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This is a combined Control Report and Control Checklist template for controllers performing management verifications in Interreg programmes in the 2021 – 2027 programming period.

The main objectives of these template(s) are:

* To reflect the work and scope done by controllers;
* To outline a minimum set of fields and optional fields that programmes can choose. Programmes can also add additional fields and clarifications, if necessary.
* It is also possible to separate these two documents.

Guide for monitoring systems:

* The document should be automatically generated from existing information located elsewhere.

To reach a high level of harmonisation, HIT tools should be used as much as possible as they are. The tools have been designed based on an agreed structure that avoids asking for similar information in different contexts.

If needed, the following flexibility principles can be applied:

* It is possible to change the order of the main parts or questions within each part.
* Changes that don't disrupt the main logic of sections/questions are possible. The logic can be disrupted when one change influences some other part(s) of the tool.
* Optional questions (in yellow) can be left out partially or in full; the same goes for some comment sections.
* Multiple languages are possible by adding fields to enter the text in other languages.
* The maximum length of text for answers will be decided by programmes because this depends on technical options in their online monitoring system.

###### Control Report

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1. Partner progress report[[1]](#footnote-1)** | |
| Interreg programme and/or logo | *Automatically filled in from most recent AF* |
| Project title | *Automatically filled in from most recent AF* |
| Project acronym | *Automatically filled in from most recent AF* |
| Project ID | *Automatically filled in from most recent AF* |
| Approved implementation period | *(DD.MM.YYYY – DD.MM.YYYY);*  *Automatically filled in from the supplementary info section* |
| Reporting period | *(DD.MM.YYYY – DD.MM.YYYY)*  *Automatically filled in from most recent AF* |
| Partner Report Number | *Automatically filled in* |
| Report date (first time submitted) | *DD.MM.YYYY Automatically filled in* |
| Report date (resubmitted with complete documentation) | *DD.MM.YYYY*  *Automatically filled in* |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1.2 Format of documents** | | | |
| Documents were made available to the controller in the following formats (tick all that apply)  *(multiple selections possible)* | originals | copy | electronic |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Type of project report | Partner report | Final report |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **Project partner1** | |
| Name of partner organisation in English language | *Automatically filled in from most recent AF* |
| Name of partner organisation in original language | *Automatically filled in from most recent AF* |
| Partner number | *Automatically filled in from most recent AF* |
| Partner role in the project  *(lead partner, project partner)* | *Automatically filled in from most recent AF* |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Designated Project Partner Controller | | | | | |
| Control body responsible for the verification[[2]](#footnote-2) | *Automatically filled in from the previous report and updated if changed* | | | | |
| Intermediate body doing the verification (if applicable) [[3]](#footnote-3) | *Automatically filled in from the previous report and updated if changed* | | | | |
| Name of the controller | *Automatically filled in with the name of the controller signing this document* | | | | |
| Job title | *Automatically filled in from the previous report and updated if changed* | | | | |
| Division/Unit/Department | *Automatically filled in from the previous report and updated if changed* | | | | |
| Address | *Automatically filled in from the previous report and updated if changed* | | | | |
| Country | *Automatically filled in from the previous report and updated if changed* | | | | |
| Telephone Number | *Automatically filled in from the previous report and updated if changed* | | | | |
| Email | *Automatically filled in from the previous report and updated if changed* | | | | |
| Controller – Reviewer (if applicable)[[4]](#footnote-4) | *Automatically filled in from the previous report and updated if changed* | | | | |
| Verification | | | | | |
| General methodology (allowing multiple ticks) | administrative verification | | on-the-spot verification | | |
| (if on-the-spot) Date(s) of on-the-spot verification | *DD.MM.YYYY - DD.MM.YYYY* | | | | |
| (if on-the-spot) Location of on-the-spot verification | premises of project partner | project event/meeting | place of physical project output | | virtual |
| (if on-the-spot) Focus of on-the-spot verification | *e.g., accounting system, cost items, investments, etc.* | | | | |
| Risk-based verification was applied | Yes | | | No | |
| (if yes) Please describe: | *Briefly describe the sampling methodology and indicate where a detailed description can be found. For example, include additional information on the scope and on the percentage checked.* | | | | |
| 4.1 Timing | | | | | |
| Start of control work | *DD.MM.YYYY* | | | | |
| Date(s) of requests for clarifications, if applicable | *DD.MM.YYYY – text* | | | | |
| Date of receipt of satisfactory clarifications, if applicable | *DD.MM.YYYY* | | | | |
| End of control work | *DD.MM.YYYY* | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Declared (A)  (total amount declared in EUR) | Confirmed (B)  (total eligible amount in EUR) | Difference (C=A-B)  (total amount deducted in EUR) | Certified in % of Declared [B/A]\*100 |
| *EUR (Calculated automaticall)* | *EUR (Calculated automatically)* | *EUR (Calculated automatically)* | *% (Calculated automatically)* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5.a Description of findings, observations and limitations[[5]](#footnote-5)** | |
| n.a. | *Linked to the checklist and automatically added here*  *A description of the types of errors found and reasoning why it is an error. Also add: a clear specification of additional observations and limitations (if any) expressed about the eligibility of some expenditures.* |
| **5.b Follow-up measures from the last progress report6** | |
| n.a. | *Follow-up measures from the last report, automatically added from the last report.*  *Follow-up measures done in this report should also be explained here.* |
| **5.c Conclusions and recommendations6** | |
| n.a. | *Linked to the checklist and automatically added here*  *The conclusion takes into consideration the above-mentioned observations/reservations. It also describes the measures implemented to solve the errors detected, and it provides recommendations, where possible, to avoid repetition of the same types of errors in the future.* |
| **5.d Follow-up measures for the next progress report6** | |
| n.a. | *Linked to the checklist and automatically added here*  *Follow-up measures to be implemented in the next progress report should be described in this section.* |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. ***(5.a, 5.b, 5.c, 5.d - Alternative)* Description of findings, observations and limitations; Conclusions and recommendations; Follow-up measures for the next progress report6** | | | |
|  |  | Comment | Typology of errors |
| General | n.a. |  |  |
| Staff costs | n.a. |  |  |
| Office and administrative costs | n.a. |  |  |
| Travel and accommodation | n.a. |  |  |
| External expertise and services | n.a. |  |  |
| Equipment | n.a. |  |  |
| Infrastructure and works | n.a. |  |  |
| Lump sums (using several cost categories) | n.a. |  |  |
| Unit costs (using several cost categories) | n.a. |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Purpose of the Control, Responsibilities, Legal Basis and Methodology[[6]](#footnote-6)** |
| **Purpose of the control report and addressees** |
| *We performed a verification of the above-mentioned report. We prepared this independent control report in order to provide the project partner with information on the control work carried out by us, the errors detected, the conclusions drawn and the recommendations and follow-up measures identified.*  *This control report refers solely to the partner report identified above and does not constitute a confirmation of the controlled entity's other statements and accounts.* |
| *This control report is primarily for the attention of the controlled lead partner/project partner.*  *It will furthermore be made available to the managing authority, the joint secretariat of the programme and managing authority, as well as authorised third parties such as the audit authority and the European Commission, upon request.* |
| **Responsibility of the project partner (PP)** |
| *The lead partner/project partner is responsible for the preparation of the partner report in accordance with the reporting provisions outlined in the subsidy contract and the respective programme documents.*  *The lead partner/project partner is furthermore responsible for executing internal control in order to enable the preparation of partner reports that are free from material misstatement, including those due to fraud or error.* |
| **Responsibility of the lead partner (LP)** |
| *The responsibilities of the lead partner are outlined in Article 26 of Reg. (EU) No 2021/1059[[7]](#footnote-7).* |
| **Responsibility of the managing authority (MA)/ joint secretariat (JS)** |
| *MA/ JS carry out the functions according to Article 46 of the Interreg Regulation and Article 49 of Reg. (EU) No 2021/1060[[8]](#footnote-8). The MA/ JS take the responsibility for monitoring the overall project progress.* |
| **Responsibility of Controller** |
| *A controller is responsible for verifying expenditues declared in the partner report based on the verifications carried out according to Article 74 CPR and Article 46(3) of the Interreg Regulation. According to Article 74(2) CPR management verifications shall be risk-based and proportionate to the risks identified ex-ante and in writing.* |
| **Legal basis and guidelines** |
| Reg. (EU) No 2021/1058[[9]](#footnote-9); Interreg Regulation; CPR  Risk – based management verifications, Article 74(2) CPR 2021-2027, Reflection paper (DRAFT)[[10]](#footnote-10)  Cooperation Programme  Programme Manual  (national, regional) Control manual |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Controller's signature** (applicable if Control report and Control checklist are separate documents) | |
| Date | *pre-filled in automatic systems (date when Certificate is generated)* |
| Name | *pre-filled in automatic systems* |
| Signature |  |
| Official stamp of the institution (if applicable) |  |

