###### Control Report

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1.Partner progress report** | |
| Interreg programme and/or logo |  |
| Project title |  |
| Project acronym |  |
| Project ID |  |
| Approved implementation period |  |
| Reporting period |  |
| Partner Report Number |  |
| Report date (first time submitted) |  |
| Report date (resubmitted with complete documentation) |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1.2 Format of documents** | | | |
| Documents were made available to 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 partner** | |
| Name of partner organisation in English language |  |
| Name of partner organisation in original language |  |
| Partner number |  |
| Partner role in the project  *(Lead partner, Project partner)* |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Designated Project Partner Controller | | | | | |
| Control body responsible for the verification |  | | | | |
| Name of the controller |  | | | | |
| Job title |  | | | | |
| Division/Unit/Department |  | | | | |
| Address |  | | | | |
| Country |  | | | | |
| Telephone Number |  | | | | |
| Email |  | | | | |
| Controller – Reviewer (if applicable)[[1]](#footnote-1) |  | | | | |
| 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) *Briefly describe 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 |  | | | | |
| Date(s) of requests for clarifications, if applicable |  | | | | |
| Date of receipt of satisfactory clarifications, if applicable |  | | | | |
| End of control work |  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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)* |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Description of findings, observations and limitations; Conclusions and recommendations** | | | |
|  |  | Comment | Typology of errors |
| General | n.a. |  |  |
| Staff Cost | n.a. |  |  |
| Office and administration | 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. |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Controller's signature** (applicable if Control report and Control checklist are separate documents) | |
| Date |  |
| Name |  |
| Signature |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **6. Follow-up measures for the next progress report** | |
| n.a. |  |

1. 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-1)