



CENTRAL BALTIC
INTERREG IV A
PROGRAMME
2007-2013

Terms of Reference of the Programme Evaluation



EUROPEAN UNION
EUROPEAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT FUND
INVESTING IN YOUR FUTURE

Regional Council of
Southwest



Finland

1. Call for Tender

The Managing Authority of the Central Baltic INTERREG IV A Programme 2007-2013 (hereinafter referred to as Programme), the Regional Council of Southwest Finland (hereinafter referred to as the MA), invites the interested parties to file a written tender for the evaluation of the Programme.

The tendering procedure is done according to the Finnish public procurement law as well as following the tender instructions of the Regional Council of Southwest Finland and in accordance with the Directive 2004/18/EC and 2004/17/EC. In addition to the Programme website (see below) the call has been published at the Finnish public procurement website www.hankintailmoitukset.fi (HILMA) and also via HILMA in the Supplement to the Official Journal of the European Community (S series) and the TED (Tenders Electronic Daily) database but only to improve the visibility of the tender procedure. (NB! The total cost of the offers to be ranked can be up to 120 000 Euros at the most, VAT 0).

This Terms of Reference document (ToR) aims to set the framework for the mid-term evaluation of the Programme in accordance with (EC) 1083/2006 Articles 33, 47 and 48 while taking into account Article 49 and also (EC) 1828/2006 Article 4.2 (information and publicity issues) and requirements for environmental monitoring and assessment (Directive 2001/42/EC) and requirements to respect equality (1083/2006 Art 16) and sustainable development (1083/2006 Art 17). In addition the Chapter 11 of the Programme document has been taken into account.

In general the evaluations aim to improve the quality, effectiveness and consistency of the assistance from the funds and the strategy and implementation of the operational programmes with respect to the specific structural problems affecting the Member States and regions concerned, while taking account of the objective of sustainable development and of the relevant Community legislation concerning environmental impact and strategic environmental assessment.

Evaluations may be of a strategic nature in order to examine the evolution of a programme or group of programmes in relation to Community and national priorities, or of an operational nature in order to support the monitoring of an operational programme. The evaluation during the programme period may take the form of traditional mid-term (MTE) or on-going evaluation.

The evaluation on the Programme will be carried out by combining the idea of traditional mid-term MTE (Phase 1) with most of the work to be done during 2010 covering the years 2007-2010 and an on-going evaluation (Phase 2) in the form of follow up period during 2011-2013. The work will be monitored and steered by an Evaluation Steering Group (ESG) consisting of representatives of the MA and Joint Technical Secretariat (JTS) and Member States/Åland. The evaluation objectives and key issues are divided into strategic and operational questions resulting from preparatory process preceding the tender and evaluation phases. The Monitoring Committee (MC) has decided on 25.11.2009 on the arrangements of the evaluation process including setting up the ESG.

The Programme language is English. Therefore all the tender documents as well as the evaluation reports and presentations must be **in English only**.

2. Introduction to the Programme

The Central Baltic INTERREG IV A Programme 2007-2013 aims at increased co-operation across the borders of the Central Baltic Sea region. The programme provides funding for different cross-border co-operation projects. Altogether 96 million euros from the European Regional Development Fund will be given out to projects in the participating regions of Estonia, Finland including the Åland Islands, Latvia and Sweden. All projects must involve partners from at least two countries. The Programme consists of the overall Central Baltic Programme, the Southern Finland - Estonia and the Archipelago and Islands Sub-programmes. The common priorities of all three programmes are:

1. Safe and healthy environment
2. Economically competitive and innovative region
3. Attractive and dynamic societies

For further information on the Programme and relevant documents (i.e. Programme document) to support the preparation of the offer, please see:

www.centralbaltic.eu

3. Introduction to the MA and JTS

The Regional Council of Southwest Finland has been designated by the participating Member States/Åland to act as MA of the Programme in accordance with Article 60 of the (EC) No 1083/2006. The MA is responsible for managing and implementing the operational programme in accordance with the EU regulations and is also responsible for the legal and technical implementation of the Programme evaluation. It is stated in the Programme Document that the Regional Council have been assigned to function also as Certifying Authority (CA) in accordance with Article 61 of the (EC) No 1083/2006 and Audit Authority (AA) in accordance of the (EC) No 1083/2006 §62 and to Article 14(1) of the (EC) No 1083/2006 by designating these tasks to separate departments of the Council. The MA has set up a Joint Technical Secretariat (JTS) with offices established in Mariehamn and Tallinn (Sub-Secretariats) as well as in Riga and Stockholm (Info points) and in Turku (Main Office).