###### Control Checklist

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1.1. Accounting System** | | | |
| [according to Article 74 1a(i) CPR]  Project partner maintains separate accounting records/system, or accounting code, for all transactions related to the project. Ensuring separation of project expenditure for all transactions relating to the project  (filled-in once) | Yes | | No  *NOTE for Monitoring systems – In case No is selected, finalisation of the Checklist should not be possible* |
| Double-financing is excluded:  *e.g., the accounting system avoids the allocation of the same invoice to different projects and time recording system for staff prevents any duplication*  (Pre-filled from the previous report and updated if changed) | Yes | No | *Comment*  *In case of YES, please describe how it was ensured*  *In case of No, please provide further explanation.*  *NOTE for Monitoring systems – In case No is selected, finalisation of the Checklist should not be possible* |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1.2 VAT** | | | | |
| Is the size of the project equal to/ over 5 million Euro (incl. VAT)?? | yes | no |  |  |
| The partner organisation has the right to recover VAT. *Please provide comments if 'partially' is ticked.* (filled in once). | yes | partially | no | *Pre-filled from the previous report and updated if changed)* |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1.3 Bank Account** | | | |
| Correct IBAN is used for the transfer of programme funds and belongs to the partner organisation  (filled in once in case of change). | Yes | No | *Comment* |

