

New Release 14/12/2018 SFC2014 Front Office 2.16.7

NEW FUNCTIONALITIES:	1
PERFORMANCE REVIEW	1
CHANGES:	1
OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME (IGJ)	1
IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (IGJ)	2
IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (IGJ,ETC)	2
FINANCIAL DATA (IGJ,ETC,IPA-CB,EMFF,FEAD).....	3
FINANCIAL DATA (IGJ,ETC,IPA-CB)	3
ACCOUNTS (ALL)	3
ANNUAL CONTROL REPORT (ALL)	3
NATIONAL AUDIT REPORT (ALL)	4
DEFECTS FIXED:	4
OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME (ETC)	4
MAJOR PROJECT NOTIFICATION (ART.102(1) AND 103) & MAJOR PROJECT SUBMISSION (ART. 102(2)).....	4
IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (IGJ)	4
IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (ETC)	4
ACCOUNTS (ETC).....	4
IRRECOVERABLE AMOUNTS (ALL).....	5
ANNUAL CONTROL REPORT (ALL)	5
NATIONAL AUDIT REPORT (IGJ,ETC)	5

New Functionalities:

Performance Review

- PR (10476) – There is a new menu item called “Performance Review” under menu option “Monitoring” managing the document type “Performance review letter”.

Changes:

Operational programme (IGJ)

- OP IGJ (1160) – Two new type of Priorities (Natural disaster and SME) and new validation rules were added or changed for these type of priorities.

1. New indicator on non-TA Priority: Natural disaster + 2 new validation rules for this type of indicator (2.76 and 2.77).

2. New indicator on non-TA Priority: SME + validation rules (2.11, 2.18, 2.24, 2.29, 2.30, 2.67) were modified to be applied on these priorities.

Modified validation rules:

- 2.11 validate that for each of the Categorisation Breakdowns (Tables 7-10 and 14-16), the total Union Support per Priority Axis and Fund equals the total Union Support (main+performance) per Priority Axis and Fund in Table 18a, and vice versa (error). For Table 11 the Total does not have to add up. This rule doesn't apply for SME Programmes and SME Priority Axes since they do not have Categorisation.
- 2.18 validate that there is at least one Indicator defined in the relevant Indicator Tables (error)
 - T3 one record for each PA, IP, SO (Only for ERDF, CF)(Warning)
 - T4 one record for each PA, IP (Only for ESF)(Warning)

- *T4a one record for each PA, IP (Only for YEI) (Warning)*
- *T5 one record for each PA, IP (For all)(warning)*
- *T6 one record (For all, except for priority axes containing only YEI, for SME programmes and SME priority axes and for TA programmes)(error)*
- *T12 one record for each PA, SO (Only for ERDF, CF, ESF)(Warning)*
- *T13 one record for each PA (Only for ERDF, CF, ESF)(Warning)*
- *2.24 validate that SME Programmes and SME Priority Axes only use Thematic Objective 3 (error)*
- *2.29 validate that there is no Performance Reserve amount specified in Tables 17 and 18a for YEI Programmes and Priority Axes, nor for SME Programmes, SME Priority Axes and TA Programmes (error)*
- *2.30 validate in Table 18a, that for non-TA priority axes, non-YEI Priority Axes/Funds with a Union Support (A) > 0, the "Performance Reserve amount as proportion per Priority Axis (L)" is between 5% and 7%. Doesn't apply for SME Programmes, SME Priority Axes and TA Programmes. If the Union Support (A) in the current version decreased compared to the last adopted version then this rule is a (warning) else it is an (error)*
- *2.67 validate for non-SME Programmes that the co-financing rate of each non-YEI Programme Priority Plan record in Table 18a doesn't exceed the maximum allowed co-financing rate*
- **New Validation Rules:**
 - *2.76 validate when Priority Axis is dedicated to natural disasters that it only covers ERDF (error)*
 - *2.77 validate when Programme contains a natural disasters Priority Axis that the total Union support on natural disasters over all Member State Programmes is <= 5% of the Total ERDF Union support over all Member State Programmes (warning)*
- **OP IGJ (1201) –** Previously, only quantitative indicators could be used in the Performance Framework table for IGJ, ETC and IPACBC. DG REGIO however has a few ERDF Programmes where the Key Implementation Step Indicator could be qualitative. Therefore Qualitative Key Implementation Step Indicator is now allowed in the Performance Framework Table (Tables 6 and 28 for IGJ, Tables 5 and 24 for ETC and Tables 5 and 25 for IPACBC). The model was already allowing this but now in the edit screens for the performance framework tables (Table 6 for IGJ, Table 5 for ETC and Table 5 for IPACBC), there is an extra checkbox "Qualitative" and an extra field "Qualitative final target (2023)". When the "Qualified" checkbox is checked, the numeric target fields are disabled and the qualitative one is enabled. In the display screens for the performance framework tables (Table 6 and 28 for IGJ, Table 5 and 24 for ETC and Table 5 and 25 for IPACBC), either the numeric target or the qualified target is displayed in the same "Final target (2023)" field.

