



## **URBACT III**

(2014 - 2020)

Priority axis-Investment Priority-Specific Objective 1-1-2

1. Promoting Integrated Sustainable Urban Development

1.1. Disseminating good practice and expertise and capitalising on the results of the exchange of experience in relation to sustainable urban development, including urban-rural linkages

1.1.2. To improve the design of sustainable urban strategies and action plans in cities

## **INTERACTIVE CITIES**

(Ref : 236 / 1433751188)

**DIGITAL, SOCIAL MEDIA AND USER GENERATED-CONTENT BOOSTING URBAN  
MANAGEMENT**

## **FINAL certificate**

Certificate #5

Submitted version

Period from 2015-09-15 to 2018-08-03 for expenditure paid until 2018-10-03

Tartu City Government

## Table of contents

1. Project Information	1
2. Project financing plan	2
3. First Level Controller Declaration	4
4. Annex 1 : Expenditure list	5
5. Annex 2 : Expenditure breakdown per category	8
6. Annex 3 : First Level Control Checklist	9
6.1 <i>General Checks</i>	9
6.2 <i>Accounting and Audit Trail</i>	9
6.3 <i>Staff costs</i>	10
6.4 <i>Office and Administration Costs</i>	11
6.5 <i>Travel and Accommodation Costs</i>	11
6.6 <i>External Expertise and Services</i>	11
6.7 <i>Equipment Costs</i>	12
6.8 <i>Public Procurement</i>	12
6.9 <i>Information and publicity rules</i>	13
6.10 <i>Compliance with other EU rules</i>	13
6.11 <i>Other Considerations</i>	13

## 1. Project Information

<b>Name of the project</b>	<b>DIGITAL, SOCIAL MEDIA AND USER GENERATED-CONTENT BOOSTING URBAN MANAGEMENT</b>
Acronym	INTERACTIVE CITIES
Reference SYNERGIE-CTE	236
Internal number of management	1433751188
Name of the Lead Partner organisation &#134; country	Genoa ITALY
Monitoring Committee first approving decision	2016-06-17
Project starting date	2015-09-15
Project ending date	2018-05-03
Administrative closure date	2018-10-03
Partner	Tartu City Government
Function (Lead Partner or Project Partner)	Partner
Name of the first level controller	Aita Teder
organisation	Ministry of Finance - Rahandusministeerium

## 2. Project financing plan

### ERDF

Name of partner	ERDF	% ERDF	Public co-financing	Total
Municipality of Genoa	126,231.00 €	70.00 %	54,099.00 €	180,330.00 €
Sub total	126,231.00 €		54,099.00 €	180,330.00 €
Tartu City Government	58,114.50 €	85.00 %	10,255.50 €	68,370.00 €
Alba Iulia Municipality	58,114.50 €	85.00 %	10,255.50 €	68,370.00 €
CITY OF VARNA	43,681.50 €	85.00 %	7,708.50 €	51,390.00 €
EDC DEBRECEN URBAN AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CENTER	40,281.50 €	85.00 %	7,108.50 €	47,390.00 €
MUNICIPALITY OF PALERMO	41,106.00 €	85.00 %	7,254.00 €	48,360.00 €
Sub total	241,298.00 €		42,582.00 €	283,880.00 €
Murcia	58,114.50 €	85.00 %	10,255.50 €	68,370.00 €
Municipality of Liverpool - phase 1 only	13,289.75 €	85.00 %	2,345.25 €	15,635.00 €
Sub total	71,404.25 €		12,600.75 €	84,005.00 €
GENT CITY COUNCIL	38,846.50 €	70.00 %	16,648.50 €	55,495.00 €
SEMAEST	33,194.00 €	70.00 %	14,226.00 €	47,420.00 €
Community Led Local Development of Lisbon	38,846.50 €	70.00 %	16,648.50 €	55,495.00 €
Sub total	110,887.00 €		47,523.00 €	158,410.00 €
Total	549,820.25 €	77.81	156,804.75 €	706,625.00 €
Total %	77.81 %	77.81 %	100.00 %	100 %

### Swiss Fund

Name of partner	Swiss Fund	% Swiss Fund	Public co-financing	Total
Lausanne City Council - phase 1 only	5,060.00 €	50.00 %	5,060.00 €	10,120.00 €
Sub total	5,060.00 €		5,060.00 €	10,120.00 €
Total	5,060.00 €	50.00	5,060.00 €	10,120.00 €
Total %	50.00 %	50.00 %	100.00 %	100 %