1. **Audit Trail Checklist**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **General considerations / eligibility criteria[[11]](#footnote-11)** | **Accepted** | | | **Comments[[12]](#footnote-12)** |
| **Yes** | **Not (fully)** | **n.a.** |
| The partnership agreement is signed by the project partner and latest version is available (filled in once). |  |  |  |  |
| Costs are correctly recorded in the partner accounting system. |  |  |  |  |
| The source of the partner’s contribution (private or public) is correctly indicated. |  |  |  |  |
| Costs are directly related to the project and necessary for the development or implementation of the project. |  |  |  | *e.g., Verified that:*   * *Costs have been initially planned in the application form (AF) under this cost category OR* * *A written agreement of these costs exists from the JS* * *Costs are justified in the Report and within the programme flexibility rule* |
| Costs are correctly allocated to the relevant cost categories. |  |  |  | *e.g., Inspected list of expenditures.* |
| Costs are declared only once. |  |  |  | *e.g., Inspected the list of expenditures and verified that expenditures had not been declared twice in different cost categories or in previous reporting periods.* |
| **(NOT needed for flat rates, unit costs, lump sums, depreciation):**  [according to Articles 63(2), Article 67(2) CPR, Art 74 1a(i) CPR]  Expenditure was incurred and paid in the project eligibility period and supported by the proof of payment. |  |  |  | *e.g., Verified that preparation expenditure foreseen in the approved AF is incurred between 1 January 2021 and the date of the approval of the AF by MC.*  *e.g., Implementation expenditure is incurred and paid within the starting date of the project set in the co-financing contract and the end of the relevant reporting period.* |
| **(NOT needed for flat rates, unit costs or lump sums):**  Expenditure is supported by invoices or documents of equivalent probative value, which are correct in content and accounting terms. |  |  |  |  |
| Ineligible costs according to the Regulations and programme rules are excluded from the Report |  |  |  | *e.g., Article 64 CPR* |
| VAT for projects where total costs equal to/ over 5 million Euro (incl. VAT) is deducted if recoverable under national legislation |  |  |  | *e.g., Article 64 1(c) CPR* |
| The co-financed products and services were delivered, or delivery is in progress. |  |  |  | *e.g., Inspected project evidence provided with the partner report, in particular agendas and signed attendance lists of meetings, written outputs, pictures, etc.; OR performed own research, in particular search on the internet, OR obtained external confirmation of the project's existence, in particular from...' or 'Inspected the project partner and activities on the spot.*  *In the case of the Last implementation Report..* |
| Project partner has received the programme funds from the previous periods within the timeframe agreed by all partners. |  |  |  | *e.g., Inspected in the bank statement* |
| The total partner budget, and budget per cost category were respected. |  |  |  | *e.g., Verified that accumulated partner expenditure is within the partner budget of the latest version of the approved AF. If not, differences have been covered by the budget flexibility or explained/approved by the [Select: lead partner, joint secretariat, managing authority, Monitoring Committee].* |
| If the partner contribution does not come from the partner's own resources but from an external public source, the total public contribution has not been exceeded. |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General comments, recommendations, points to follow-up; NOTE: deductions (if any) are allocated to the relevant cost categories (*NOTE for Monitoring systems*: section appears if the question "Are there findings?" has been answered with a YES) | | |
| Description of findings, observations and limitations | n.a. |  |
| Conclusions and recommendations | n.a. |  |
| Follow-up measures for the next progress report | n.a. |  |

**On-the-spot verifications (OPTIONAL)**

Guide to programmes and Controllers: The Control checklist does not make any assumptions on where the verifications take place (administrative, on-the-spot, interviews in the office of the controller). HIT added a separate list for on-the-spot verifications anyway. The advantage of having such a list is to emphasise the types of verifications expected on the spot. For programmes not needing such a list, on-the-spot verifications will be part of the normal Control Checklist (same verification objective, different verification method).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **On-the-spot verifications** | | | **Accepted** | | | **Comments** |
| **Yes** | **Not (fully)** | **n.a.** |
| Documents submitted match the originals. | | |  |  |  |  |
| Documents are correctly archived. | | |  |  |  |  |
| *Option for programmes to add mandatory verification(s) (if necessary)* | | |  |  |  |  |
| General comments, recommendations, points to follow-up; NOTE: deductions (if any) are allocated to the relevant cost categories | | | | | | |
| Description of findings, observations and limitations | n.a. |  | | | | |
| Conclusions and recommendations | n.a. |  | | | | |
| Follow-up measures for the next progress report | n.a. |  | | | | |

