 |  | fdg | fdg | dfg |
| 3 |  | dfg | dfg | dfg |
| 4 |  | ghj | ghj | 2016-10-13 |
| 5 |  | dfg | dfg | 2016-10-12 |
| 6 |  | fgh | fgh | 2016-10-20 |
| 1 |  | DFGDF | DFG | DFG |
| 2 |  | fdg | fdg | dfg |
| 3 |  | dfg | dfg | dfg |
| 4 |  | ghj | ghj | 2016-10-13 |
| 5 |  | dfg | dfg | 2016-10-12 |
| 6 |  | fgh | fgh | 2016-10-20 |

#%ISSUECOVEREDTABLE%

1. Satisfaction / comfort Rating:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rating Parameter | Description | Weightage | **Assigned by audit**  **(1 to 5)** | **Parameter Rating** |
| **Documentation** | * Adequacy, accessibility, storage, retrieval & safety of documents & records * Best practices / Kaizens followed | 20% | 1 , 1 | **1** |
| **Compliance** | * Adherence to Safety & regulatory compliance * Adherence to SOP / SOD compliance | 20% | 2,2 | 2 |
| **Process & financial controls** | * Overall process controls devised and its effectiveness * Financial controls devised and its effectiveness | 25% | 2,2 | 2 |
| **Response to Audit** | * Timely action reported audit observations * Significant / Key Audit observations | 15% | 2,1 | 1 |
| **Pre-audit disclosure** | * Disclosure about discrepancies identified prior to audit * Status of action on such discrepancies | 10% | 2,2 | 2 |
| **New initiatives / process improvements** | * Identification of new areas for improvements * Implementation of improvements in existing processes | 10% | 4,2 | 3 |
| Overall comfort Rating (on a scale of 1 to 5) | | | |  |

1. [Executive summary](#EXECUTIVE)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S No** | **Observation** | **Risk rating** | **Impact category** | **Key observation (Yes/No)** | **Auditee Response to observation (Agreed / Not agreed)** | **Follow-up required (Yes / No)** | **SBU Head** |
| 1 | dsf | Likelihood | OE | YES | NO | Yes | TR |

#%SUMMARY%

*Note: For detailed audit observations, please refer the hyperlinks given in the table.*

1. Detailed Audit Observations

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Observation** | | | | **Category** | | **OE** | | |
| **Risk Rating** | | **Likelihood** | | |
|  | **dsf** | | | | | | | |
|  | dsfsd | | | | | | | |
|  | dsf | | | | | | | |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Root Cause** | **Impact** | | dfgdfgdfg | dgdfgdfgdfgdfg | | dfgdfgdfg | dfgdfgdfg | | fgdfg | dfgdfgfdg | | dsfdsf | sdfsdfdsf | | sdfdsf | sdfsdfsdfdsfdsf | | | | | | | | | |
| **Suggestion:** | | | | | | | | |
| |  | | --- | |  | | ddd | | cgdfgfdgfdgfdgfdg | | fgdfgdfgdfg f dgdfgdfg dfgfdgfd fdgfgdf gdf dfgfdg | | fdgfdgdfg | | | | | | | | | |
| **Agree with the observation? (Yes / No)** | | | | | | | | YES |
| **Justification, if disagree / Action Planned, implemented so far, if agree** | | | | | | | | |
| **sd** | | | | | | | | |
| **Agree with the Suggestion? (Yes / No)** | | | | | | | | YES |
| **Alternate Action Plan, if disagree with the Suggestion:** | | | | | | | | |
| **ff** | | | | | | | | |
| **Responsibility** | | | | | | | **Target Date** | |
| **Name** | | as | **Email Id:** | | asa | | 2016-10-14 | |
| **AUDIT REJOINDER, if necessary** | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | |

1. Audit Methodology

Rating Methodology for observations

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Abbreviations** | **Description** | **Detailed description** |
| **SN** | **Statutory Non-Compliance** | Issues which are in violation of any applicable statute. Acts may be central, state or any other. |
| **PD** | **Policy Deviation** | Issues which are not in line with company policy Viz. DOA, HR, Travel, etc. |
| **PG** | **Process Gap** | At its current state the process is not line with industry standards and may result in financial loss.  A pure control lapse. |
| **OE** | **Operating Effectiveness** | Process is in place with few transactional deviations. This may/may not result in a financial loss. |
| **PI** | **Process Improvement** | Issues which do not result in any process gap; however, if implemented may result in an improvement in the existing process. The improvement may or may not be with a financial benefit. |

**Risk Matrix showing the Risk Levels**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Consequence**  **Likelihood** | **Negligible** | **Small** | **Moderate** | **Severe** |
| **Low** | Low | Low | Low | **Medium** |
| **Moderate** | Low | **Medium** | **Medium** | **High** |
| **High** | Low | **Medium** | **High** | **High** |
| **Very high** | **Medium** | **High** | **High** | **High** |

**Comfort ratings and its meaning**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Rating range | Satisfaction level |
| Upto 2.4 | Significant improvements required |
| 2.5 to 3.9 | Satisfactory & potential to improve |
| 4 – 5 | Suitable for bench marking |