### 3. First Level Controller Declaration

Amount certified: 17,600.73 €

- I. Based on the documents provided and my verification and professional judgement as a first level controller, I certify that:
- a. Expenditure is in line with European, programme and national eligibility rules and complies with conditions for support of the project and payment as outlined in the subsidy contract.
  - b. Expenditure was actually paid with the exception of costs related to depreciations and simplified cost options.
  - c. Expenditure was incurred and paid (with the exceptions above under “b”) within the eligible time period of the project and was not previously reported.
  - d. Payment of staff costs is proven on the basis of payslips or documents of equivalent probative value;
  - e. Expenditure based on simplified cost options is correctly calculated and the calculation method used is appropriate.
  - f. Expenditure reimbursed on the basis of eligible costs actually incurred is either properly recorded in a separate accounting system or has an adequate accounting code allocated. The necessary audit trail exists and all was available for inspection.
  - g. Expenditure in currency other than Euro was converted using the correct exchange rate
  - h. Relevant EU/ national/ institutional and programme public procurement rules were observed.
  - i. EU and programme publicity rules were observed.
  - j. Co-financed products, services and works were actually delivered.
  - k. Expenditure is related to activities in line with the application form and the subsidy contract.

II. Based on the documents provided, my verification and my professional judgement as a first level controller, and for the amount certified, I have NOT found any evidence of:

- a. Infringements of rules concerning sustainable development, equal opportunities and non-discrimination, equality between men and women and state aid.
- b. Double-financing of expenditure through other financial sources.
- c. Generation of undisclosed project-related revenue.
- d. Suspected or established fraud

III. I hereby confirm that the verification of the project financial report was done precisely and objectively.

The control methodology and scope and further information on the control work actually done are documented in the first level control report and checklist.

I and the institution / department I represent are independent from the project’s activities and financial management and authorised to carry out the control.

NAME: Ms Aita Teder

Signature:

Place and date:

#### 4. Annex 1 : Expenditure list

Expenditure fund	Invoice reference	Issued by	Payment date	Invoice document type	Payment mode	Claimed Amount	Amount certified	Amount rejected	Auditor comment
ERDF	7 / 17.01.2018	Tartu City Government	2018-02-02	Certificate	Bank transfer	902.95 €	902.95 €	-	
ERDF	7 / 17.01.2018	Tartu City Government	2018-02-01	Certificate	Bank transfer	675.28 €	675.28 €	-	
ERDF	REQ-1	E-riigi Akadeemia SA	2018-02-09	Invoice	Bank transfer	1,151.77 €	1,151.77 €	-	
ERDF	I325275101	Estravel AS	2018-02-28	Invoice	Bank transfer	556.48 €	556.48 €	-	
ERDF	M00346	Entri OÜ	2018-04-13	Invoice	Bank transfer	91.00 €	91.00 €	-	
ERDF	1054	Hurrdurr OÜ	2018-04-25	Invoice	Bank transfer	277.60 €	277.60 €	-	
ERDF	1042	Color Media OÜ	2018-04-20	Invoice	Bank transfer	780.00 €	780.00 €	-	
ERDF	18041801	Noventa OÜ	2018-04-24	Invoice	Bank transfer	960.00 €	960.00 €	-	
ERDF	29	Ühiskonna Doktorid OÜ	2018-04-25	Invoice	Bank transfer	277.00 €	277.00 €	-	
ERDF	749	Mikser Disain OÜ	2018-04-25	Invoice	Bank transfer	286.70 €	286.70 €	-	
ERDF	1621	CakeMill OÜ	2018-04-27	Invoice	Bank transfer	87.00 €	87.00 €	-	
ERDF	34 / 20.03.2018	Tartu City Government	2017-04-25	Certificate	Bank transfer	791.06 €	791.06 €	-	
ERDF	34 / 20.03.2018	Tartu City Government	2018-04-24	Certificate	Bank transfer	803.85 €	803.85 €	-	
ERDF	REQ-3	E-riigi Akadeemia SA	2018-05-02	Invoice	Bank transfer	946.00 €	946.00 €	-	
ERDF	218046	E-riigi Akadeemia SA	2018-05-09	Invoice	Bank transfer	4,200.00 €	4,200.00 €	-	
ERDF	1629	CakeMill OÜ	2018-05-10	Invoice	Bank transfer	200.00 €	200.00 €	-	
ERDF	Payment and taxes_A.Säälük_January 2018	Tartu City Government	2018-01-30	Certificate	Bank transfer	295.35 €	295.35 €	-	

