



UNIONE EUROPEA



**REGIONE AUTÒNOMA DE SARDIGNA
REGIONE AUTONOMA DELLA SARDEGNA**



MEDITERRANEAN SEA BASIN ENI CBC PROGRAMME 2014-2020

DESCRIPTION OF THE MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL SYSTEMS (DMCS)

ANNEX 9

CHECK LIST VERIFICATIONS JOINT TECHNICAL SECRETARIAT



Negotiation Check grid - JTS/BOs check

Acronym and Reference number:					
First check					
Officer:			Officer:		
Signature:			Signature:		
Date:			Date:		
Second check					
Officer:			Officer:		
Signature:			Signature:		
Date:			Date:		
OUTCOMES: recommendations are fulfilled – acceptable					
YES					
A	Check on JMC / EU Commission comments	YES/NO/NA	Comments/recommendations	YES/NO/NA	Check on the fulfillment / Comments/recommendations
A.1	Are there any EC/JMC minor corrections / clarification / recommendations addressed to the Applicant?	NA			
B	Check on the external assessors / PSC evaluation grids	YES/NO/NA	Comments/recommendations	YES/NO/NA	Check on the fulfillment / Comments/recommendations
B.1	Are there any major weaknesses/inconsistencies/risks identified by the external assessors in the WPs description	NO			
B.2	Are there any major weaknesses/inconsistencies/risks identified by the external assessors listed in the Action Plan (consistency with the workpackage description)	NO			
B.3	Are there any major weaknesses/ inconsistencies/risks identified by the external assessors in the activities and outputs plan	NO			
B.4	Are there any major weaknesses/ inconsistencies/risks identified by the external assessors in the budget?	NO			
C	Specific checks on budget / activities	YES/NO/NA	Comments/recommendations	YES/NO/NA	Check on the fulfillment / Comments/recommendations
C.1	Bulk of the Action: is the management of the project under the responsibility of the Lead Beneficiary and Partners and only limited and specific portions of the activities are sub-contracted?	YES			
C.2	Are there activities planned outside the eligible and adjoining Programme area?	NO			
C.3	Are there management costs in the Subcontratcing Cost Category? If YES, please check any duplication with HR budget	NO			
C.4	Are costs for sub- grants within a) Maximum 30% of the total direct costs can be awarded as sub-grants; b) Maximum amount of the sub-grant per each third party is € 60.000	YES			
C.5	Are costs for external expenditures verification within 3% of the total eligible budget costs?	YES			
C.6	Are costs for infrastructures described and justified in the relevant sections of the WP description and budget?	NA			
D	Other				
D.1	Is there any other relevant issue?	YES			



Progress Report - JTS Check List	
PROJECT INFO	
Reference Number	
Acronym	
KEEP key words	
Duration	
Starting/ending date	
Total budget €	
ENI Contribution	
Report n°	
Reporting period	
Lead Beneficiary	
EU PPs/Countries	
MPC PPs/Countries	
Associated partners	
JTS Officers	
REPORT INFO (this section has to be filled by JTS PO)	
Reported expenditures	
Report status	
Notes	

n.	Question	Answer	Comments
1.1	Has the deadline for submission been respected?		
1.2	Is the report duly completed, described and in line with the approved proposal?		
1.3	If the answer is NOT: are missing information relevant and need to be integrated (i.e. the entire sections of logical framework and/or reported expenditures and/or WP implementation are empty)?		
1.4	Have the necessary integrations been requested?		
1.5	Have the integrations been provided within the deadline?		
1.6	Has the language of the project been respected?		
1.7	Is there any improvement from report to report?		
1.8	Has the ENI contribution been transferred to all partners according to the agreed amounts and deadlines as indicated in the PA?		
1.9	Are the referring supporting documents available on the MIS (e.g. bank statements)		
		Score	

4 - Very good: Outputs delivered are in line with the action plan and the description in the e-form. Achievement of the expected results seems feasible and very likely to be completed with potential good practice(s). All partners are fully committed and activities are jointly implemented. Few recommendations should be considered.

3 - Good: Overall the outputs delivered are in line with the action plan and the description in the e-form. Even if no good practice(s) are detected, activities are jointly implemented and expected results seems likely to be achieved. Minor issues require corrective actions.

2 - Problems: Although all main expected results are still likely to be achieved some of them may not or should be reconsidered.

1 - Serious deficiencies: Sensitive issues have been reported and need immediate corrective actions / measures.

n.	Question	Answer	Comments
	Reported expenditures		
2.1	Did all partners report the occurred expenditures?		
2.2	Are reported expenditures in line with the approved budget?		
2.3	Are reported expenditures in line with scheduled timing of the approved budget?		