**3. Eligibility along cost categories**

**3.1 Staff costs**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Staff costs - ONLY in the case of SIMPLIFIED COST OPTIONS (OPTIONAL)[[13]](#footnote-13)** | | | | | |
| Criteria – Simplified cost option  [according to Article 39(3)(c) of the Interreg Regulation - flat rate, Article 55(2) CPR - unit costs]] | **Accepted** | | | **Comments[[14]](#footnote-14)** | **Index No.[[15]](#footnote-15)** |
| **Yes** | **Not (fully)** | **n.a.** |  |  |
| The staff calculation option is in line with programme rules. |  |  |  | *e.g., Verified that the flat rate for staff costs is in line with the programme rules and the subsidy contract.* |  |
| Staff costs are calculated correctly. |  |  |  | *e.g., Recalculated simplified staff costs using the calculation scheme.*  *(in the case of up to 20% flat rate):*  *Staff costs calculated on a flat rate basis are up to 20% of the direct costs other than staff costs of that project partner*  *e.g., In the case of unit costs, the multiplication is correct (number of hours reported multiplied by the unit cost as set in programme eligibility rules).* |  |
| ***(only in the case of unit costs):[[16]](#footnote-16)***  Persons who declared staff costs are employees of the beneficiary or work under a contract considered as an employment contract. |  |  |  | *e.g., Inspected employment/work contracts and contracts considered as employment contracts of individuals declaring staff costs (part-time and full-time).* |  |
| ***(only in the case of unit costs):***  Written agreements exist outlining work for the project. |  |  |  | *e.g., Inspected agreements of employees declaring staff costs (part-time and full-time).* |  |
| ***(only in the case of unit costs):***  The number of hours worked on the project is documented in a time registration system. |  |  |  | *e.g., verified that the timesheets of persons claiming staff costs are in line with the number of working hours claimed.* |  |
| ***(only in the case of unit costs):***  The total number of hours declared per person for a given year or month do not exceed the number of hours used for the calculation of the hourly rate. |  |  |  | *Article 55(3) CPR* |  |
| *Option for programmes to add mandatory verification(s) (if necessary)* |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Staff Costs - ONLY in the case of REAL COSTS reimbursement (OPTIONAL) [[17]](#footnote-17)** | | | | | |
| **Criteria – Real costs**  [according to Article 39 of the Interreg Regulation and Article 55(5) CPR] | **Accepted** | | | **Comments** | **Index No.** |
| **Yes** | **Not (fully)** | **n.a.** |  |  |
| Persons who declared staff costs are employees of the project partner or work under a contract considered as an employment document. |  |  |  | *e.g., Inspected employment/ work contracts and contracts considered as employment contracts of individuals declaring staff costs (part-time and full-time).* |  |
| A document defining the percentage worked on the project (100% or less) is available (e.g., task assignment letter). |  |  |  | *e.g., Inspected agreements of persons declaring staff costs (part-time and full-time).* |  |
| ***(in the case of the fixed percentage method – for part-time assignments)***  The task assignment document OR other similar documentation defining the tasks and percentage of work on the project per employee exists. |  |  |  | *e.g., Task assignment document; employment/ work contracts if task assignment (with percentage and tasks is part of the contract)* |  |
| ***(in the case of the fixed percentage method – for part-time assignments)***  The task assignment document OR other similar documentation defining the tasks and percentage of work on the project per employee is up-to-date. |  |  |  | *e.g., The correct version (valid from) of the task assignment document is in place.* |  |
| ***(in the case of the fixed percentage method – for part-time assignments)***  The fixed percentage worked on the project is plausible in relation to tasks and acitivites within the project and the job profile of the employee. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The percentage worked on the project is correctly applied to calculate the eligible staff costs. |  |  |  |  |  |
| If the staff is involved in several projects, it is ensured that not more than 100% of the time is reported (e.g., task assignment letters for all projects are not for more than 100%). |  |  |  |  |  |
| Staff costs to which the percentage is applied are limited to salary payments and other costs directly linked to salary payments incurred and paid by the employer for the employee working on the project. |  |  |  | *e.g., Inspected, e.g., payrolls/payslips, print-out of accounting system, etc. of employees working on the project (part-time and full-time) and verified that staff costs are based on salary payments plus any other costs directly linked to salary payments incurred and paid by the employer such as employment taxes and social security including pensions provided that they are:*   * *(i) fixed in an employment document or by law;* * *(ii) in accordance with the legislation refer red to in the employment document and with standard practices in the country and/or organisation where the individual staff member is actually working; and*   *(iii) not recoverable by the employer.* |  |
| *Option for programmes to add mandatory verification(s) (if necessary)* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Option for Controllers to add risk-based verification (if necessary)[[18]](#footnote-18)* |  |  |  |  |  |

**3.2 Other costs (Staff costs \* up to 40%)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria – Simplified cost options**  [according to Article 56 CPR]  Flat rate (up to 40% of eligible direct staff costs to calculate the remaining eligible costs of the project). No real costs are acceptable. | **Accepted** | | | **Comments** | **Index No.** |
| **Yes** | **Not (fully)** | **n.a.** |
| The flat rate is calculated correctly. |  |  |  | *e.g., The correct percentage is applied on top of the eligible direct staff costs* |  |
| The staff costs are eligible. |  |  |  | *e.g., Verification of the staff costs will depend on the reimbursement method used (real costs, incl. the fixed percentage method, or unit costs; i.e., flat rate for staff costs cannot be used).* |  |
| *Option for programmes to add mandatory verification(s) (if necessary)* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Option for Controllers to add risk-based verification (if necessary)* |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General comments, recommendations, points to follow-up; NOTE: deductions (if any) are allocated to the relevant cost categories. (Note: section appears if the question "Are there findings?" has been answered with a YES) | | |
| Description of findings, observations and limitations | n.a. |  |
| Conclusions and recommendations | n.a. |  |
| Follow-up measures for the next progress report | n.a. |  |

**3.3 Office and administrative costs**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Office and administrative costs - ONLY in the case of SIMPLIFIED COST OPTIONS [[19]](#footnote-19)** | | | | | |
| **Criteria – Simplified cost option** [according to Article 54 CPR and Article 40(2) of the Interreg Regulation] | **Accepted** | | | **Comments** | **Index No.** |
| **Yes** | **Not (fully)** | **n.a.** |
| The flat rate is calculated correctly. |  |  |  | *e.g., The correct percentage is applied.* |  |
| There is no double declaration of the same cost item in other cost categories. |  |  |  | *e.g., Verified that cost items listed in Article 40 of the Interreg Regulation had not been included in other cost categories.* |  |
| The basis costs to calculate flat rate are eligible. |  |  |  | *e.g., Verification of the basis costs will depend on the reimbursement method used.* |  |