For further information on the Regional Council, please see:

www.varsinais-suomi.fi

www.varsinais-suomi.fi/in_English/Frontpage

and also on the MA unit as well as the whole JTS and the personnel, please see

www.centralbaltic.eu

4. Basic set up of the Programme evaluation

The Programme evaluation during the programme period combines the approaches of MTE and on-going evaluation. First during 2010 a more traditional mid-term evaluation process (Phase 1) will be carried out with the Final MTE report published early 2011. Based on the outcome of the Final –MTE report certain recommended corrective/development actions will be implemented in case needed. After the Final report have been approved by the MC a follow-up period (Phase 2) will begin with two follow-up reports produced in 2012 and 2013 concentrating on the implementation of the recommendations of the Final MTE report and other relevant aspects brought up in the Final MTE Report or as defined otherwise.

The follow up period also concentrates on Programme specific issues of strategic and operational nature taking also into account the preparations for the Programme period 2014+ contributing to the future of the Central Baltic Programme concept in a constructive way.

5. Action plan for evaluation

The offer itself is to include an overall **Action Plan for Evaluation** (APE) consisting of both phases 1-2 taking into account the requirements set below but will be further defined by the chosen evaluator separately for phases 1-2 in the final Action Plans (1 and 2) for the Evaluation preceding the launch of each of these two evaluation phases. This is especially important for the Phase 2 where the content of the evaluation is dependent on the outcome of the phase 1.

The chosen evaluator produces always a detailed APE for each phase and the APEs will be handled in the ESG. On the basis of the feedback given to the evaluator the APEs will be finalised. The finalised plans are sent to the MC for information.

6. Schedule of the Evaluation

The planned schedule¹ for evaluation procedure is as follows:

<i>Tender process</i>	
December 18, 2009	Call for tenders published
February 1, 2009	Deadline for submitting the tenders to the Regional Council/MA
Early/Mid February	Evaluation of the offers by the MA/JTS with a confidential feedback process allowed for the members of the ESG based on summary information provided by the MA/JTS (Offer documents are not

¹ The planned schedule is subject to some flexibility due to various technical and administrative factors

	sent out!)
Late February/Early March 2010	Final decision on the selected evaluator taken by the MA (Regional Council) ²
The end of March/Early April, 2010 <i>(at the latest)</i>	Contract signed between the MA and the selected evaluator (after the 7+14 days' appeal period)
<i>Phase 1/MTE evaluation</i>	
Early April 2010	The launch of the evaluation procedure
Late April/Early May 2010	The presentation of the Action Plan 1 for the Evaluation to the ESG - <i>ESG feedback to the evaluator</i> ³
Mid May 2010	ESG agrees on the final Action Plan1
May 2010	The MC receives for information the final Action Plan 1
September/October 2010	Draft Interim MTE Report taking the summary form provided for the ESG with a possibility to give feedback to the evaluator
November/December 2010	The first official DRAFT Final MTE report with a consultation round to follow within Programme authorities, JTS and Member States/Åland - <i>Presented to the MC by the evaluator</i> - <i>Final feedback to the evaluator</i>
January/February, 2011	The Final MTE report made available and presented to the MC by the evaluator. - <i>To be approved/rejected by the MC in spring meeting 2011</i> - <i>In case of rejection based on quality reasons⁴ the MC proposes corrections which the evaluator will take into account and a new MTE report will be made available without any delay to be handled by the MC by written procedure</i>
<i>Phase 2/Follow-up evaluation</i>	
May/June 2011	Presentation of the detailed follow-up Action Plan 2 for the Evaluation to the ESG - <i>ESG feedback to the evaluator</i>

² The final administrative decision will be taken by the Region Mayor in accordance with the internal decision making capacity assigned to holder of the office.

³ All the ESG feedback during the overall evaluation process will be compiled into one by the MA represented also in the ESG.

⁴ The possible rejection is not based on the content/nature of the results and recommendations as such but on the **quality of argumentation path** behind the overall outcome of the evaluation.

