

Capacity-building for the Implementation of Interreg and Cohesion Policy

Study visit Report - *Hungary*

- Study visit for Controllers – *13-17 October 2025*

19 November 2025



Contract

Capacity-building for the Implementation of Interreg and Cohesion Policy

Contract No: 2024CE160AT081

This project is implemented by a Particip-led consortium, in partnership with SZPO



Contact details

Jawad Wariaghli, Project Director jawad.wariaghli@particip.eu
Dominikos Chrysidis, Project Manager dominikos.chrysidis@particip.eu

Prepared by

dr. Adrienn Futó, Lead Training Expert	SZPO
Péter Virágh, Training Expert	SZPO
Richárd Gönczi, Coordinator	SZPO
Edmunds Snikeris, Training expert	Particip

Study visit to Budapest

13-17 October 2025

Table of Contents

1. Summary	5
2. Implementation	6
2.1. Agenda.....	6
2.2. Comments on delivery of the study visit.....	7
2.3. Challenges	9
3. Lessons learned/ Recommendations	11
4. Annexes	12

1. Summary

Activity	Overview
Project task	Task 3.2 – Preparation and execution of study visits
Aim	Providing participants with practical exposure to Interreg programme management, financial control and monitoring processes.
Event	Overview
Event name	Study visit for Controllers
Date of activity/duration	13-17 October 2025
Location	Budapest
Country	Hungary
Target Audience	Controllers

Participants	
Guest List/Participants	Number (all in person)
Number of participants	12
Guest list Breakdown	
Government officials	12
Local/regional government officials	-
Other (specify)	-
EUD/EU Staff	-
Female	8
Male	4
Not identified	-

2. Implementation

2.1. Agenda

Agenda study visit to Budapest	
Day 1	Content and time
12:30–13:30	Welcome lunch
13:30–14:30	Welcome and introduction to the study visit
14:30–15:00	Coffee break
15:00–16:30	Presentation on the different models of control system
Day 2	Content and time
09:30–11:00	Control procedures and practices, Control documents (legislation, programme and national level documents, operational manual, guidelines)
11:00–11:30	Coffee break
11:30–12:30	National co-financing –and prefinancing system in Hungary - different practices. Control procedures and practices
12:30–13:30	Lunch break
13:30–15:00	General introduction – examples from several Interreg programmes Risk-based management verifications, theory and practice in different programmes
15:00–15:30	Coffee break
15:30–16:30	Scope and methodology of on the-spot checks
Day 3	Content and time
9:30–10:30	Monitoring systems used for control in Hungary I+. Jems, Portal , NAHU comparison, main features
10:30–11:00	Coffee break
11:00–12:00	Monitoring systems used for control in Hungary I+. Jems, Portal , NAHU comparison, main features
12:00–12:30	Handling errors, corrections and irregularities in the Monitoring systems
12:30–13:30	Lunch break

13:30-15:00	Cooperation, procedures and involvement of other programme and national bodies - panel discussion with the representatives of different programmes (JS, NC)
15:00–15:30	Coffee break
15:30–16:30	Questions & answers
19:00–21:00	Dinner and networking event
Day 4	Content and time
08:30–11:30	Travel to Pécs
11:30–12:45	Visit to the first project – Mecsek Discovery Center
12:45–13:30	Lunch break – Mecsek Discovery Center
14:00–15:30	Visit to the second project – Zoo in Pécs
15:30–16:30	Visit to the third project – Gloves factory
16:30–19:30	Travel to Budapest
Day 5	Content and time
09:30–10:30	Panel discussion with representatives from the four countries focusing on different topics (i.e., HHRR perspectives, internal quality review) – roundtable with the participants
10:30–11:00	Coffee break
11:00–12:30	Wrap-up, lessons learned session
12:30–13:30	Farewell lunch
14:00 onward	Return travel

2.2. Comments on delivery of the study visit

During the five-day study visit, SZPO and Particip experts provided insight into their daily work using various methods, including presentations, open discussions, role-playing, and group exercises. One day was dedicated to project visits, where selected projects were showcased to demonstrate specific professional challenges that had been successfully addressed.

A round-table discussion was also held, during which SZPO and Particip presented good examples of communication between different levels, e.g., controllers and Joint Secretariats.

Finally, participants were given the opportunity to exchange experiences among themselves, fostering peer learning and strengthening cooperation between institutions. Participants were highly engaged throughout the event.