**3.4. Travel and accommodation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria – Real costs**  [according to Article 41 of the Interreg Regulation] | **Accepted** | | | **Comments** | **Index No.** |
| **Yes** | **Not (fully)** | **n.a.** |
| Travels are related to the project activities. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Travel and accommodation costs relate to the partner organisation's staff or natural persons who work under a contract considered as employment document of the partner organisation or associated partners. |  |  |  | *e.g., Inspected invoices and documents of equivalent probative value to ensure that costs were incurred by employees or persons working under contracts considered as employment contracts. Inspected that travel costs of external experts are included under External expertise and services category* |  |
| *Option for programmes to add mandatory verification(s) (if necessary)* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Option for Controllers to add risk-based verification (if necessary)* |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Travel and Accommodation - ONLY in the case of SIMPLIFIED COST OPTIONS (OPTIONAL) [[20]](#footnote-20)** | | | | | |
| **Criteria – Simplified cost option** [according to Article 41(5) of the Interreg Regulation] | **Accepted** | | | **Comments** | **Index No.** |
| **Yes** | **Not (fully)** | **n.a.** |
| The flat rate is calculated correctly. |  |  |  | *e.g., The correct percentage is applied on top of the direct staff costs of the partner.* |  |
| There is no double declaration of the same cost item in other cost categories. |  |  |  | *e.g., Verified that cost items listed in Article 41(1) of the Interreg Regulation had not been included in other cost categories.* |  |
| The staff costs are eligible. |  |  |  | *e.g., Verification of the staff costs will depend on the reimbursement method used.* |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General comments, recommendations, points to follow-up; NOTE: deductions (if any) are allocated to the relevant cost categories. (Note: section appears if the question "Are there findings?" has been answered with a YES) | | |
| Description of findings, observations and limitations | n.a. |  |
| Conclusions and recommendations | n.a. |  |
| Follow-up measures for the next progress report | n.a. |  |

**3.5. External expertise and services**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| External expertise and services were acquired in this reporting period | Yes | No |
| (if yes) Refer to Section 4 for verifying public procurements |  | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria – Real costs**  [according to Article 42 of the Interreg Regulation] | | | **Accepted** | | | **Comments** | **Index No.** |
| **Yes** | **Not (fully)** | **n.a.** |
| Providers of services or expertise are external to the project partnership. | | |  |  |  | *e.g., Interviewed the project partner to verify that external expert or service providers are not employees of the project partnership.* |  |
| The types of costs listed under this cost category are eligible according to EU and programme rules. | | |  |  |  | *e.g., Verified that the types of costs listed under this cost category are eligible according to Article 42 of the Interreg Regulation.* |  |
| Invoices or documents of equivalent probative value are in line with the contract(s) or, where applicable, with the selected offer, in terms of amount and nature. | | |  |  |  | *e.g., Inspected invoices and documents of equivalent probative value to verify that they are in accordance with the contract(s).* |  |
| ***(in the case of experts or services that are NOT exclusively used for the project)***  The share allocated to the project is plausible; i.e., calculated according to a fair, equitable and verifiable method. | | |  |  |  | *e.g.,Verified that only a share of the expenditure is allocated to the project and that this share is calculated according to a fair, equitable and verifiable method.* |  |
|  | | |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Option for programmes to add mandatory verification(s) (if necessary)* | | |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Option for Controllers to add risk-based verification (if necessary)* | | |  |  |  |  |  |
| General comments, recommendations, points to follow-up; NOTE: deductions (if any) are allocated to the relevant cost categories. (Note: section appears if the question "Are there findings?" is answered with a YES) | | | | | | | |
| Description of findings, observations and limitations | n.a. |  | | | | | |
| Conclusions and recommendations | n.a. |  | | | | | |
| Follow-up measures for the next progress report | n.a. |  | | | | | |

**3.6. Equipment**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| New equipment is reported | Yes | No |
| (if yes) Refer to Section 4 for verifying public procurements |  | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria – Real costs**  [according to Article 43 of the Interreg Regulation] | | | **Accepted** | | | **Comments** | **Index No.** |
| **Yes** | **Not (fully)** | **n.a.** |
| The types of costs listed under the cost categories are eligible according to EU and programme rules. | | |  |  |  | *e.g., Verified that the types of costs listed under the cost categories are eligible according to* *Article 43 of the Interreg Regulation.* |  |
| Invoices or documents of equivalent probative value are in line with the contract(s) or, where applicable, the selected offer in terms of amount and nature. | | |  |  |  | *e.g., Inspected invoices and documents of equivalent probative value to verify that they are in accordance with the contracts in terms of amount and nature.* |  |
| The method used to calculate equipment expenditure (full costs, pro rata, depreciation) is correctly applied in line with EU and programme rules. | | |  |  |  | *e.g., Verified that the calculation methods used complies with rules .*  *e.g., For pro-rata calculation, the share allocated to the project is based on a fair, equitable and verifiable calculation method.*  *E.g., For depreciation: it is in line with Article 67(2) CPR and programme rules* |  |
| Equipment is available and used for the intended project purpose | | |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Option for programmes to add mandatory verification(s) (if necessary)* | | |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Option for Controllers to add risk-based verification (if necessary)* | | |  |  |  |  |  |
| General comments, recommendations, points to follow-up; NOTE: deductions (if any) are allocated to the relevant cost categories. (Note: section appears if the question "Are there findings?" is answered with a YES) | | | | | | | |
| Description of findings, observations and limitations | n.a. |  | | | | | |
| Conclusions and recommendations | n.a. |  | | | | | |
| Follow-up measures for the next progress report | n.a. |  | | | | | |

**3.7 Infrastructure and works**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria – Real costs**  [according to Article 44 of the Interreg Regulation] | | | **Accepted** | | | **Comments** | **Index No.** |
| **Yes** | **Not (fully)** | **n.a.** |
| Providers of infrastructure and works are external to the project partnership. | | |  |  |  |  |  |
| Invoices or documents of equivalent probative value are in line with the contract(s) or, where applicable, the selected offer in terms of amount and nature. | | |  |  |  | *e.g., Inspected invoices and documents of equivalent probative value to verify that they are in accordance with the contract(s) or selected offers.* |  |
| ***(in the case of infrastructure and works that are NOT exclusively used for the project)***  The share allocated to the project is plausible; i.e., calculated according to a fair, equitable and verifiable method. | | |  |  |  | *e.g., Verified that only a share of the expenditure is allocated to the project and that this share is calculated according to a fair, equitable and verifiable method.* |  |
| *Option for programmes to add mandatory verification(s) (if necessary)* | | |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Option for Controllers to add risk-based verification (if necessary)* | | |  |  |  |  |  |
| General comments, recommendations, points to follow-up; NOTE: deductions (if any) are allocated to the relevant cost categories. (Note: section appears if the question "Are there findings?" is answered with a YES) | | | | | | | |
| Description of findings, observations and limitations | n.a. |  | | | | | |
| Conclusions and recommendations | n.a. |  | | | | | |
| Follow-up measures for the next progress report | n.a. |  | | | | | |