	- <i>ESG confirms the Action plan 2</i>
August/September 2011	The MC receives for information the final Action Plan 2 for the Evaluation of the follow-up evaluation phase
The first follow-up report version by the end of February/March 2012 The final version by the end of June 2012	The first final follow-up report preceded by interim consultation with the ESG during which the main observations are presented and feedback given to the evaluator - <i>The results of the follow-up report are presented to the MC by the evaluator</i> - <i>The follow-up report will be approved/rejected by the MC</i> - <i>In case of rejection the MC proposes corrections which the evaluator will take into account and a new report will be made available asap to be handled by the MC by written procedure</i>
The second follow-up report version by the end of February/March 2013 The final version by the end of June 2013	The second final follow-up report preceded by interim consultation with the ESG during which the main observations are presented and feedback given to the evaluator - <i>The results of the follow-up report are presented to the MC by the evaluator</i> - <i>The follow-up report will be approved/rejected by the MC</i> - <i>In case of rejection the MC proposes corrections which the evaluator will take into account and a new report will be made available asap to be handled by the MC by written procedure</i>

7. Steering of the Evaluation process

The overall evaluation procedure will be steered by the Evaluation Steering Group (ESG) set by the MC on 25.11.2009 consisting of the representatives of the MA/JTS and Member States/Åland. The group will convene to analyse the proceeding of the process and the results of the evaluation. The evaluator is obliged to report to the ESG on quarterly basis on how the evaluation process is proceeding. These reports are informal email reports containing information on steps taken in the process during that quarter (the reports are sent directly to every member within two weeks after the quarter has ended).

The ESG will convene physically 4 times in various locations in the participating Member States/Åland during the overall procedure first at the beginning of the evaluation process (the presentation of the evaluation plan), secondly after the Draft Final Report is presented (final feedback given), thirdly when the Action Plan for the Evaluation for the follow up period is presented and depending on the need also when the results of the follow up evaluation are made available. The evaluator (**max 2 persons**) participates in the meetings (NB! The travel costs must be included in the budget).

In addition the evaluator will participate in meetings of the MC to present the results and final reports. The MC meetings (2 annual meetings) are organised in various countries as follows:

- 2010 Sweden (participation in the autumn meeting only)
- 2011 Åland (participation in the spring meeting only)
- 2012 Estonia (participation in the spring meeting only)
- 2013 Finland (participation in the spring meeting only)

The MC convenes twice annually and one time participation by the evaluator each year is foreseen (**max 2 persons**). The exact dates and places will be communicated to evaluator by the MA. Please notice that in some cases it might be relevant to have only 1 person participating in the meetings referred to above and the remaining cost reservations could be used for other event participations by the evaluator such as Programme seminars/events for main stakeholders etc.

During the implementation time of the evaluation the evaluator reserves the financing for two Programme seminars (presentations by the evaluator) for **one person** representing the organisation responsible for the evaluation.

There might be a need for 1-3 additional ad-hoc meetings between the evaluator and MA/JTS also in Turku (to be taken into account in the budget also).

It must be emphasized that a continuous information flow between the evaluator(s) and the MA/JTS as well with the ESG must be ensured at all times during the evaluation process and this in general needs to be taken into account in the evaluation budget proposed by the tenderers. (In case of additional travels to non-foreseen meetings/events, they will be covered separately outside the range covered by the approved offer.)

8. Evaluation questions/themes required to be analysed 2010-2013

The primary objective of the Programme evaluation process is to provide evaluation analysis on questions set below and further continue the process 2012-2013 by follow-up phase mainly on the fulfilment of the initial recommendations made by the evaluator.

1. Strategic Questions

A)The Functioning of the Programme Strategy		
Evaluation report	Follow up 2012	Follow up 2013
1.How the Programme strategy and objectives have been met taking into account the sub-programme structure and especially the relation between the overall "new" CB programme and the "old" sub-programmes and should the strategy and objectives be revised in order to improve the quality of the expected outcome of the whole Programme (to be closely evaluated in conjunction with the 3.)	Follow up –report on modifications conducted on the basis of evaluation recommendations and their possible impact on Programme implementation and in addition recommendations for the Programme period 2014+	The final conclusions on topics evaluated taking the form of a summary
2.	A follow up case study <u>only</u> on the quality and impact on the set of projects (sample) with the emphasis on the environmentally oriented projects	No
3.How the relevant aspects/pillars of the Baltic Sea Strategy have been taken into account in the actual implementation? Has there been any impact? (to be closely evaluated in conjunction with the 1.)	Follow up –report on modifications conducted on the basis of evaluation recommendations and their possible impact on Programme implementation and in addition recommendations for the Programme period 2014+	The final conclusions on topics evaluated taking the form of a summary