Score	
--------------	--

4 - Very good: Outputs delivered are in line with the action plan and the description in the e-form. Achievement of the expected results seems feasible and very likely to be completed with potential good practice(s). All partners are fully committed and activities are jointly implemented. Few recommendations should be considered.
3 - Good: Overall the outputs delivered are in line with the action plan and the description in the e-form. Even if no good practice(s) are detected, activities are jointly implemented and expected results seems likely to be achieved. Minor issues require corrective actions.
2 - Problems: Although all main expected results are still likely to be achieved some of them may not or should be reconsidered.
1 - Serious deficiencies: Sensitive issues have been reported and need immediate corrective actions / measures.

n.	Question	Answer	Comments
3.1	Are there any major gaps between the planned partners contribution and their actual commitment?		
3.2	How has cross border cooperation being implemented? Is the approach effective?		
3.3	Have any additional activities aiming at creating new synergies with other projects at national and/or local level been implemented?		
3.4	Is there any evidence of synergies in terms of implemented activities and outputs delivered (according to what listed in the approved project proposal)?		
3.5	Have the locations of the action been respected as stated in the approved proposal?		
3.6	Is the state of play in line with the project proposal or are there any major modifications?		

Score	
-------	--

<p>4 - Very good: Outputs delivered are in line with the action plan and the description in the e-form. Achievement of the expected results seems feasible and very likely to be completed with potential good practice(s). All partners are fully committed and activities are jointly implemented. Few recommendations should be considered.</p>
<p>3 - Good: Overall the outputs delivered are in line with the action plan and the description in the e-form. Even if no good practice(s) are detected, activities are jointly implemented and expected results seems likely to be achieved. Minor issues require corrective actions.</p>
<p>2 - Problems: Although all main expected results are still likely to be achieved some of them may not or should be reconsidered.</p>
<p>1 - Serious deficiencies: Sensitive issues have been reported and need immediate corrective actions / measures.</p>

n.	Question	Answer	Comments
4.1	Staff assigned to the project and new jobs created as a result of project initiatives		
4.1.a	Is the staff of the project adequate in number and skills?		
4.1.b	Are the contracts signed by the Lead beneficiary, partners, associates or subcontractors adequate in number and quality of services delivered according to the project proposal references?		
4.1.c	Are the staff contracts (full-time and part-time) signed by the target groups as a result of project activities adequate in number according to the project proposal references?		
4.2	Participation and visibility		
4.2.a	Project events		
4.2.a.1	Have project events been realized according to the Communication Plan and in respect of the timeline?		
4.2.a.2	Is the number of participants to project events satisfactory?		
4.2.b	Partnership organizations website		
4.2.b.1	Is the number of visits to PPs' project related link satisfactory?		
4.2.c	Social media		
4.2.c.1	Are the social media activities satisfactory?		
4.2.d	Supporting documents		
4.2.d.1	Are the related supporting documents provided?		
4.3	Priority, expected results and indicators		
4.3.a	Is the total % of project values achieved (result indicators) in line with the project proposal (<i>according to project timeline</i>)?		
4.3.b	Is any adjustment needed concerning project results?		
4.4	Project outputs (WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6)		
4.4.a	tot. % of achieved values (output indicators) - <i>according to project timeline</i>		
4.4.b	Are the results of the quality assessment of outputs satisfactory?		
4.4.d	Is any adjustment needed concerning outputs delivery?		
4.4.e	Which is the level of effectiveness of output(s) already delivered?		
4.5	Overview of the outputs and (expected/actual) delivery		
4.5.a	Have the outputs been delivered according to timescheduling?		
4.5.b	Is the % of outputs delivered in line with the timescheduling?		

Score	
-------	--

4 - Very good: Outputs delivered are in line with the action plan and the description in the e-form. Achievement of the expected results seems feasible and very likely to be completed with potential good practice(s). All partners are fully committed and activities are jointly implemented. Few recommendations should be considered.
3 - Good: Overall the outputs delivered are in line with the action plan and the description in the e-form. Even if no good practice(s) are detected, activities are jointly implemented and expected results seems likely to be achieved. Minor issues require corrective actions.
2 - Problems: Although all main expected results are still likely to be achieved some of them may not or should be reconsidered.
1 - Serious deficiencies: Sensitive issues have been reported and need immediate corrective actions / measures.

n.	Question	Answer	Comments
5.1	Potential risks, external conditions and corrective measures		
5.1.a	Is there any expected or new potential risk(s) and/or external condition(s) which may prevent the project from completing all outputs and achieving all its expected results?		
5.1.b	Proposed/implemented solutions (if any)		

Score	3
-------	---

4 - Very good: Outputs delivered are in line with the action plan and the description in the e-form. Achievement of the expected results seems feasible and very likely to be completed with potential good practice(s). All partners are fully committed and activities are jointly implemented. Few recommendations should be considered.
3 - Good: Overall the outputs delivered are in line with the action plan and the description in the e-form. Even if no good practice(s) are detected, activities are jointly implemented and expected results seems likely to be achieved. Minor issues require corrective actions.
2 - Problems: Although all main expected results are still likely to be achieved some of them may not or should be reconsidered.
1 - Serious deficiencies: Sensitive issues have been reported and need immediate corrective actions / measures.

