

Annex 2B

Guidelines for Specific Procedures to be performed

1. VERIFICATION EVIDENCE

When performing the specific procedures listed in Annex 2A, the Auditor may apply techniques such as inquiry and analysis, (re)computation, comparison, other clerical accuracy checks, observation, inspection of records and documents, inspection of assets and obtaining confirmations.

The Auditor obtains verification evidence from these procedures to draw up the report of factual findings. Verification evidence is all information used by the Auditor in arriving at the factual findings and it includes the information contained in the accounting records underlying the Financial Report and other information (financial and non-financial).

The contractual requirements that relate to verification evidence are:

- Expenditure should be identifiable, verifiable and recorded in the accounting records of the Beneficiary(ies) (Article 14.1.d of the General Conditions of the Grant Contract);
- The Beneficiary(ies) will allow any external auditor to carry out verifications on the basis of supporting documents for the accounts, accounting documents and any other document relevant to the financing of the Action. The Beneficiary(ies) give access to all documents and databases concerning the technical and financial management of the Action (Article 16.3 of the General Conditions);
- Article 16.9 of the General Conditions of the Grant Contract provides a list of the types and nature of evidence that the Auditor will often find in expenditure verifications.

Moreover, for the purpose of the procedures listed in Annex 2A, records, accounting and supporting documents:

- shall be easily accessible and filed so as to facilitate their examination (Article 16.7 of the General Conditions);
- shall be available in the original form, including in electronic form (Article 16.8).

Guidance: records and accounting and supporting documents should be available in documentary form, whether paper, electronic or other medium (e.g. a written record of a meeting is more reliable than an oral presentation of the matters discussed). Electronic documents can be accepted only where:

- the documentation was first received or created (e.g. an order form or confirmation) by the Beneficiary(ies) in electronic form; or
 - the Auditor is satisfied that the Beneficiary uses an electronic archiving system which meets established standards (e.g. a certified system which complies with national law).
- should preferably be obtained from independent sources outside the entity (an original supplier's invoice or contract is more reliable than an internally approved receipt note);
 - which is generated internally is more reliable if it has been subject to control and approval;
 - obtained directly by the Auditor (e.g. inspection of assets) is more reliable than evidence obtained indirectly (e.g. inquiry about the asset).

If the Auditor finds that the above criteria for evidence are not sufficiently met, he/she should detail this in the factual findings.

2. OBTAINING AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE GRANT CONTRACT (ANNEX 2A — PROCEDURE 1.1)

The Auditor obtains an understanding of the terms and conditions of the Grant Contract. He/she should pay particular attention to Annex I of the Grant Contract (the Description of the Action), Annex II (General Conditions) and Annex IV (Contract-award procedures) which provides rules for procurement (including nationality and origin rules) by grant beneficiaries in EU external actions. Failure to comply with these rules makes expenditure ineligible for EU financing. These procurement rules apply to all grant contracts but depending on the legal basis for the Grant Contract, nationality and origin rules may vary. The Auditor ensures with the Beneficiary that the applicable nationality and origin rules are clearly identified and understood.

Applicable rules on nationality and origin are set out in Annex A2 to the PRAG. See:

http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/procedures/implementation/index_en.htm.

The rules are set out in Section 2.3.1 of the PRAG (by clicking on 2. Basic rules, then on 2.3 Eligibility criteria and other essentials).

If the Auditor finds that the terms and conditions to be verified are not sufficiently clear he/she should request clarification from the Beneficiary.

3. SELECTING EXPENDITURE FOR VERIFICATION (ANNEX 2A — PROCEDURES 3.1 – 3.7)

The expenditure claimed by the Coordinator in the Financial Report is generally presented under the following expenditure headings: 1 Human Resources, 2 Travel, 3 Equipment and Supplies, 4 Local office, 5 Other costs, services, 6 Other, 8 Provision for contingency reserve and 10 Indirect costs. Expenditure headings 1 to 6 represent direct costs of the Action. Expenditure headings can be broken down into expenditure subheadings such as for example 1.1 Salaries.

Expenditure subheadings can be broken down into individual expenditure items or classes of expenditure items with the same or similar characteristics. The form and nature of the supporting evidence (e.g. a payment, a contract, an invoice etc.) and the way expenditure is recorded (e.g. journal entries) vary with the type and nature of the expenditure and the underlying actions or transactions. However, in all cases expenditure items should reflect the accounting (or financial) value of the underlying actions or transactions, whatever the type and nature of the action or transaction concerned.

Value should be the principal factor used by the Auditor to select expenditure items or classes of expenditure items for verification. The Auditor selects high-value expenditure items to ensure an appropriate coverage of expenditure.

4. VERIFICATION COVERAGE OF EXPENDITURE (ANNEX 2A — PROCEDURES 3.1 – 3.7)

The Auditor applies the principles and criteria set out below when planning and performing the specific verification procedures for selected expenditure in Annex 2A (procedures 3.1–3.7).

Verification by the Auditor and verification coverage of expenditure items does not necessarily mean a complete and exhaustive verification of all the expenditure items that are included in a specific expenditure heading or subheading. The Auditor should ensure a systematic and representative verification. Depending on certain conditions (see further below) the Auditor may obtain sufficient verification results for an expenditure heading or subheading by looking at a limited number of selected expenditure items.