2. Operational questions

A)The economic downturn/recession		
Evaluation Report	Follow up 2012	Follow up 2013
1.The impact of the financial crisis? How the programme should adapt?	Follow up –report on modifications conducted on the basis of evaluation recommendations	The final conclusions on topics evaluated taking the form of a summary
B)The functioning of the chosen administrative structures		
Evaluation Report	Follow up 2012	Follow up 2013
1.How has the set up with the main CB Programme and two sub-programmes, JTS main office (in Turku) and two sub-secretariats and two info points and three Steering Committees (SC) been functioning technically and administratively?	Follow up –report on fulfilment of recommendations initially made	The final conclusions on topics evaluated taking the form of a summary
2.How has this set up been contributing to the implementation of the overall Programme strategy?	Follow up –report on fulfilment of recommendations initially made	The final conclusions on topics evaluated taking the form of a summary
C)The functioning of the project generation and consultation activities in view of the de-centralised JTS set up and the implementation of the Programme's Communication Plan		
Evaluation Report	Follow up 2012	Follow up 2013
1.How effective the numerous JTS activities have been and how they have been contributing to the amount and quality of the applications in view of the decentralised JTS set-up?	Follow up –report on fulfilment of recommendations initially made	The final conclusions on topics evaluated taking the form of a summary
2.Have the JTS project generation and consultation activities been in general adequate and what realistic possibilities for improvements exists or could have existed?	Follow up –report on fulfilment of recommendations initially made only if relevant (=in case no project generation/calls are arranged anymore no analysis is needed)	The final conclusions on topics evaluated taking the form of a summary

3. How well the Programme's Communication plan has been implemented and how the targets set have been met and what improvements could still be done and achieved	Follow up –report on fulfilment of recommendations initially made	The final conclusions on topics evaluated taking the form of a summary
D)Functionality of the programme indicators		
Evaluation Report	Follow up 2012	Follow up 2013
1.Reformulate those indicator definitions which are producing biased information during application and reporting keeping however the existing set up and number of indicators intact. Expected result: A technical recommendation (A technical task)	No	No

Each evaluation question is to be analysed and conclusions presented and in case deemed necessary by the evaluator a set of recommendations have to be produced in the evaluation report. In addition each report will include at least the following information:

- o Detailed conclusions and recommendations supported by well defined argumentation path,
- o Summary of the conclusions and recommendations,
- o An explanation of the methodology used including details of data sources and original research undertaken in relevant cases,
- o Clear division of chapters according to the evaluation questions set above,
- o Data sources and details of survey questionnaires used.

There may be different reasons to re-examine and, if necessary, to revise operational programmes (EC 1083/2006 Article 33), including significant socio-economic changes in the programme environment, major changes in Community, national or regional priorities, implementation difficulties, or where the monitoring of operational programmes reveals a significant departure from the goals initially set. In these cases, the revision of an operational programme should be preceded/supported by an evaluation. Therefore the evaluator is to clearly state the **need for changes** taking the form of recommendation in the Programme in case the outcome of the analysis so require.

The Phase 1 (MTE) and the first follow-up report have to be comprehensive reports whereas the second follow-up report in 2013 provides final conclusions in a summary form.

9. Evaluation analysis, method and sources of information

In the offers the approach (proposed analysis) on each evaluation question is to be in accordance with the set up described above (the table) and the proposed analysis is to present the tenderer's view how to approach in more detail each evaluation question for both phases 1-2. This is to be done so that the full understanding of the evaluation task on each question is made clear. Therefore the description in the offers must include **at least** the following parts on each evaluation question taking into account the follow-up period⁵:

1. Description of the background and relevance of the evaluation question/theme as understood by the evaluator (why it is important to evaluate it?),
2. A content proposal for the actual analysis on evaluation question/theme as seen by the evaluator (what aspects should be brought up in the actual analysis, how the actual analysis should be presented and constructed etc.?),
3. A content proposal for the recommendations as seen by the evaluator (How should they be formulated, how deep they should go into question etc.?).