<p>4 - Very good: Outputs delivered are in line with the action plan and the description in the e-form. Achievement of the expected results seems feasible and very likely to be completed with potential good practice(s). All partners are fully committed and activities are jointly implemented. Few recommendations should be considered.</p>
<p>3 - Good: Overall the outputs delivered are in line with the action plan and the description in the e-form. Even if no good practice(s) are detected, activities are jointly implemented and expected results seems likely to be achieved. Minor issues require corrective actions.</p>
<p>2 - Problems: Although all main expected results are still likely to be achieved some of them may not or should be reconsidered.</p>
<p>1 - Serious deficiencies: Sensitive issues have been reported and need immediate corrective actions / measures.</p>

n.
7.1
7.1.a
7.1.b
7.1.c
7.1.d
7.2
7.2.a
7.2.b
7.2.c
7.3
7.3.a
7.3.b
7.3.c

Question	Answer	Comments
Selection		
Are sub-grants foreseen in the project implementation?		
Have the related selection procedures been launched?		
Are the procedures in line with the Programme guidelines and handbook (transparency, equal treatment, co-financing, no cumulative award, no retroactivity)?		
Is the type of financial regime chosen adequate?		
Management		
Are the sub-grants implemented according to the approved schedule?		
Are the sub-grants managed according to the state aid rules?		
Are the sub-grantees reports available and complete?		
Impact		
Is the planned result/impact of subgrants achieved or expected to be achieved?		
Is the number of beneficiaries selected in line with scheduled results?		
If not, are there any corrective measures in place?		

Score	
--------------	--

4 - Very good: Outputs delivered are in line with the action plan and the description in the e-form. Achievement of the expected results seems feasible and very likely to be completed with potential good practice(s). All partners are fully committed and activities are jointly implemented. Few recommendations should be considered.
3 - Good: Overall the outputs delivered are in line with the action plan and the description in the e-form. Even if no good practice(s) are detected, activities are jointly implemented and expected results seems likely to be achieved. Minor issues require corrective actions.
2 - Problems: Although all main expected results are still likely to be achieved some of them may not or should be reconsidered.
1 - Serious deficiencies: Sensitive issues have been reported and need immediate corrective actions / measures.

Session	Score	Final comments
1_Overview	0	
2_Reported expenditures	0	
3_Main findings	0	
4_Logical Framework	0	
5_Potential risks	3	
6_WPs implementation	0	
7_Sub-grants		

Total average score	
Any adjustment (<i>at Expert discretion</i>)	

FINAL SCORE	
FINAL COMMENT	

	Name and surname	Tot. Working days	Comments
JTS officer in charge			
Tematic Senior Expert involved			
Financial Expert involved (if the case)			here the reason for the involvement
Others experts involved (if the case)			here the reason for the involvement
Report evaluation starting date			
Validating date			
	Answer	Comments	
Any difficulties arised in interpreting the report?			
Was it necessary to ask clarifications to the LB?			
Has the timeline set for evaluating the report been respected?			

Interim / Final Report package - JTS Check List

PROJECT INFO	
Reference Number	
Acronym	
KEEP key words	
Duration	36 months
Starting/ending date	
Total budget €	
ENI Contribution	
Report n°	1st Interim Report
Reporting period	
Lead Beneficiary	
EU PPs/Countries	
MPC PPs/Countries	
Associated partners	
JTS Officers	
REPORT INFO (this section has to be filled by JTS PO)	
Reported expenditures	
Submitted Report Check – Start date	
Submitted Report Check – End date	
Request for clarification – date of request	
Request for clarification – date of receipt	
Clarification Check - Start date	
Clarification Check - End date	
Report status	
Notes	

Report n. 1
PRE-CONDITION FOR STARTING THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHECK

Question	Answer	Notes
Does the request of further pre-financing respect the requirements as set in art.7.2 of the Grant Contract?		
Have the required documents been submitted by using the appropriate templates and duly signed (when applicable)?		
Have the expenditure reports been signed by auditors certified by the respective national authorities?		
Have the required documents been submitted in the project language?		