ERDF	Payment and taxes_A.Säälik_January 2018	Tartu City Government	2018-01-30	Certificate	Bank transfer	8.86 €	8.86 €	-	
ERDF	Payment and taxes_L.Lukka_January 2018	Tartu City Government	2018-01-30	Certificate	Bank transfer	627.19 €	627.19 €	-	
ERDF	Payment and taxes_L.Lukka_January 2018	Tartu City Government	2018-01-30	Certificate	Bank transfer	18.82 €	18.82 €	-	
ERDF	Payment and taxes_L.Park_January 2018	Tartu City Government	2018-01-30	Certificate	Bank transfer	646.76 €	646.76 €	-	
ERDF	Payment and taxes_L.Park_January 2018	Tartu City Government	2018-01-30	Certificate	Bank transfer	19.40 €	19.40 €	-	
ERDF	Payment and taxes_L.Lukka_Februaru 2018	Tartu City Government	2018-02-26	Invoice	Bank transfer	396.29 €	396.29 €	-	
ERDF	Payment and taxes_L.Lukka_Februaru 2018	Tartu City Government	2018-02-26	Invoice	Bank transfer	11.89 €	11.89 €	-	
ERDF	Payment and taxes_L.Park_February 2018	Tartu City Government	2018-02-26	Certificate	Bank transfer	165.55 €	165.55 €	-	
ERDF	Payment and taxes_L.Park_February 2018	Tartu City Government	2018-02-26	Certificate	Bank transfer	4.97 €	4.97 €	-	
ERDF	Payment and taxes_L.Lukka_March 2018	Tartu City Government	2018-03-28	Certificate	Bank transfer	215.04 €	215.04 €	-	
ERDF	Payment and taxes_L.Lukka_March 2018	Tartu City Government	2018-03-28	Certificate	Bank transfer	6.45 €	6.45 €	-	



ERDF	Payment and taxes_L.Lukka_April 2018	Tartu City Government	2018-04-27	Certificate	Bank transfer	866.51 €	866.51 €	-	
ERDF	Payment and taxes_L.Lukka_April 2018	Tartu City Government	2018-04-27	Certificate	Bank transfer	26.00 €	26.00 €	-	
ERDF	Payment and taxes_L.Park_April 2018	Tartu City Government	2018-04-27	Certificate	Bank transfer	736.70 €	736.70 €	-	
ERDF	Payment and taxes_L.Park_April 2018	Tartu City Government	2018-04-27	Certificate	Bank transfer	22.10 €	22.10 €	-	
ERDF	Payment and taxes_L.Lukka_May 2018	Tartu City Government	2018-05-30	Certificate	Bank transfer	206.78 €	206.78 €	-	
ERDF	Payment and taxes_L.Lukka_May 2018	Tartu City Government	2018-05-30	Certificate	Bank transfer	6.20 €	6.20 €	-	
ERDF	Payment and taxes_L.Park_May 2018	Tartu City Government	2018-05-30	Certificate	Bank transfer	323.48 €	323.48 €	-	
ERDF	Payment and taxes_L.Park_May 2018	Tartu City Government	2018-05-30	Certificate	Bank transfer	9.70 €	9.70 €	-	
<b>Total</b>						<b>17,600.73 €</b>	<b>17,600.73 €</b>	<b>0.00 €</b>	