Implementation report (IGJ)

- **IR IGJ (1222) –** Previously, only quantitative indicators could be used in the Performance Framework table for IGJ, ETC and IPACBC. DG REGIO however has a few ERDF Programmes where the Key Implementation Step Indicator could be qualitative. Therefore Qualitative Key Implementation Step Indicator is now allowed in the Performance Framework Table (Table 5 for IGJ and Table 3 for ETC and IPACBC). The Implementation Report model was already allowing this but in the edit and display screens for the performance framework tables there are now extra columns for the "Qualitative final target (2023)" and for the annual qualitative values. The extra columns are only foreseen when the table contains a qualitative Key Implementation Step indicator. In the print, the layout will not change but the current columns will either show the quantitative or the qualitative values.

Implementation Report (IGJ,ETC)

- **IR IGJ ETC (488) –** The indicator tables in the Implementation reports for IGJ and ETC were very wide and it was impossible to see the relation between a value in a cell and its column name or its record name. Now the column headings and the record headings are fixed when scrolling.

Financial data (IGJ,ETC)

- PF IGJ ETC (10471) – There are 2 new validation rules on Table 2 Territorial Delivery Mechanism codes (2.32, 2.33):
 - 2.32 validate in table 2 that per priority axis, the Territorial Delivery Mechanism with code 02 doesn't coexist with TDM codes 03, 04, 05 and 07 (warning)
 - for IGJ/ETC ERDF and ESF => "In table 2, the Territorial Delivery Mechanism code "02" should not coexist with Territorial Delivery Mechanism codes "03", "04", "05" or "07" for priority axis: \{0}, Fund: \{1}, region category: \{2}, intervention field: \{3}, form of finance: \{4}, territorial type: \{5}, territorial delivery mechanism: \{6}, thematic objective: \{7}, economic dimension: \{8}, location: \{9}"
 - for IGJ/ETC CF => "In table 2, the Territorial Delivery Mechanism code "02" should not coexist with Territorial Delivery Mechanism codes "03", "04", "05" or "07" for priority axis: \{0}, Fund: \{1}, intervention field: \{2}, form of finance: \{3}, territorial type: \{4}, territorial delivery mechanism: \{5}, thematic objective: \{6}, economic dimension: \{7}, location: \{8}"
 - 2.33 validate in table 2 that per priority axis, the Territorial Delivery Mechanism codes used exist as well in the corresponding OP table 10 (IGJ) and CP table 9 (ETC) (warning)
 - for IGJ ERDF, ESF => "In table 2, the Territorial Delivery Mechanism code used should also exist in table 10 of the Operational Programme for priority axis: \{0}, Fund: \{1}, region category: \{2}, intervention field: \{3}, form of finance: \{4}, territorial type: \{5}, territorial delivery mechanism: \{6}, thematic objective: \{7}, economic dimension: \{8}, location: \{9}"
 - for IGJ CF and YEI => "In table 2, the Territorial Delivery Mechanism code used should also exist in table 10 of the Operational Programme for priority axis: \{0}, Fund: \{1}, intervention field: \{2}, form of finance: \{3}, territorial type: \{4}, territorial delivery mechanism: \{5}, thematic objective: \{6}, economic dimension: \{7}, location: \{8}"
 - for ETC ERDF => "In table 2, the Territorial Delivery Mechanism code used should also exist in table 9 of the Cooperation Programme for priority axis: \{0}, Fund: \{1}, region category: \{2}, intervention field: \{3}, form of finance: \{4}, territorial type: \{5}, territorial delivery mechanism: \{6}, thematic objective: \{7}, economic dimension: \{8}, location: \{9}"
 - for ETC CF => "In table 2, the Territorial Delivery Mechanism code used should also exist in table 9 of the Cooperation Programme for priority axis: \{0}, Fund: \{1}, intervention field: \{2}, form of finance: \{3}, territorial type: \{4}, territorial delivery mechanism: \{5}, thematic objective: \{6}, economic dimension: \{7}, location: \{8}"