ADMINISTRATIVE CHECK LIST

Questions	Original hard copies	Uploaded on MIS	Comments
Request for payment			
The reporting period is the one indicated in the Financial Report and in the EVR			
The reported amount correspond to the one indicated in the Financial report			
The Request for payment is issued by the same organisation signing the Grant Contract			
The Request for payment is signed by the legal representative of the LB organisation			
The LB declares that the original EVRs of the partners have been received and are available upon request			
Consolidated EVR			
The Consolidated EVR is duly completed and signed by the LB's Auditor			
The Consolidated list of factual findings is attached and duly completed			
The List of all contracts is duly completed and signed by the BEN Auditor			
Partners individual EVRs (including the LB)			
Every Partner's Individual EVR is duly signed by the PP's Auditor			
Every Partner's individual summary of project expenses is attached			
Every Partner's individual list of Factual findings is attached			
Every Partner's individual Auditor Check list is attached and duly signed			
Every Partner's Individual EVR has been transmitted to the respective CCP			
Narrative Report			
The narrative report is duly completed			
All outputs, deliverables and products have been uploded on the MIS			
Any other general remark			
Financial Report			
The financial report is duly completed and consistent with the auditors' documents			

Questions	Original hard copies	Uploaded on MIS	Comments
Other documents			
Are the De Minimis Declarations available, if the case may be?			
ONLY FOR THE FINAL REPORT: are the proofs of the transfers of ownership as referred to in Article 22.6 of the GC included?			
OTHER documents required: specify			

RESULT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHECK	ON CONDITION
---	---------------------

Reference Number0

Acronym0

Report n°1st Interim Report

JTS Checklist - INTERIM/FINAL FINANCIAL REPORT

CHECK ON COST CATEGORIES									
0	Overall Information	Yes/No/NA	Budget Lines	Ben	PP1	PP2	PP3	PP4	Comments
0,1	If forecasted, have expenditures under the 50% rule incurred?								
0,2	Are Bank interests indicated?								
0,3	Are any revenues indicated?								
0,4	The amount of reported and previous certified expenses is within the 20% flexibility for minor changes?								
0,5	Are the variations properly justified?								
0,7	Are there suggested JTS cuts for not respecting the state aid rules?								

1	Human Resources	Yes/No/NA	Budget Lines	Ben	PP1	PP2	PP3	PP4	Comments
1.1	Are there transparent recruitment procedures for new staff?	Yes							
1.2	Do the recruitment procedures include publicity of the opportunity for the potential candidates?	Yes							
1.3	Are job contracts / any similar type of contract according to national rules / designation or secondment order of civil servant for all project staff available?	Yes							
1.4	Are Monthly timesheets for staff partially devoted to the project available?	Yes							
1.5	Are Timesheets sufficiently detailed (name of the employee, date, time and description of the daily activity)?	No					No		
1.6	On the basis of the time-sheets check, is double funding excluded?	N/A							

2	Travel and Subsistance	Yes/No/NA	Budget Lines	Ben	PP1	PP2	PP3	PP4	Comments
2.1	Are per diem rates respected?	Yes		Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Information not available
2.2	Have travel costs and per diem outside eligible areas been identified?	No							No travels outside the programme area
2.3	If yes, have these costs been previously authorised by the MA?	N/A							

3	Infrastructures	Yes/No/NA	Budget Lines	Ben	PP1	PP2	PP3	PP4	Comments
3.1	Is any proof of physical existence of the infrastructures available?	N/A							
3.2	Are procedures of procurement over € 60.000 transparent?	N/A							
3.3	Have the procedures of procurement over € 60.000 received appropriate publicity?	N/A							
3.4	Is absence of conflict of interest ensured for all procurement procedures?	N/A							

4	Equipment and Supplies	Yes/No/NA	Budget Lines	Ben	PP1	PP2	PP3	PP4	Comments
4.1	Is any proof of physical existence of the equipment or supplies available?	N/A							
4.2	Are procedures of procurement over € 60.000 transparent?	N/A							
4.3	Have the procedures of procurement over € 60.000 received appropriate publicity?	N/A							
4.4	Is absence of conflict of interest ensured for all procurement procedures?	N/A							

5	Subcontracted Services	Yes/No/NA	Budget Lines	Ben	PP1	PP2	PP3	PP4	Comments
5.1	Are procedures of procurement over € 60.000 transparent?	Yes							
5.2	Have the procedures of procurement over € 60.000 received appropriate publicity?	Yes							
5.3	Is absence of conflict of interest ensured for all procurement procedures?	Yes							