The 12 participants of the event filled-in the evaluation forms, and they all of them showed a high level of satisfaction with the content and its correspondence to the needs of participants,

by marking “Very useful” as an overall score. None of them marked it as as “Useful” or “Not useful”.

The detailed scoring of the evaluation of the delivery by the participants is as follows:

On the sessions	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Average (on 5)
Were the scope and the coverage of the training responsive to your needs?	11	1	-	-	-	4.9
Was the training material clear and adequate?	12	-	-	-	-	5
Was the level of information given for each topic sufficient?	12	-	-	-	-	5
Was the distribution of presentations and group work appropriate?	11	1	-	-	-	4.9
Was the time dedicated to each topic adequate?	12	-	-	-	-	5
Were the trainers well prepared?	12	-	-	-	-	5
Was the overall organisation adequate?	12	-	-	-	-	5

The detailed scoring for on acquired knowledge and skills (5 being the highest mark) is as follows:

Acquired knowledge & skills	5	4	3	2	1	Average (on 5)
Models of control system	12	-	-	-	-	5
Control procedures and practices	12	-	-	-	-	5
Risk-based management verifications	12	-	-	-	-	5
On the-spot checks	10	2	-	-	-	4.8
Monitoring system used for control	10	2	-	-	-	4.8
Handling errors, corrections and irregularities	11	-	1	-	-	4.8
Cooperation, procedures and involvement of other programme and national bodies	10	1	-	-	-	4.9
Visit to first project-Mecsek Discovery Center	11	-	-	-	-	5
Visit to second project- Zoo in Pécs	11	-	-	-	-	5

2.3. Challenges

Participants expressed strong appreciation for the depth and relevance of the topics covered during the study visit. The overall structure and use of varied techniques also contributed positively to the learning experience.

While the participants were satisfied with the study visit they also provided constructive suggestions for improvement:

According to some participants, the five-day duration was too long; however, others felt that there was insufficient time to explore certain topics in greater depth, such as procurement rules and procedures, handling irregularities, and on-the-spot checks. The practical components of the programme were highly appreciated, and some participants indicated that they would have welcomed even more practical content.

Question	Comments
<p>What aspects of the event did you find to be of the greatest value?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We appreciated all the aspects during the study visit. A strong control system makes the implementation of the projects as it is expected. The success of Mecsek shows that on time control can solve appearing problems. • The study visit from the beginning was really impressive and as a first time for me it was a really good experience and very useful got a lot of new information and the networking was great. • Practical exchange. • Exchange of experience. • Overall training bring very much useful and with new ideas to level up work and be more professional. • Most of them were quite valuable for my work. • All the aspects, but networking and the exchange of experience is the most important. • Operational manual of the Control Unit I would leave to have a copy of the Hungarian case. • During the financial control: expenditures, executed without proper budgetary, deficiencies in public, procurement, procedures and funds. • visit of the projects and last day panel discussion. • On the spot study visits, experience from another countries that are on their way on joining EU.

Question	Comments
What could be potentially improved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • So deep and explicit information was presented that for now no idea of something to improve. • I suggest to keep it up with the same energy and passion. • Everything on high level organized. • Meet and communicate more often. • Everything is already very good prepared so maybe more discussion on going in the training. • When comparing the practices to highlight the most universally suitable ones. • Everything was excellent. • Too long probably 3 days would be sufficient. • To split the time on so/so theory with visit on the spot. • Involving in such training not only managerial positions but controllers.
On which other issues would you like to receive more information in the future?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Control technics, finance management of control. • I would like to get more information regarding procurement rules and everything related to those, like irregularities and main verification from FLC point of view. • Establishment of regular practical experience between controllers. • Regular practical experience between partners. • Nothing specific everything. • Procurement procedures, irregularities on this aspect. • Responsibilities of the person that supervises and organises the work of the controllers. • Practical issues. • Communication hierarchy with in JS, MA, NA, FLC,... • Visibility,transparency, less on theory and information about projects with big percentage of success. • On the spot checks, cooperation between JS/MA and NC.

3. Lessons learned/ Recommendations

Based on both the trainers' observations and participants' feedback, the study visit can be regarded as highly successful. The overall level of satisfaction was evident and frequently expressed by participants, both in terms of the professional content and the organisation of the programme. The host organisation, SZPO, mobilised 17 colleagues throughout the week to ensure that the event was delivered at the highest possible standard. It is also worth noting that the commitment and motivation of the participants played an important role in the success of the study visit.

4. Annexes

Powerpoint presentations, exercises and other materials, list of participants and pictures.