**3.8 Lump sums (using several cost categories)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria – Simplified cost option**  Lump sums (using several cost categories). No real costs are acceptable. | | | **Accepted** | | | **Comments** | **Index No.** |
| **Yes** | **Not (fully)** | **n.a.** |
| Amounts are in line with the applicable programme, national and internal rules of the partner organisation. | | |  |  |  |  |  |
| If relevant, did the activity/event take place and are potential deliverables of service provided? | | |  |  |  | *e.g., Events, services delivered* |  |
| *Option for programmes to add mandatory verification(s) (if necessary)* | | |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Option for Controllers to add risk-based verification (if necessary)* | | |  |  |  |  |  |
| General comments, recommendations, points to follow-up; NOTE: deductions (if any) are allocated to the relevant cost categories. (Note: section appears if the question "Are there findings?" was answered with a YES) | | | | | | | |
| Description of findings, observations and limitations | n.a. |  | | | | | |
| Conclusions and recommendations | n.a. |  | | | | | |
| Follow-up measures for the next progress report | n.a. |  | | | | | |

**3.9 Unit costs (using several cost categories)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria – Simplified cost option**  Unit costs (using several cost categories). No real costs acceptable. | | | **Accepted** | | | **Comments** | **Index No.** |
| **Yes** | **Not (fully)** | **n.a.** |
| Amounts are in line with the applicable programme, national and internal rules of the partner organisation. | | |  |  |  |  |  |
| If relevant, did the activity/event take place and are potential deliverables of service provided? | | |  |  |  | *e.g. Events, services delivered* |  |
| *Option for programmes to add mandatory verification(s) (if necessary)* | | |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Option for Controllers to add risk-based verification (if necessary)* | | |  |  |  |  |  |
| General comments, recommendations, points to follow-up; NOTE: deductions (if any) are allocated to the relevant cost categories. (Note: section appears if the question "Are there findings?" was answered with a YES) | | | | | | | |
| Description of findings, observations and limitations | n.a. |  | | | | | |
| Conclusions and recommendations | n.a. |  | | | | | |
| Follow-up measures for the next progress report | n.a. |  | | | | | |

**5. Compliance with information and publicity requirements**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria – Real costs**  [according to Annex IX CPR and Articles 46, 47 and 49(6) CPR]. | | | **Accepted** | | | **Comments** | **Index No.** |
| **Yes** | **Not (fully)** |  |
| Information and publicity rules of the EU were complied with.[[21]](#footnote-21) | | |  |  |  | *e.g., Inspected project publicity items, including brochures, agendas of conferences, studies and deliverables to ensure they meet the publicity requirements outlined in Annex XII CPR.* |  |
| All communication and visibility material is made available upon request, and use of such material is granted to the Union | | |  |  |  | *e.g., Communication and visibility material has been inspected and contains Union rights of use according to Article 47 CPR.* |  |
| General comments, recommendations, points to follow-up; NOTE: deductions (if any) are allocated to the relevant cost categories. (Note: section appears if the question "Are there findings?" was answered with a YES) | | | | | | | |
| Description of findings, observations and limitations | n.a. |  | | | | | |
| Conclusions and recommendations | n.a. |  | | | | | |
| Follow-up measures for the next progress report | n.a. |  | | | | | |

**6. Compliance with other EU rules**

Guide to programmes and controllers: Control is asked here for a professional judgement as a controller based on experience and training, but not for the expertise of EU policies on sustainable development, equal opportunities and non-discrimination, equality between men and women, or State Aid. Controller is asked to confirm that he/she has not come across anything that made him/her doubt that the EU horizontal principles are not adhered to.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria – Real costs** | | | **Accepted** | | | **Comments** | | | **Index No.** |
| **Yes** | **Not (fully)** | **n.a.** |
| [according to Article 3 of the Treaty on the European Union (TEU)]  There is no evidence that the project activities do not comply with the EU horizontal principle of sustainable development. | | |  |  |  | *e.g., Compared the partner report to the AF and verified that activities are in line with the AF and do not raise any new issues.* |  | | |
| There is no evidence that equipment purchased does not comply with EU and national legislation in terms of environmental impacts, required permits, etc. | | |  |  |  | *e.g., Verified based on my professional judgement as a controller that compulsory requirements set by the EU and national legislation related to respective equipment are fulfilled (e.g., environmental impacts, permits, etc.).* |  | | |
| There is no evidence that infrastructure and works do not comply with EU and national legislation in terms of environmental impacts, required permits, etc. | | |  |  |  | *e.g., Verified based on my professional judgement as a controller that compulsory requirements set by the EU and national legislation related to respective infrastructure and works are fulfilled (e.g., environmental impact assessment, building permissions, etc.).* |  | | |
| Based on the available information,the project activities comply with the EU horizontal principle of gender equality and non-discrimination. | | |  |  |  | *e.g., Compared the partner report to the AF and verified that activities are in line with the AF and do not raise any new issues.* |  | | |
| Based on the available information the project activities comply with EU and programme rules on State Aid. | | |  |  |  | *e.g., Compared the partner report to the AF and verified that activities are in line with the AF and do not raise any new issues.*  *e.g., Verified that the project partner does not exceed the de minimis threshold and is not 'in difficulty'.* |  | | |
| *Option for programmes to add mandatory verification (if necessary)* | | |  |  |  |  | |  | |
| General comments, recommendations, points to follow-up; NOTE: deductions (if any) are allocated to the relevant cost categories. (Note: section appears if the question "Are there findings?" was answered with a YES) | | | | | | | | | |
| Description of findings, observations and limitations | n.a. |  | | | | | | | |
| Conclusions and recommendations | n.a. |  | | | | | | | |
| Follow-up measures for the next progress report | n.a. |  | | | | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Controller's signature** | |
| Validation body (only applicable for Portugal and Spain) |  |
| Date | *pre-filled in automatic systems (date when Checklist is generated)* |
| Name | *pre-filled in automatic systems* |
| Signature |  |
| Official stamp of the institution (if applicable) |  |