6	Others (sub-grants)	Yes/No/NA	Budget Lines	Ben	PP1	PP2	PP3	PP4	Comments
6.1	Are sub-grants awarded respecting the established ceiling?	N/A							
6.3	Are sub-granting procedures transparent?	N/A							
6.4	Have sub-granting procedures ensured the correct publicity?	N/A							
6.5	Have sub-granting procedures ensured equal treatment to all potential applicants?	N/A							
6.6	Are rules on non-cumulative award ensured?	N/A							

Reference Number 0

Acronym 0

Report n° 1st Interim Report

CHECK-LIST EVR		Submitted Report		Carifications	
EVR - BEN		Yes/No/NA	JTS Remarks/Comments	Yes/No/NA	JTS Remarks/Comments
1	Reporting period and expenditures				
1.1	Is the reported period indicated in the EVR corresponding to the one indicated in the Financial Report?				
1.2	Do the stated expenditures in the EVR (verified by the auditor) correspond with the value indicated in the Financial Report (Annex I to the EVR)?				
2	Procedures performed				
2.1	Has the Auditor declared on the spot verifications?				
2.2	Has the auditor ensured that the expenditure coverage ratio (ECR) is 100% for EU and Lebanese LB?				
2.3	Has the auditor ensured that the ECR is at least 65% for the other MPC LBs per each cost category?				
2.4	Has the auditor ensured that the ECR is 100% for all procurement procedures above € 60.000,00?				
2.5	Has the auditor verified that the exception rate is less than 10% of the total amount of expenditure verified (i.e. 6,5 %)?				
2.6	In case the exception rate is less than 10% of the total amount of expenditure verified, has the auditor finalized the verification?				
2.7	In case the exception rate found is higher than 10%, are the verification procedures extended by the auditor until the ECR is at least 85%?				
3	Auditor's checklist				
3.1	is the auditor's checklist complete? If not, a request for clarification shall be sent.				
3.2	Does the auditor report any irregularity?				
3.3	If an irregularity is reported, does the auditor provide all necessary information to assess the impact on the reported expenditures? If not, a request for clarification shall be sent.				
4	Administrative costs				
4.1	ONLY FOR THE FIRST INTERIM: has the Auditor verified that the calculation method of indirect costs?				
4.2	Has the Auditor verified that the organisation is not receiving an operating grant?				
5	Non-eligible costs				
5.1	Has the Auditor verified whether expenditure includes special taxes/contributions (such as IRAP in Italy, contribution to AGEFIPH in France and in Bonificación Seguridad Social del personal investigador in Spain)?				
5.2	Has the Auditor verified that the LB can reclaim taxes and VAT?				
5.3	Has the Auditor verified that the coverage of these taxes and VAT in the expenditure is authorized by the applicable regulations, rules and practices in the country concerned?				
5.4	Has the Auditor quantified the VAT amount not eligible?				
5.6	Has the Auditor verified if any interests accrued by the pre-financing is recorded in the financial report?				
5.7	Has the Auditor verified that the bank account statement indicate the amount of interest accrued to the project during the reporting period?				
6	List of findings (Annex II to the EVR)				
6.1	Are the findings indicated in the list matching with the findings described in the EVR and in the MIS? If not, a clarification shall be requested				
6.2	Are the findings properly justified.If not, a clarification shall be requested				

7	Expenditures incurred in different periods				
7.1	Is there any expenditure reported and not certified in previous Interim Reports?				
7.2	If yes, are these expenditures properly justified in terms of: - Amount re-submitted (the value of the expenditure submitted in the new report has to be lower or equal to the reduced amount - verify the previous auth check list); - Justification for the re-submission; - for per diem expenses, details on meeting, participants, lenght of travel, are available or have been provided?				
7.3	Is there any expenditure incurred in different periods (before the current reporting period and/or after the implementation period)?				
7.4	If yes, are these expenditures properly justified and acceptable?				
7.5	ONLY FOR FINAL REPORTS: Are the expenditures for the preparation of the Final Report within the limits set by the Programme rules				

CHECK-LIST CONSOLIDATED EVR		Submitted Report		Clarifications	
		Yes/No/NA	JTS Remarks/Comments	Yes/No/NA	JTS Remarks/Comments
1	Reporting period and expenditures				
1.1	Is the consolidated EVR consistent with the individual ones?				
2	List of findings (Annex II to the Consolidated EVR)				
2.1	Are the findings indicated in the consolidated list matching with those reported in the tables submitted by all PPs?				

Reference Number #RIF!

Acronym #RIF!

Report n° #RIF!