The Auditor may apply statistical sampling techniques for the verification of one or more expenditure headings or subheadings of the Financial Report. The Auditor examines whether ‘populations’ (i.e. expenditure subheadings or classes of expenditure items within expenditure subheadings) are suitable and sufficiently large (i.e. are made up of large numbers of items) for effective statistical sampling.

If applicable the Auditor should explain in the report of factual findings for which headings or subheadings of the Financial Report sampling has been applied, the method used, the results obtained

and whether the sample is representative.

The Expenditure Coverage Ratio ('ECR') is the total amount of expenditure verified by the Auditor, expressed as a percentage of the total amount of expenditure reported by the Coordinator in the Financial Report and claimed by the Coordinator for deduction from the total sum of pre-financing under the Grant Contract. This amount is reported in Annex V of the Grant Contract.

The Auditor ensures that the overall ECR is at least **65 %**. If he/she finds an exception rate of less than 10% of the total amount of expenditure verified (i.e. 6.5 %) the Auditor finalises the verification procedures and continues with reporting.

If the exception rate found is higher than 10% the Auditor extends verification procedures until the ECR is at least **85 %**. The Auditor then finalises verification procedures and continues with reporting regardless of the total exception rate found. The Auditor ensures that the **ECR for each expenditure heading and subheading** in the Financial Report is at least **10 %**.

5. PROCEDURES TO VERIFY SELECTED EXPENDITURE (ANNEX 2A — PROCEDURES 3.1 – 3.7)

The Auditor verifies the selected expenditure items by carrying out procedures 3.1–3.7 listed in Annex 2A and reports all the factual findings and exceptions resulting from these procedures. Verification exceptions are all verification deviations found when performing the procedures set out in Annex 2A.

The Auditor quantifies the amount of verification exceptions found and the potential impact on the EU contribution, should the Commission declare the expenditure item(s) concerned ineligible (taking into account the percentage of funding by the Commission and the impact on indirect expenditure (e.g. administrative costs, overheads)). The Auditor reports all exceptions found, including those for which he/she cannot quantify the amount of the verification exception found and the potential impact on the EU contribution.

Example: if the Auditor finds an exception of € 1 000 with regard to procurement rules for a grant contract where the EU finances 60 % of the expenditure and where indirect costs represent 7 % of total direct eligible expenses, the Auditor reports an exception of € 1 000 and a financial impact of 642€ (€ 1 000 x 60 % x 1.07).

Specific guidance for procedure 3.1.9 Compliance with Procurement, Nationality and Origin Rules

The Auditor verifies whether the expenditure for a selected item was incurred in accordance with the applicable procurement, nationality and origin rules by examining the underlying documents on the procurement and purchase processes (as per Annex IV). These documents relate to the opening of tenders, the assessment of the eligibility of tenderers and conformity of tenders, the evaluation of the tenders and the decisions with regard to the awarding of the contract. When examining these procurement documents the Auditor takes into account the risk indicators listed at the end of this Annex and he/she reports, if applicable, which of these indicators were identified.

RISK INDICATORS PROCUREMENT

- Inconsistencies in the dates of the documents or illogical sequence of dates. Examples:
 - Tender dated after the award of contract or before the sending of the invitations to tender
 - Tender by the winning tenderer dated before the publication date of the tender or dated significantly later than tenders from other tenderers
 - Tenders by different candidates all having the same date
 - Dates on documents not plausible/consistent with dates on accompanying documentation (e.g. date on the tender not plausible/consistent with the postal date on the envelope; date of a fax not plausible/consistent with the printed date of the fax machine)
- Unusual similarities in tenders by candidates participating in the same tender. Examples:
 - Same wording, sentences and terminology in tenders from different tenderers
 - Same layout and format (e.g. font type, font size, margin sizes, indents, paragraph wrapping, etc.) in tenders from different tenderers
 - Similar letterhead paper or logos
 - Same prices used in tenders from different tenderers for a number of subcomponents or line items
 - Identical grammar, spelling or typing errors in tenders from different tenderers
 - Use of similar stamps and similarities in signatures
- Financial statement or other information indicating that two tenderers participating in the same tender are related or part of the same group (e.g. where financial statements are provided, the notes to the financial statements may disclose ultimate ownership of the group. Ownership information may also be found in public registers for accounts.)
- Inconsistencies in the selection and award decision process. Examples:
 - Award decisions not plausible / consistent with selection and award criteria
 - Errors in the application of the selection and award criteria
 - A regular supplier of the beneficiary participates as a member of a tender evaluation committee
- Other elements and examples indicating a risk of a privileged relationship with tenderers:
 - The same tenderer (or small group of tenderers) is invited with unusual frequency to tender for different contracts
 - The same tenderer (or small group of tenderers) wins an unusually high proportion of the bids
 - A tenderer is frequently awarded contracts for different types of goods or services
 - The winning tenderer invoices additional goods not provided for in the tender (e.g. additional spare parts invoiced without clear justification, installation costs invoiced although not provided for in the tender).
- Other documentation, issues and examples indicating a risk of irregularities:

- Use of photocopies instead of original documents
- Use of pro-forma invoices as supporting documents instead of official invoices
- Manual changes on original documents (e.g. figures manually changed, figures ‘tippexed’, etc.)

Use of non-official documents (e.g. letterhead paper not showing certain official and/or compulsory information such as commercial registry number, company tax number, etc.)