Procurement Checklist

This is a Procurement checklist template for standard projects applying for funds in any Interreg strand.

The main objectives of this template are:

* To reflect the work and scope done by controllers regarding the procurement verifications
* To outline a minimum set of fields and optional fields that programmes can choose. Programmes can also add additional fields and clarifications, if necessary.

Guide for monitoring systems developers:

* This section appears only if public procurement is indicated in the List of Expenditures.
* This section should be repeated (duplicated) for each public procurement (button: 'add public procurement'). Purchases below a certain amount (amount to be set by the programme) can be combined in one table. For example, there could be one table for all purchases below national public procurement thresholds.

To reach a high level of harmonisation, the HIT tools should be used as much as possible as they are. The tools have been designed based on an agreed structure that avoids asking for similar information in different contexts.

If needed, the following flexibility principles can be applied:

* It is possible to change the order of main parts or questions within each part.
* Changes that don't disrupt the main logic of sections/questions are possible. The logic can be disrupted when one change influences some other part(s) of the tool.
* Optional questions (in yellow) can be left out partially or in full.
* Multiple languages are possible by adding fields to enter the text in other languages.
* The maximum length of text for answers will be decided by programmes because this depends on technical options in their online monitoring system.

###### Compliance with procurement rules

Purpose and logic:

* Section 7 of the control checklist could be filled for each contract individually. In this case, the system would ideally allow the section to be repeated/duplicated.
* The applicability of the procurement rules depends, among others, on the legal status of the awarding institution.
* For partners not falling under public procurement rules[[22]](#footnote-22) sections 7.a (contracting amounts below EUR 10.000) and 7.b (contracting amounts above EUR 10,000) will be used.
* For partners falling under public procurement rules, sections 7.a, 7.b and 7.c are used:
  + contracting amounts below EUR 10.000 (excl. VAT - unless the threshold set by the applicable national rules is stricter) section 7.a is to be filled once for all the contracts reported in the period. 7.b. For those beneficiaries not falling under the scope of procurement rules this section is to be filled in from EUR 10.000 and above. For those falling under the scope of public procurement rules this section is to be filled in for amounts between EUR 10.000 and the threshold set by the applicable EU and national rules. For contracting amounts above the threshold set by the applicable EU or national rules section 7.c has to be filled in.
* In cases where public procurement procedures were already checked during previous reporting periods, the national controller is to include a comment accordingly. In the case of a change in the contract, the relevant section has to be filled in again.
* Any deductions necessary following infringement of procurement rules are to be reported under the respective cost categories in this checklist.

7.a Contracting amounts below EUR 10.000 (excl. VAT) unless the threshold set by the applicable national rules is stricter *(applicable to all types of beneficiaries – to be filled in only once for all contracts)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Verifications | Confirmed | | |
| Yes | No | n.a. |
| 1. The value for money of costs was ensured and demonstrated. |  |  |  |
| 1. There is no evidence of artificial splitting of the contract objective/value. |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Results, comments, recommendations, points to follow-up (if any).**  *NOTE: deductions (if any) are allocated to the relevant cost categories* |
|  |

7.b Contracting between EUR 10.000 (excl. VAT) and the threshold set by the applicable EU or national rules. For those beneficiaries not falling under the scope of procurement rules this section is to be filled in from EUR 10.000 and above. *(applicable to all types of beneficiaries – to be duplicated and filled in for each contract)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Title of the procurement – if Applicable |  | | | | | |
| Type of procurement | services | works | | | supply | |
| Name of purchased services/work/supply |  | | | | | |
| Name of contractor  *(for purchases between EUR 10.000 excl. VAT and the applicable threshold)* |  | | | | | |
| Total amount as per contract (excl. VAT) |  | | | | | |
| Verifications | | | Confirmed | | | |
| Yes | No | | n.a. |
| 1. Adequate market researches were performed and are duly documented (if applicable, according to the national rules and/or programme manual). | | |  |  | |  |
| 1. There is no evidence of artificial splitting of the contract objective/value. | | |  |  | |  |
| If applicable, any amendment of the contract is in line with the applicable procurement rules without putting into question the validity of the initial procurement procedure?  *(Only in cases where a contract amendment/extension has been issued)* | | |  |  | |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Results, comments, recommendations, points to follow-up (if any).** NOTE: deductions (if any) are allocated to the relevant cost categories. |
|  |