The evaluation method(s) to be used are defined in detail in the offer(s). The set of evaluation questions require comprehensive supportive data in order to be analysed properly. Therefore the overall Action Plan for the Evaluation must at least include:

- 1) Description of the method on the progress made by the Programme financially and contentwise based on financial and progress indicators supported by desk research (examination of relevant Programme documents and project material),
- 2) Description of the method on Case studies where appropriate, required or recommended by the evaluator,
- 3) Description of the method on survey research where appropriate, required or recommended by the evaluator,
- 4) Description of the method on interviews of the key Programme personnel as well as key stakeholders including the MC/SC members (sample) and some representatives of project personnel (sample).

In the offers the evaluation method is to be constructed in accordance of the set up referred to above (1-3). The description of the evaluation method has to be linked clearly to evaluation questions set above. The chosen evaluator is granted temporary necessary access to the Programmes's monitoring system CBMS2007 to ensure that appropriate data is made available regarding financial and project related data for instance. All the official Programme documents are available at the Programme's website (see above).

The relevant **official** Programme documents to be used in this conjunction include at least the Programme Document, Communication Plan, Description of Management and

⁵ As stated for instance in Chapter 5 the APE will be further defined for phases 1 and 2 separately later on by the chosen evaluator in accordance with the set schedule (Chapter 6)

Control system and Programme Manuals as well as Selection Criteria as required in the evaluation process. Other materials will be made available on ad-hoc basis as required in the overall process.

In addition the Baltic Sea Strategy and related documents are available at: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/cooperation/baltic/

See also:

<http://www.centralbaltic.eu/eusbsr>

The proposed evaluation analysis, method and sources of information are included in the set of criteria to evaluate offers.

10. Requirements on qualifications of the evaluator

A list of references have to be included in the offers providing relevant information on relevant qualifications by the tenderer from the past 3 years (01.01.2007-). **By relevant is meant various programme evaluations and other studies on EU co-financed programmes either approved by the respective Monitoring Committee/other organ or by an organisation itself depending on the case.** The list of references is to provide clearly set out information on relevant specific requirements which are:

1. An experience on previous evaluations either on EU Structural Fund programmes or other EU co-financed programmes (experience on evaluations on any Interreg/Territorial Co-operation Programmes is regarded as an asset) taking the form of list of approved evaluations and similar studies (with the date of approval included)
2. An experience on previous evaluations on development projects co-financed either by EU Structural Fund programmes or other EU co-financed programmes (experience on evaluations on any Interreg/Territorial Co-operation Projects is regarded as an asset) taking the form of list of approved evaluations and similar studies (with the date of approval included).

The offer must also include the list and CVs of the personnel which will carry out the evaluation process 2010-2013. In case the personnel will change after the offer is submitted or during the overall evaluation process the organisation carrying out the evaluation is obliged to inform the MA immediately and to ensure that the new personnel possess equal qualifications (This is very important aspect for the follow-up phase). The specific requirements are:

3. A list of personnel reserved for the task with information of relevant qualifications (work experience on past evaluations and other relevant studies with suitable university level degrees). (The CVs have to be included in the offer letter and not as separate documents).

The qualifications of the evaluators are included in the set of criteria to evaluate offers.

11. Setting up the price

The offers must include the budget of the overall evaluation process (**NB! All the costs of the overall evaluation process**) including necessary travel costs to various meetings (ESG and MC +ad-hoc meetings with MA/JTS) and purchase of relevant materials/statistics in case needed. Please do notice that even the finalised evaluation reports sent to the Monitoring Committee may be rejected for various reasons. Therefore the budget estimations must take this into account by including the possibility for various corrections/modifications/additions. In case the abovementioned additional travels/meetings or report corrections/modifications are not needed up to the full reserved amount these “extra resources” are used elsewhere during the overall evaluation process as agreed between the MA and the evaluator. The budget is divided according to the phases 1 and 2 of the evaluation process. Prices have to be mentioned both including and without VAT, VAT % to be mentioned. **The total cost of the offers to be ranked can be up to 120 000 Euros at the most, VAT 0. In case this ceiling is exceeded the offer will be rejected.**

The price is included in the set of criteria to evaluate offers.