CHECK-LIST EVR

EVR - PPn (specify the number)

Submitted Report

Yes/No/NAJTS Remarks/Comments

Carifications

Yes/No/NAJTS Remarks/Comments

1	Reporting period and expenditures				
1.1	Is the reported period indicated in the EVR corresponding to the one indicated in the Financial Report?				
1.2	Do the stated expenditures in the EVR (verified by the auditor) correspond with the value indicated in the Financial Report (Annex I to the EVR)?				
2	Procedures performed				
2.1	Has the Auditor declared on the spot verifications?				
2.2	Has the auditor ensured that the expenditure coverage ratio (ECR) is 100% for EU and Lebanese PPs?				
2.3	Has the auditor ensured that the ECR is at least 65% for the other MPC PPs per each cost category?				
2.4	Has the auditor ensured that the ECR is 100% for all procurement procedures above € 60.000,00?				
2.5	Has the auditor verified that the exception rate is less than 10% of the total amount of expenditure verified (i.e. 6,5 %)?				
2.6	In case the exception rate is less than 10% of the total amount of expenditure verified, has the auditor finalized the verification?				
2.7	In case the exception rate found is higher than 10%, are the verification procedures extended by the auditor until the ECR is at least 85%?				
3	Auditor's checklist				
3.1	is the auditor's checklist complete? If not, a request for clarification shall be sent.				
3.2	Does the auditor report any irregularity?				
3.3	If an irregularity is reported, does the auditor provide all necessary information to assess the impact on the reported expenditures? If not, a request for clarification shall be sent.				
4	Administrative costs				
4.1	ONLY FOR THE FIRST INTERIM: has the Auditor verified that the calculation method of indirect costs?				
4.2	Has the Auditor verified that the organisation is not receiving an operating grant?				
5	Non-eligible costs				
5.1	Has the Auditor verified whether expenditure includes special taxes/contributions (such as IRAP in Italy, contribution to AGEFIPH in France and in Bonificación Seguridad Social del personal investigador in Spain)?				
5.2	Has the Auditor verified that the LB can reclaim taxes and VAT?				
5.3	Has the Auditor verified that the coverage of these taxes and VAT in the expenditure is authorized by the applicable regulations, rules and practices in the country concerned?				
5.4	Has the Auditor quantified the VAT amount not eligible?				
5.6	Has the Auditor verified if any interests accrued by the pre-financing is recorded in the financial report?				
5.7	Has the Auditor verified that the bank account statement indicate the amount of interest accrued to the project during the reporting period?				
6	List of findings (Annex II to the EVR)				
6.1	Are the findings indicated in the list matching with the findings described in the EVR and in the MIS? If not, a clarification shall be requested				
6.2	Are the findings properly justified.If not, a clarification shall be requested				
7	Expenditures incurred in different periods				
7.1	Is there any expenditure reported and not certified in previous Interim Reports?				
7.2	If yes, are these expenditures properly justified in terms of: - Amount re-submitted (the value of the expenditure submitted in the new report has to be lower or equal to the reduced amount - verify the previous auth check list); - Justification for the re-submission; - for per diem expenses, details on meeting, participants, lenght of travel, are available or have been provided?				
7.3	Is there any expenditure incurred in different periods (before the current reporting period and/or after the implementation period)?				
7.4	If yes, are these expenditures properly justified and acceptable?				
7.5	ONLY FOR FINAL REPORTS: Are the expenditures for the preparation of the Final Report within the limits set by the Programme rules				

JTS Financial Check list

1.Overview

n.	Question	Answer	Comments
1.1	Has the deadline for submission been respected?		
1.2	Is the report duly completed, described and in line with the approved proposal?		
1.3	If the answer is NOT: are missing information relevant and need to be integrated (i.e. the entire sections of logical framework and/or reported expenditures and/or WP implementation are empty)?		
1.4	Have the necessary integrations been requested?		
1.5	Have the integrations been provided within the deadline?		
1.6	Has the language of the project been respected?		
1.7	Is there any improvement from report to report?		
Score Overview			3

2.Reported expenditures

n.	Question	Answer	Comments
2.1	Did all partners report the occurred expenditures?		
2.2	Are reported expenditures in line with the approved budget?		
2.3	Are reported expenditures in line with scheduled timing of the approved budget?		
Score Reported expenditures			3

3.Main Findings

n.	Question	Answer	Comments
3.1	Are there any major gaps between the planned partners contribution and their actual commitment?	No	
3.2	How has cross border cooperation being implemented? Is the approach effective?	Yes	They re-think the project considering the COVID impact on MSMEs in the textile sector.
3.3	Have any additional activities aiming at creating new synergies with other projects at national and/or local level been implemented?	No	
3.4	Is there any evidence of synergies in terms of implemented activities and outputs delivered (according to what listed in the approved project proposal)?	Partially	Only some very preliminar actions/information have been described.
3.5	Have the locations of the action been respected as stated in the approved proposal?	Yes	
3.6	Is the state of play in line with the project proposal or are there any major modifications?	Yes	Some modifications discussed with JTS about Subgrants.
3.7	Are State Aid rules respected in case of activities undertaken by Project Partners		
Score Main Findings			3