Financial data (IGJ,ETC,IPA-CB)

- PF IGJ ETC IPACBC (978) – There is now some new and modified validation rules to improve the quality of the data in view of better Annual Implementation Report data for IGJ/ETC and IPA-CB (2.17-2.31). The validation rule 2.11 is now more restrictive and only applicable for ERDF and CF. In Table 2 the Thematic Objective list is now activated only for ERDF and CF and in Table 2 the ESF Secondary Theme lists is only activated for ESF.

Accounts (ALL)

- ACC (7085) – The compare functionality is now implemented for the Accounts.

Annual control report (ALL)

- ACR (10467) – The obligation to set at least one element for modification during action "Complete assessment with observations" was removed.
- ACR (10473) – In the Annex 1, when importing the National Audit Report, the records from CCIs that don't exist in the Annual Control Report are now filtered.

- ACR (10370) - The Annex 3 was renamed to Annex 4. Now the Annex 3 becomes the management of the document of type "Calculation random sample selection + total error rate" and this change is also reflected in the print version.

National audit report (ALL)

- NAR (10431) – There is now a new final status "Report assessed together with the ACR" and action "Report assessed together with the ACR". The workflow was modified by adding this new action.

Defects fixed:

Operational programme (ETC)

- OP ETC (10425) – The sorting for Tables 21 and 22 is now applied in the print.

Major project notification (Art.102(1) and 103) & Major project submission (Art. 102(2))

- MPN MPS (10461) – When the commission user changed the status of a Major project notification (Art.102(1) and 103) or a Major project submission (Art. 102(2) from "Sent" to "Acknowledged" , the status should be displayed as "Acknowledged by EC" but this did not happen. This has now been fixed.
- MPN MPS (10462) – When the commission user acknowledged a Major project notification (Art.102(1) and 103) or a Major project submission (Art. 102(2) the text message displayed was in debug form. This has now been fixed.
- MPN MPS (10463) – The new "Acknowledgment" status could not be used for already Sent projects. The button appeared only for new submissions or after a project was returned and re-sent. The new workflow now updates an already sent project as well.

Implementation report (IGJ)

- IR IGJ (5296) – The Table 2C for Technical Assistance Priority Axes didn't always show the Measurement Unit nor the Measurement Unit for Baseline and target in the Display and in the Print. This has now been fixed.
- IR IGJ (10245) – The Edit details pop-up for Table9 was not displayed correctly in 1280x1080 resolution. This has now been fixed.
- IR IGJ (10396) – On creating a new Implementation Report version, in table 2c, the field 'decreasing target' was not being copied. This has now been fixed.

Implementation report (ETC)

- IR ETC (10398) – When creating the Implementation Report, the indicator tables 1 and 2 were not filled for TA axes not containing ERDF fund. This has now been fixed and now the tables fields are populated with the data from the Operational Programme.

Accounts (ETC)

- ACC ETC (10404) – The Annual Summary document from previous version didn't appear in list that should contain any previous annual summary document. This has now been fixed.

Irrecoverable Amounts (ALL)

- IRA (10288) – In the Irrecoverable Amounts results were not being shown in the CCI Search results. This has now been fixed.

Annual control report (ALL)

- ACR (10429, 10433) – The user was getting an error when trying to click on the Annex 4 in the compare mode. This has now been fixed.
- ACR (10489) – The Action "complete the assessment with observation" didn't contain the section "Allow to modify the following elements in the next version". This has now been fixed.

National audit report (IGJ,ETC)

- NAR (10469) – The action 'Return for modification by MS' was giving an error. This has now been fixed.