1. Price for PHASE 1 (MTE evaluation):

- a) Estimation of the needed working time in days/months
- b) Daily and monthly rate
- c) Travel costs separately per person
- d) Total cost

2. Price for PHASE 2: (on-going evaluation)

- a) Estimation of the needed working time in days/months
- b) Daily and monthly rate
- c) Travel costs separately per person
- d) Total cost

3. Total Cost of Phases 1-2

12. Weighted criteria for choosing between the offers

The overall most advantageous tender will be approved. The over-all most advantageousness is determined as follows:

The set of criteria consists of the main criteria (3) to which a coefficient is assigned. For each of the main criteria a set of sub criteria will be used to carry out the scoring. For each of the sub-criteria the scoring runs from one (1) to five (5). The scoring will be judged in a following way:

1= Poor (NB! in case the information is missing or cannot be identified the offer will be rejected as invalid, see below)

2= Tolerable

3= Satisfactory

4= Good

5= Excellent

By using scoring for each of the sub-criteria a mean value is calculated at level of main criteria. Each of the mean values (3) are multiplied by the coefficient assigned. The final and total score for each of the offers made are the summation of the weighted mean values of the main criteria.

1. Evaluation analysis, method and sources of information, coefficient 40%

1a. Description of the evaluation analysis and approach in accordance with the minimum set-up:

- Description of the background and relevance of the evaluation question/theme as understood by the evaluator (why it is important to evaluate it?),
- A content proposal for the actual analysis on evaluation question/theme as seen by the evaluator (what aspects should be brought up in the actual analysis, how the actual analysis should be presented and constructed etc.?),
- A content proposal for the recommendations as seen by the evaluator (How should they be formulated, how deep they should go into the question etc.?).

1b. Description of the method on the progress made by the Programme financially and contentwise based on financial and progress indicators supported by desk research (examination of relevant Programme documents and project material),

1c. Description of the method on Case studies where appropriate, required or recommended by the evaluator,

1d. Description of the method on survey research where appropriate or required or recommended by the evaluator,

1e. Description of the method on interviews of the key Programme personnel as well as key stakeholders including the MC/SC members (sample) and some representatives of project personnel (sample).

2. Relevant qualifications of the evaluator organisation and evaluators, coefficient 30 %

2a. An experience on previous evaluations⁶ either on EU Structural Fund programmes or other EU co-financed programmes (experience on approved evaluations on any Interreg/Territorial Co-operation Programmes is regarded as an asset⁷) taking the form of list of approved evaluations and similar studies (with the date of approval included)

2b. An experience on previous evaluations on development projects co-financed either by EU Structural Fund programmes or other EU co-financed programmes (experience on approved evaluations on any Interreg/Territorial co-operation projects is regarded as an asset⁸),

2c. A list of personnel reserved for the task with information of relevant qualifications (work experience on past evaluations and other relevant studies with suitable university level degrees)⁹.

3. Price, coefficient 30 %

3a. Estimation of the needed working time in days/month

3b. Daily and monthly rate

3c. Travel costs separately

3d. Total cost

Incomplete tenders not including all the information requested and used to evaluate the offers will be rejected as invalid. The tenderers having submitted a valid tender will be consulted in case there is a need to receive small clarifications in order to make the offers more comparable. However, the written received tenders cannot be changed.

13. Submitting the offers

The tenders have to be submitted in a sealed envelope in English to the MA (address below) by mail or e-mail by personal delivery no later than **Monday 01.02.2010 at 15.00 hours Finnish time** (at the latest, final date and hour of receipt). The tenders received after the deadline will not be considered. **The submitted offers have to be valid by 30.04.2010.**

⁶ 01.01.2007 onwards only

⁷ This means that in case two tenderers have conducted otherwise similar evaluations on any EU co-financed programmes but the other one has carried out an approved one on any Interreg/Territorial Co-operation Programmes, then this one receives a better score.

⁸ This means that in case two tenderers have conducted otherwise similar evaluations on any EU co-financed projects but the other one has carried out an approved one on any Interreg/Territorial Co-operation Programmes, then this one receives a better score.

⁹ The CVs have to be included in the offer letter and not as separate documents.

The e-mail and envelope must be marked with reference "TENDER FOR CB-EVALUATION".