4.Potential risks

n.	Question	Answer	Comments
4.1	Potential risks, external conditions and corrective measures		
4.1.a	Is there any expected or new potential risk(s) and/or external condition(s) which may prevent the project from completing all outputs and achieving all its expected results?	Partially	They discribed the difficulties faced by textile sector caused by COVID-19.
4.1.b	Proposed/implemented solutions (if any)	Yes	They re-arranged the Subgrants management, due to the new COVID scenario. They want to study new solutions to help textile sector to re-organize its system. Also, they re-organised their activities online.
Score Potential risks			3

5.Subgrants

n.	Question	Answer	Comments
5.1.a	Are sub-grants foreseen in the project implementation?	Yes	
5.1.b	Have the related selection procedures been launched?	No	
5.1.c	Are the procedures in line with the Programme guidelines and handbook (transparency, equal treatment, co-financing, no cumulative award, no retroactivity)?	NA	Subgrants' procedures not launched yet. The project modified the implementation procedures to face COVID impacts.
5.1.d	Is the type of financial regime chosen adequate?	NA	
5.2	Management		
5.2.a	Are the sub-grants implemented according to the approved schedule?	NA	
5.2.b	Are the sub-grants managed according to the state aid rules?	NA	
5.2.c	Are the sub-grantees reports available and complete?	NA	
5.3	Impact		
5.3.a	Is the planned result/impact of subgrants achieved or expected to be achieved?	NA	
5.3.b	Is the number of beneficiaries selected in line with scheduled results?	NA	
5.3.c	If not, are there any corrective measures in place?	NA	
Score Subgrants		NA	

Reference Number 0

Acronym 0

Report n° 1st Interim Report

6.Logical Framework

n.	Question	Answer	Comments
6.1	Staff assigned to the project and new jobs created as a result of project initiatives		
6.1.a	Is the staff of the project adequate in number and skills?		
6.1.b	Are the contracts signed by the Lead beneficiary, partners, associates or subcontractors adequate in number and quality of services delivered according to the project proposal references?		
6.1.c	Are the staff contracts (full-time and part-time) signed by the target groups as a result of project activities adequate in number according to the project proposal references?		
6.2	Participation and visibility		
6.2.a	Project events		
6.2.a.1	Have project events been realized according to the Communication Plan and in respect of the timeline?		
6.2.a.2	Is the number of participants to project events satisfactory?		
6.2.b	Partnership organizations website		
6.2.b.1	Is the number of visits to PPs' project related link satisfactory?		
6.2.c	Social media		
6.2.c.1	Are the social media activities satisfactory?		
6.2.d	Supporting documents		
6.2.d.1	Are the related supporting documents provided?		
6.3	Priority, expected results and indicators		
6.3.a	Is the total % of project values achieved (result indicators) in line with the project proposal (<i>according to project timeline</i>)?		
6.3.b	Is any adjustment needed concerning project results?		
6.4	Project outputs (WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6)		
6.4.a	tot. % of achieved values (output indicators) - <i>according to project timeline</i>		
6.4.b	Are the results of the quality assessment of outputs satisfactory?		
6.4.c	Is any adjustment needed concerning outputs delivery?		
6.4.d	Which is the level of effectiveness of output(s) already delivered?		

6.5	Overview of the outputs and (expected/actual) delivery		
6.5.a	Have the outputs been delivered according to timescheduling?		
6.5.b	Is the % of outputs delivered in line with the timescheduling?		
Score Logical Framework			3

Reference Number 0

Acronym 0

Report n° 1st Interim Report

7.WP performance assessment

n.	WP	Question	Answer	Comments
7.1	WP1	Have outputs been fully delivered according to the project timeline?		
		Have activities been fully implemented according to the project timeline?		
		Did PPs duly complete their task in activities' implementation according to project timeline?		
		Is there any specific problem concerning the overall management? (e.g. staff, recruitment procedures, turnover etc. which might delay implementation)		
		Is there any relevant solution proposed/implemented?		
		Have Kick-off / Steering Committee meetings been held according to time schedule? Is the provided information on these meetings accurate? (date, place, number and type of participants, main achieved results)		
		Have deliverables been reported and attached?		
		Quality assessment of deliverables (<i>please justify in details your assessment note</i>)		