## 5. Annex 2 : Expenditure breakdown per category

BUDGET LINES	FORECASTED BUDGET (as from the last application form approved by the MC)	CERTIFIED EXPENDITURE (for the reporting period concerned)	CERTIFIED EXPENDITURE (cumulative from the beginning of the project)
<b>Staff costs</b>			
Lead Partner Staff Costs	61,000.00 €	0.00 €	0.00 €
Project Partner Staff Costs	141,964.76 €	4,479.65 €	18,579.60 €
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>202,964.76 €</b>	<b>4,479.65 €</b>	<b>18,579.60 €</b>
<b>Office and Administration</b>			
Lead Partner Office and Administration	1,830.00 €	0.00 €	0.00 €
Project Partner Office and Administration	4,258.94 €	134.39 €	557.40 €
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>6,088.94 €</b>	<b>134.39 €</b>	<b>557.40 €</b>
<b>Travel and Accommodation</b>			
Staff Travel and Accommodation	175,656.05 €	3,729.62 €	18,274.55 €
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>175,656.05 €</b>	<b>3,729.62 €</b>	<b>18,274.55 €</b>
<b>External Expertise and Services</b>			
Lead Partner External Expertise Project Coordination	27,000.00 €	0.00 €	0.00 €
Project Partner External Expertise Project Coordination	86,146.45 €	4,200.00 €	10,500.00 €
Expertise Meeting Organisation	76,150.00 €	378.00 €	8,439.49 €
Expertise Communication	62,488.80 €	2,581.30 €	4,652.10 €
Expert and other non-staff Travel	63,500.00 €	2,097.77 €	4,008.07 €
Expertise First Level Control	16,750.00 €	0.00 €	0.00 €
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>332,035.25 €</b>	<b>9,257.07 €</b>	<b>27,599.66 €</b>
<b>Equipment</b>			
Equipment	0.00 €	0.00 €	0.00 €
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>0.00 €</b>	<b>0.00 €</b>	<b>0.00 €</b>
<b>TOTAL INCOMES</b>			<b>0.00 €</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>716,745.00 €</b>	<b>17,600.73 €</b>	<b>65,011.21 €</b>

## 6. Annex 3 : First Level Control Checklist

### 6.1 General Checks

-	YES	NO	N/A	Comment
1. Are the following documents available for the First Level Controller: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subsidy Contract <input type="checkbox"/> Application Form <input type="checkbox"/> Joint Convention	X			
2. If the partner contribution does not come from the partner's own resources but from an external public source, has the total public contribution not been exceeded? If the partner contribution comes from the partner's own resources or entirely from private sources, please tick 'n/a'.			X	own resources
3. Is it ensured that the expenditure has not already been reimbursed by any other funding (EU, regional, local or other)? Are there mechanisms in place to avoid double-financing?	X			
4. Was recoverable VAT deducted? If the project partner is not entitled to recover the VAT, please select 'N/A and state this in the comment box'.			X	Project partner is not entitled to recover the VAT

### 6.2 Accounting and Audit Trail

-	YES	NO	N/A	Comment
1. Has one of the following options been chosen to clearly identify the costs allocated to the project? a) <input type="checkbox"/> A separate accounting system b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An adequate accounting code	X			An adequate accounting code
2. Are the amounts paid accurately recorded in the accounting system? Not applicable for flat rates, standard scales of unit costs or lump sums.	X			
3. Are all costs only declared once?	X			
4. Has all expenditure been incurred within the eligible programme area? If not, has prior approval from the programme been obtained (through the application form or direct approval from the joint secretariat)?	X			
5. Is the part of the expenditure that is incurred outside the Union part of the programme area eligible according to Article 20 of Regulation (EU) 1299/2013 and programme rules?			X	no expenditures outside
6. Is there an internal control system reasonably capable of guaranteeing that the partner is complying with the European, national and URBACT legal and financial requirements?	X			
7. Has each reported expenditure been supported by an invoice or an accounting document of equivalent probative value that are complete and accurate in accounting terms? Not applicable for flat rates, standard scales of unit costs or lump sums.	X			
8. Are costs eligible according to the programme rules?	X			
9. Have the costs been correctly allocated to the budget categories?	X			
10. Has the total budget by category not been exceeded by more than the flexibility allowed by the programme?	X			
11. Has the partner's budget by budget line been respected? If not, has the excess spending been approved by the lead partner?	X			

12. Has the partner's total budget not been exceeded by more than the flexibility allowed by the programme?	X			
13. Is the exchange rate used for the conversion into Euro correctly applied, using the monthly accounting exchange rate of the Commission in the month during which that expenditure was submitted for verification to the controller?	X			All costs are in euros
14. Has the partner received the ERDF share from the previous periods?	X			Partner has received first payment in amount of 8614,05 euros on January 2017, second payment in amount of 6 241,83 euros on September 2017 and third payment in amount of 15 761,32 euros on March 2018.
15. Does the account from which payments are made and received belong to the partner organisation?	X			
16. Is it ensured that ineligible costs according to programme rules and Article 69 (3) (a+b) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 and Art 2 (2) of Delegated Regulation No 481/2014 are not included? In particular: - interest on debt - fines - financial penalties - costs related to fluctuation of foreign exchange rate - gifts that are not related to the promotion communication, publicity and information or that exceed EUR 50	X			
17. Have in kind contributions been included in the claim?			X	no in-kind
19. Have all net revenues been deducted from the total reported eligible costs? If there are no revenues, please tick n/a and confirm in the comment box			X	no revenues
20. Is there evidence that reported activities have taken place and that co-financed products and services were delivered or are in progress to be delivered? If the evidence was not obtained through an on-the-spot check, it is important to indicate in the comment section how sufficient assurance was gained instead.	X			meeting agendas, participation lists, photos, etc submitted.
21. Are all costs directly related to the project and necessary for the development or implementation of the project?	X			
22. Has any expenditure been considered ineligible? If so, please indicate the amount and explain the reason why the expenditure has been considered ineligible			X	No ineligible expenditure.
23. Is there evidence of effective anti fraud measures in place at partner level?	X			