Central Baltic INTERREG IV A Programme 2007-2013
"TENDER FOR CB-EVALUATION"
P.O. Box 273 (Ratapihankatu 36)
20101 Turku
FINLAND
E-mail: kirjaamo@varsinais-suomi.fi

More information:

Regional Council of Southwest Finland
Central Baltic INTERREG IV A Programme
Management Coordinator
Mr. Esa Höglblom

tel: +358 40 7760310 / +358 2 2100 927
Fax: +358 2 210 0901
email: firstname.lastname@varsinais-suomi.fi

14. Special conditions and relevant information

The MA will reserve the following rights to itself to be applied if deemed necessary after receiving the offers:

1. To use external expertise to assist in evaluating the offers,
2. To consult the previous customers in order to verify the references,
3. To consult the tenderers to clarify possible indistinct issues before the final decision on the evaluator is made,
4. To ask the tenderer(s) to present the Action Plan for the Evaluation to MA before decision is made,
5. To approve the offer only partially if deemed necessary,
6. To reject the offer if:
 - o The tenderer is subject to judicial proceedings due to a state of bankruptcy or foreseen state of bankruptcy with specific arrangement on debts to be recovered,
 - o The tenderer has given false information,
 - o The tenderer has unpaid taxes/fees,
 - o The offer has not been prepared according to the request and the information provided is incomplete,
 - o The pricing is not done according to the instructions set by the request,
 - o The tenderer has been acting against the law or the good conduct of business making,
 - o The offer has arrived after the dead-line set in this request,
 - o The total price is set at such a (low) level which cannot be deemed adequate for the task.
 - o The total price ceiling set has been exceeded

NB! Possible relevant but confidential trade and business issues have to be included in a separate annex and has to be made clearly identifiable.

15. Copyright issues

After each phase of the evaluation is concluded and the MC has approved the reports the ownership rights on the evaluation report will be transferred to MA and the reports can be made public for instance at the Programme's website and distributed to key stakeholders of the Programme. In the published evaluation materials the evaluator organisation and personnel behind the work are clearly mentioned.

The information included in various evaluation reports and other documents related to confidential business issues of the evaluating organisation are not published. The evaluator informs the MA on these matters.

16. The technical content of the offer

The offers are to include at least the following information in addition to the information requested in previous chapters in order to be included among the offers which are ranked and evaluated by the MA (See above, Chapter 14).

Organisation:

The organisation's name, contact person, address, telephone, fax and e-mail as well as the legal status of the organisation and a bank reference must be included. In addition the existing valid www -address of the organisation is to be included in the offers.

Additional compulsory information to be provided:

- The VAT registry number of the service provider
- Tax certificate
- Proof of the paid employer fees (possible unpaid taxes/fees affect the choice of the evaluator)

Sub-contracting:

In case the offer is provided in the name of the consortium, the main contractor must be clearly identified in the offers as well as clear division of labour and responsibilities between the main and sub-contractors. The contract with the MA is only signed with the main contractor.

17. Payment and contract

After the approval of the offer by the MA, a contract will be signed between the MA and the organisation carrying out the evaluation in which the specific conditions for the evaluation procedure are set according to the approved offer (It must be noted that the decision by the MA to purchase the evaluation from the chosen evaluator is not the contract and therefore does not possess the same legal relevance. The implementation of the evaluation cannot be started before the contract is signed by both parties). The contract document shall be provided by the organisation carrying out the evaluation and

the final content is based on mutual understanding of the parties concerned. In case of sub-contracting the contract must include the division of labour and related responsibilities of each evaluator/sub-evaluator.

The MA will set a payment schedule for evaluation costs as follows:

1. The first payment (20% of the Phase 1 costs) immediately after the agreement has been signed by both parties,
2. The second payment (80% of the Phase 1 costs) after the final evaluation report has been approved by the Programme's Monitoring Committee¹⁰,
3. The third payment (20% of the Phase 2 costs) after the Action Plan for the Evaluation for the follow-up period approved by the ESG,
4. The fourth payment (remaining 40% of the Phase 2 costs) after the first follow-up report has been approved by the Programme's Monitoring Committee,
4. The fifth payment (remaining 40% of the Phase 2 costs) after the second follow-up report has been approved by the Programme's Monitoring Committee.

Regional Council of Southwest Finland

Turku 17.12.2009

Mr. Juho Savo
Region Mayor

¹⁰ In case the MC would repeatedly refuse to approve the finalized Evaluation reports even after the corrections are made by the evaluator based on the feedback of the MC, the MA will make the payment after the procedure with the MC has been completed.