7.c. Contracting amounts above the threshold set by the applicable National or EU rules (*for institutions falling under the scope of application of the public procurement laws* *– to be duplicated and filled in for each contract*)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Title of the procurement |  | | | | | | |
| Name of contractor |  | | | | | | |
| Total amount as per contract (excl. VAT) |  | | | | | | |
| The value of the procured works, goods or services is above the EU threshold. | Yes | | | no | | | |
| Type of tender | services | works | | | | supply | |
| Procurement procedure chosen (open, restricted, negotiated, direct contracting, etc.). |  | | | | | | |
| Channels/means chosen for publication |  | | | | | | |
| VAT number (or other identifier) | *To be filled if contract above EU-threshold* | | | | | | |
| Contract reference number | *To be filled if contract above EU-threshold* | | | | | | |
| Date of contract | *To be filled if contract above EU-threshold* | | | | | | |
| Verifications | | | Confirmed | | | | |
| Yes | | No | | n.a. |
| 1. EU, national and any other applicable public procurement rules were observed; *e.g.,*   *Complies with the applicable rules;*  *Publicity requirement were respected;*  *The principles of transparency, non-discrimination, equal treatment, effective competition have been complied with;*  *There was a clear distinction between selection and award criteria in the evaluation of the bids;*  *Selection and award criteria and required technical specifications and national permits are transparent, nondiscriminatory and ensure equal treatment;*  *Decisions are properly documented and justified.*  *No cases of actual or potential conflict of interest came to the attention of the controller, or the conflict of interest policy was followed where applicable* | | |  | |  | |  |
| 1. The procurement procedure is documented and available (If documentation is not required, please tick *n.a.* and provide an explanation in the comments section)*,*   *e.g.,*  *Initial cost estimate made by the project partner to identify the applicable public procurement procedure;*  *Request for offers or procurement publication/notice;*  *Terms of reference (TOR);*  *Offers/quotes received;*  *Report on assessment of bids (evaluation/selection report);*  *Information on acceptance and rejection (notification of bidders);*  *Legal remedies / contradictory procedure / complaints;*  *The contract including any amendments and in line with the selected offer, etc.* | | |  | |  | |  |
| 1. There is no evidence of artificial splitting of the contract objective/value. | | |  | |  | |  |
| 1. If applicable, any amendment of the contract is in line with the relevant public procurement rules without any relevant impact on the validity of the initial procurement procedure.   *(Only if the contract was amended or extended).* | | |  | |  | |  |
| 1. If the partner organisation decided to award the contract directly (negotiated procedure without prior publication), the decision is justified and documented.   *For direct awards because of:*   * *Urgency: it is proven that the urgency is due to unforeseeable circumstances.* * *Technical/exclusivity reasons: it is ruled out (based on objective evidence) that any other supplier is capable of providing the services.), etc.* | | |  | |  | |  |
| 1. The invoices have been issued and payments have been made in respect of the products and services delivered and the tender (in terms of nature, procurement budget and the amounts fixed in the contract/accepted offer). | | |  | |  | |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Results, comments, recommendations, points to follow-up (if any).**  *NOTE: deductions (if any) are allocated to the relevant cost categories.* |
|  |

1. Not needed if merged with Control certificate or Control checklist. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The nominated Control body responsible for Control on a programme, national, regional or local level. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. In cases where the control function is delegated to intermediate bodies. 'Intermediate body' means any public or private law body which acts under the responsibility of a managing authority, or which carries out functions or tasks on behalf of such an authority. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Peer review (i.e., another controller checks the work done by the primary controller) is suggested as a way of ensuring good quality of verifications. However, not all Control systems have the capacity to do this. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. There are two options: either points 5.a, 5.b and 5.c are in separate fields or they are combined into one. If they are combined into one, information is shown per budget line (see 5.a, 5.b and 5.c - Alternative). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. This optional information can be useful to clarify the roles of Control, LP and JS/MA. It could be included in the control report or in programme guidance documents/manuals. The table and the text should be fully adjusted according to programme needs. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Further in the document referred to as Interreg Regulation. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Further in the document referred to as CPR. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Further in the document referred to as ERDF/CF Regulation. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. To be updated once the final version is available [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. The ‘General considerations/eligibility criteria’ column contains only basic information on the criteria. Programmes may want to provide more detailed instructions on programme rules and/or the types of verifications expected. E.g., information from the ‘comments column’ could be moved to the ‘General considerations/eligibility criteria’ column. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Text in the ‘comments’ box are EXAMPLES only. It needs to be adjusted according to programme rules. Some programmes will move some of this information to the left column (‘general considerations/eligibility criteria’) to specify the eligibility criteria. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Staff costs can be reimbursed as real costs and/or simplified cost option. Programmes choose tables according to their programme rules. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Text in the ‘comments’ box are EXAMPLES only. It needs to be adjusted according to programme rules. Some programmes will move some of this information to the left column (‘general considerations/eligibility criteria’) to specify the eligibility criteria. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Refers to the Index number assigned by the controller to inspected documents. It is optional for programmes and controllers to use the Index Number system. Experience has shown that auditors often encounter situations in which it was not clear to them which documents were actually used for verifications and for which purpose. So adding this is an option to document better Control work. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Additional fields only for programmes using unit costs. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Not used in programmes that do not use real costs reimbursement of staff costs. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. If this option is chosen by programmes, the Controller can add verifications here if certain risks were detected and additional verifications are necessary. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Office and administrative costs can be reimbursed as real costs or a flat rate can be used. However, according to HIT, only flat rate should be used. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Travel and accommodation costs can be reimbursed as real costs or a flat rate can be used. Programmes choose tables according to their programme rules. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Project websites are monitored by the joint secretariat in terms of publicity requirements, content and regular updates. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. For example, private partners unless explicitly governed by public procurement rules based on national rules, [↑](#footnote-ref-22)