### 6.3 Staff costs

	YES	NO	N/A	Comment
-				
1. Are Staff costs reported in this period? If no move to next chapter.	X			
2. Is the expenditure only related to employees of the organisation which is officially listed in the application?	X			
3. Are costs calculated according to the programme specific rules outlined in the URBACT III Programme Manual Factsheet 2F? For some Member/Partner States additional staff costs calculation methods may apply that take national specificities into consideration.	X			
4. Is the calculation based on the actual salary costs (employees' gross salary + employer's contributions)?	X			
5. Are the following documents available: • work contract • payslips (or similar) • payment proofs	X			
6. If a person is working at a fixed percentage (100% or less) on the project: Is a document available fixing the percentage worked on the project and is this percentage correctly applied to the actual gross employment costs?			X	Persons are working on the project at a flexible percentage

7. If a person is working on the project at a flexible percentage (flexible number of hours) from month to month: 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Has the hourly rate been calculated by dividing the monthly gross employment cost by the number of hours per month as per the employment contract or has an hourly rate been calculated by dividing the latest annual employment cost by 1720h? 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Has the hourly rate then been multiplied by the number of hours actually worked on the project? 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Has the monthly working time been documented in a timesheet covering 100% of the working time of the employee and identifying the time spent on the project?	X			The hourly rate has been calculated by dividing the monthly gross employment cost by the number of hours per month and then been multiplied by the number of hours actually worked on the project. Timesheets are covering 100% of the working time.
8. If a person works in several projects, is it ensured that the total number of working hours declared does not exceed the total eligible working time of the employee (no double-financing)?	X			Time-sheets covering 100% of the working time submitted

#### 6.4 Office and Administration Costs

-	YES	NO	N/A	Comment
1. Are Office and Administration costs reported in this period? If no move to next chapter.	X			
2. Are office and administration costs calculated as a flat rate of 3% of the certified eligible direct staff costs?	X			
3. Is it ensured that no office and administration costs (such as stationery, photocopying, mailing, telephone, fax and internet, heating, electricity, office furniture, maintenance, office rent) are declared under any other budget line?	X			

#### 6.5 Travel and Accommodation Costs

-	YES	NO	N/A	Comment
1. Are Travel and Accommodation costs reported in this period? If no move to next chapter.	X			
2. Are the trips that these costs refer to justified by the project's activities?	X			
3. Do the travel and accommodation costs exclusively result from trips undertaken by staff employed by the partner organisations? All other travel should be reported under Expertise and Services category	X			
4. Are the reported travel and accommodation costs in line with the programme, national and internal rules of the respective partner organisation?	X			
5. Is it ensured that: - <input type="checkbox"/> the trips costs were chosen in respect of the most economic way of transport and accommodation? - <input type="checkbox"/> The travels have been actually executed? - <input type="checkbox"/> Trips are supported by all required documents (e.g. flight/train tickets, hotel invoices, etc.) - <input type="checkbox"/> Costs for taxi are eligible and properly justified (e.g. public transport was not available, etc.)	X			
6. Are the trips limited to the territory of the EU or Programme area? In case of trips outside the territory of the EU and Programme area, were they explicitly mentioned and justified in the approved application or by the joint secretariat?	X			

#### 6.6 External Expertise and Services

-	YES	NO	N/A	Comment
1. Are External Expertise and Services costs reported in this period? If no move to next chapter	X			