n.	WP	Question	Answer	Comments
7.2	WP2	Have all communication outputs been fully delivered according to the project timeline?		
		Have communication activities been fully implemented according to the project timeline?		
		Have all ENI CBC MED communication requirements been respected? If not, please specify and comment		
		Did PPs duly complete their task in activities implementation according to project timeline?		
		Any relevant problem encountered in project implementation?		
		Any relevant solution to problems proposed/implemented?		
		Have communication deliverables been reported and attached?		
		Quality assessment of deliverables (<i>please justify in details your assessment note</i>)		
		Involvement of target group		
		Involvement of final beneficiaries		
T.3	WP3	Have outputs been fully delivered according to the project timeline?		
		Have activities been fully implemented according to the project timeline?		
		Did PPs duly complete their task in activities implementation according to project timeline?		
		Any relevant problem encountered in project implementation?		
		Any relevant solution to problems proposed/implemented?		
		Have deliverables been reported and attached?		
		Quality assessment of deliverables (<i>please justify in details your assessment note</i>)		
		Involvement of target group		
		Involvement of final beneficiaries		
7.4	WP4	Have outputs been fully delivered according to the project timeline?		
		Have activities been fully implemented according to the project timeline?		
		Did PPs duly complete their task in activities implementation according to project timeline?		
		Any relevant problem encountered in project implementation?		
		Any relevant solution to problems proposed/implemented?		
		Have deliverables been reported and attached?		
		Quality assessment of deliverables (<i>please justify in details your assessment note</i>)		
		Involvement of target group		
		Involvement of final beneficiaries		

n.	WP	Question	Answer	Comments
7.5	WP5	Have outputs been fully delivered according to the project timeline?		
		Have activities been fully implemented according to the project timeline?		
		Did PPs duly complete their task in activities implementation according to project timeline?		
		Any relevant problem encountered in project implementation?		
		Any relevant solution to problems proposed/implemented?		
		Have deliverables been reported and attached?		
		Quality assessment of deliverables <i>(please justify in details your assessment note)</i>		
		Involvement of target group		
		Involvement of final beneficiaries		
7.6	WP6	Have outputs been fully delivered according to the project timeline?		
		Have activities been fully implemented according to the project timeline?		
		Did PPs duly complete their task in activities implementation according to project timeline?		
		Any relevant problem encountered in project implementation?		
		Any relevant solution to problems proposed/implemented?		
		Have deliverables been reported and attached?		
		Quality assessment of deliverables <i>(please justify in details your assessment note)</i>		
		Involvement of target group		
		Involvement of final beneficiaries		
Score WP performance assessment			3	

Final results

Session	Score	Final comments
1_Overview	3	The report is duly completed, and described in line with the approved proposal
2_Reported expenditures	3	All partners reported the occurred expenditures
3_Main findings	3	The state of play is in line with the project proposal
4_Potential risks	3	Most outputs indicators ((WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6)) are not achieved as the activities have not started yet according to proposal time scheduling
5_Sub-grants	NA	Not started yet
6_Logical Framework	3	There is no major risk except the Tunisian partner situation and the economic crisis in Lebanon
7_WPs implementation	3	WP 1&2: Outputs delivered are in line with the action plan and the description in the e-form. Achievement of the expected results seems feasible and produced with quality

Total average score	3
Any adjustment (at Expert discretion)	
FINAL SCORE	3

FINAL COMMENT	
The project activities are running smoothly and the deliverables are produced in quality. Some adjustments due to covid implemented or in progress.	

	Name and surname	Tot. Working days	Comments
JTS officer in charge			
Tematic Senior Expert involved			
Financial Expert involved (if the case)			
Others experts involved (if the case)			
Report evaluation starting date			
Validating date			
	Answer	Comments	
Any difficulties arised in interpreting the report?			
Was it necessary to ask clarifications to the LB?			
Has the timeline set for evaluating the report been respected?			

Signature of the check list	
Place and date	
Name and signature of the JTS officer in charge	
Name and signature of the Tematic Senior Expert involved	

4 - Very good: Outputs delivered are in line with the action plan and the description in the e-form. Achievement of the expected results seems feasible and very likely to be completed with potential good practice(s). All partners are fully committed and activities are jointly implemented. Few recommendations should be considered.

3 - Good: Overall the outputs delivered are in line with the action plan and the description in the e-form. Even if no good practice(s) are detected, activities are jointly implemented and expected results seems likely to be achieved. Minor issues require corrective actions.

2 - Problems: Although all main expected results are still likely to be achieved some of them may not or should be reconsidered.

1 - Serious deficiencies: Sensitive issues have been reported and need immediate corrective actions / measures.