**Methodology for selecting partner progress reports for full-scope verification**

The analysis is carried out by the FLC immediately after receiving the partner progress report(PPR). PPR that score ≥ 1.9 will be subject to detailed (full) verification. If the PPR obtains the minimum number of points before the analysis is completed, which directs it to full-scope verification, the FLC may not continue the analysis.

1. **Factors for risk analysis:**
2. **PPR value (45%)**

* PPR < EUR 5,000 – 1 point;
* EUR 5,000 ≤ PPR < EUR 10,000 – 2 points;
* EUR 10,000 ≤ PPR < EUR 30,000 – 3 points;
* PPR ≥ EUR 30,000 – 4 points.

1. **Real cost category (20%)**

* no real costs – 1 point;
* 1 real cost category in PPR other than infrastructure and works – 2 points;
* real costs only in the category of infrastructure and works – 3 points;
* 2 or more real cost categories in PPR – 4 points.

1. **Types of simplified methods (5%)**

* no simplified methods (SCOs) or flat rate used in PPR – 1 point;
* Other than flat rate simplified methods (SCOs) used in PPR – 4 points.

1. **Irregularities (including those found and reduced in PPRs) in the partner's part of the project determined in connection with previous controls (summed over the entire project implementation period for a given partner from controls conducted by the FLC and external audits) (15%)**

* Total ≤ EUR 250 – 1 point ;
* EUR 250 < total ≤ EUR 1,000 – 2 points ;
* EUR 1,000 < total ≤ EUR 10,000 – 3 points ;
* Total > EUR 10,000 – 4 points.

1. **Controller's evaluation from cooperation with the partner (also from other projects). Based on the past implementation of Interreg projects and the Interreg partner reports cleared by the partner to date, the controller assesses** **the probability of errors in documentation and project implementation as (15%)**

* low (e.g., partner has submitted previous partner reports on time, low number of errors and/or deficiencies in documentation – most often formal deficiencies, meeting deadlines for submission of clarification supplements or the next version of the progress reports, ongoing contact and informing the Controller of any delays agreed with the JS or lead partner) – 1 point;
* not high (e.g., high number of formal errors in the partner progress reports, low number of substantive errors) – 2 points;
* medium (including problems with contacting people in charge of the project, frequent delays in submitting partner progress reports, large number of formal and substantive errors) – 3 points;
* high (among other things, the beneficiary has not yet implemented projects under Interreg and submits the first partner reports) – 4 points[[1]](#footnote-1).

**Results of risk analysis**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Factors** | **PPR value** | **Real cost categories in the PPR** | **Types of simplified methods (SCOs) in PPR** | **Value of project irregularities** | **Controller's assessment of cooperation with the beneficiary** | **Result**  **(points)** |
| **Points** | 1-4 | 1-4 | 1-4 | 1-4 | 1-4 | Ʃ (factor size x weight) |
| **Weight** | 0.45 | 0.20 | 0.05 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 1 |
| **Minimum score** | 0.45 | 0.20 | 0.05 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 1 |
| **Maximum score** | 1.8 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 4 |

1. If the FLC has no experience in working with a partner or it is a new partner or a partner is implementing the very first project, he should evaluate the probability of errors in documentation and project implementation as high. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)