2. Are the following documents available to justify external expertise and services' expenses paid by the partner: -□ contracts/agreements and -□ invoices/request for reimbursement? -□ Proofs of payment?	X			
3. Are the deliverables available, identifiable and in compliance with the contract/agreement and invoices/requests for reimbursement? As for all other expenditure items, check that the external expertise and services were contracted in compliance with public procurement rules.	X			
4. Is the expenditure related to items foreseen under this budget line in the specifications provided in the application form? If not, can the expenditure be justified?	X			
5. Is it ensured that providers of service or expertise are external to the project partnership (i.e. different from the project partner organisations and their employees)?	X			
6. Have the travel and accommodation expenses of external service providers or guests invited by the project partners also been recorded under the external services and experts budget line (i.e. not under the travel and accommodation budget line)?	X			

### 6.7 Equipment Costs

-	YES	NO	N/A	Comment
1. Are Equipment costs reported in this period? If no move to next chapter.		X		no budget, no such costs
2. Have the purchased equipment items been initially planned in the application form? If this is not the case, is there a written agreement of these costs from the lead partner and joint secretariat? As for all other expenditure items, check that the equipment was purchased in compliance with public procurement rules and that they have not already been financed from other EU funds.		X		
3. Are the equipment items physically available and used for the intended project purpose?		X		
4. Is the method to calculate equipment expenditure (full costs, pro-rata) correctly applied?		X		
5. Are depreciations in line with Article 69 (2) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013?		X		
6. If the equipment item is only partially used for the project, is the share allocated to the project based on a fair, equitable and verifiable calculation method (pro-rata)?		X		

### 6.8 Public Procurement

-	YES	NO	N/A	Comment
1. Has the controlled organisation observed European, programme, national, regional and internal public procurement rules?	X			
2. Have the principles of transparency, non-discrimination, equal treatment and effective competition been respected, also for items below the EU threshold? Transparency rules are outlined in the Commission Interpretative Communication on the Community law applicable to contract awards not or not fully subject to the provisions of the public procurement directives (2006/C179/02).	X			

3. Is full documentation of the procurement procedure available? It usually includes the following: -□ 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 -□ Offers/quotes received -□ Report on assessment of bids (evaluation/selection report) -□ Information on acceptance and rejection (notification of bidders) -□ Contract including any amendments In case documentation is not required, please tick n/a and provide an explanation in the comments section to the right.			X	National threshold for bid-at-three is 5000 eur (without VAT). National threshold for simplified procurement procedures (services) is 30 000 eur (without VAT) from 01.09.2017. National threshold for public procurement (services) is 60 000 eur (without VAT) from 01.09.2017. All operations reported are below thresholds - procurement documentation is not required.
4. Are the contracts in line with the selected offers?			X	There was no need for procurement procedures
5. Has there been no artificial splitting of the contract objective/value in order to avoid public procurement requirements?	X			
6. If a contract was amended or extended, has the change been only minor without changing the overall objective, content and economy of the tender and laid down in writing adequately? Has this change been legal without any impact on the validity of the initial tender procedure?			X	No amendments
7. For tenders: Were the evaluation and award decisions properly documented and justified (e.g. evaluation and award decisions are properly documented and selection and award criteria have been applied to all received offers in a consistent way and as published in advance and no new criteria were added)?			X	No tenders
8. For direct awards because of -□ Urgency: is it proven that the urgency is due to unforeseeable circumstances? -□ Technical/exclusivity reasons: is it ruled out (based on objective evidence) that any other supplier is capable of providing the services?			X	no public procurement procedure required
9. Have invoices been issued and payments been done in respect of the procurement budget and the amounts fixed in the contract/the accepted offer (global price, unit prices)?	X			

### 6.9 Information and publicity rules

-	YES	NO	N/A	Comment
1. Has the partner applied all relevant rules on publicity and information and European visibility?	X			
2. Do all the publications produced contain appropriate references to the ERDF support and contain logos respecting the URBACT graphic charter?	X			

### 6.10 Compliance with other EU rules

-	YES	NO	N/A	Comment
1. Is there evidence that the project activities have complied with the EU horizontal objectives of sustainable development?	X			
2. Is there evidence that the project activities have complied with the EU horizontal objectives of equality between men and women and non-discrimination?	X			
3. Is there evidence that the project activities have complied with Community rules on state aid?	X			

### 6.11 Other Considerations

-	YES	NO	N/A	Comment
1. Has an administrative /desk based check been carried out?	X			
2. Has an 'on the spot' check been carried out?			X	On-the-spot check was not carried out, because it would not have provided any additional insight.
3. Any recommendations/issues to be followed-up in the next progress report?			X	