



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL  
REGIONAL AND URBAN POLICY  
Policy  
Evaluation and European Semester

## CALL FOR TENDERS

2014CE16BAT033

**Ex post evaluation of Cohesion Policy programmes 2007-2013,  
financed by the European Regional Development Fund  
(ERDF) and Cohesion Fund (CF)  
Work Package 4: Support to large enterprises**

# TENDER SPECIFICATIONS

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INFORMATION ON TENDERING.....	4
1.1	Participation.....	4
1.2	Contractual conditions.....	4
1.3	Joint tenders.....	4
1.4	Subcontracting.....	4
1.5	Content of the tender.....	5
1.6	Identification of the tenderer: legal capacity and status.....	5
2	EVALUATION AND AWARD.....	6
2.1	Evaluation steps.....	6
2.2	Exclusion criteria.....	6
2.3	Selection criteria.....	6
2.3.1	Economic and financial capacity criteria and evidence.....	7
2.3.2	Technical and professional capacity criteria and evidence.....	7
2.4	Award criteria.....	8
2.5	Technical offer.....	8
2.6	Financial offer.....	9
3	TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS.....	9
3.1	Overall purpose and context of this evaluation.....	9
3.2	Specific context of this contract.....	10
3.3	Subject of the contract.....	11
3.4	Scope of the contract.....	11
3.5	Tasks.....	12
3.6	Methodology.....	15
3.7	Work organisation.....	16
3.8	Time schedule.....	16
3.9	Deliverables.....	16
3.10	Organisation of the study.....	17
3.11	Volume of the contract.....	18
3.12	Terms of payment.....	18
3.13	Documentation for the tenderers.....	19
4	CONTENT, STRUCTURE AND GRAPHIC REQUIREMENTS OF THE FINAL DELIVERABLES.....	19
	Annex 1: Declaration of honour.....	21

Annex 2: Themes for Work Packages of the Ex Post Evaluation .....	22
Annex 3: ERDF allocation to spending codes containing large enterprise, 2007-14 .....	23
Annex 4 - Quality Control: Output Quality Criteria .....	24
Annex 5: Bibliography .....	25
Annex 6: Template for graphic requirements.....	26

# **1 INFORMATION ON TENDERING**

## **1.1 PARTICIPATION**

Participation in this tender procedure is open on equal terms to all natural and legal persons coming within the scope of the Treaties and to all natural and legal persons in a third country which has a special agreement with the Union in the field of public procurement on the conditions laid down in that agreement. Where the Multilateral Agreement on Government Procurement<sup>1</sup> concluded within the WTO applies, the participation to the call for tender is also open to nationals of the countries that have ratified this Agreement, on the conditions it lays down.

## **1.2 CONTRACTUAL CONDITIONS**

The tenderer should bear in mind the provisions of the draft contract which specifies the rights and obligations of the contractor, particularly those on payments, performance of the contract, confidentiality, and checks and audits.

## **1.3 JOINT TENDERS**

A joint tender is a situation where a tender is submitted by a group of economic operators (consortium). Joint tenders may include subcontractors in addition to the joint tenderers.

In case of joint tender, all economic operators in a joint tender assume joint and several liability towards the Contracting Authority for the performance of the contract as a whole. Nevertheless, tenderers must designate a single point of contact for the Contracting Authority.

After the award, the Contracting Authority will sign the contract either with all members of the group, or with the member duly authorised by the other members via a power of attorney.

## **1.4 SUBCONTRACTING**

Subcontracting is permitted in the tender but the contractor will retain full liability towards the Contracting Authority for performance of the contract as a whole.

Tenderers must give an indication of the proportion of the contract that they intend to subcontract.

During contract execution, the change of any subcontractor identified in the tender will be subject to prior written approval of the Contracting Authority.

---

<sup>1</sup> See [http://www.wto.org/english/tratop\\_E/gproc\\_e/gp\\_gpa\\_e.htm](http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_E/gproc_e/gp_gpa_e.htm)

## 1.5 CONTENT OF THE TENDER

The tenders must be presented as follows:

Part A: Identification of the tenderer (see below)

Part B: Evidence for exclusion criteria (see section 2.2)

Part C: Evidence for selection criteria (see section 2.3)

Part D: Technical offer (see section 2.5)

Part E: Financial offer (see section 2.6)

## 1.6 IDENTIFICATION OF THE TENDERER: LEGAL CAPACITY AND STATUS

The tender must include a cover letter presenting the name of the tenderer (including all entities in case of joint offer) and identified subcontractors if applicable, and the name of the single contact person in relation to this tender.

If applicable, the cover letter must indicate the proportion of the contract to be subcontracted.

In case of joint tender, the cover letter must be signed by a duly authorised representative for each tenderer, or by a single tenderer duly authorised by other tenderers (with power of attorney).

Subcontractors must provide a letter of intent stating their willingness to provide the service foreseen in the offer and in line with the present tender specification.

In order to prove their legal capacity and their status, all tenderers must provide a signed Legal Entity Form with its supporting evidence. The form is available on:

[http://ec.europa.eu/budget/contracts\\_grants/info\\_contracts/legal\\_entities/legal\\_entities\\_en.cfm](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/contracts_grants/info_contracts/legal_entities/legal_entities_en.cfm)

The tenderer (or the single point of contact in case of joint tender) must provide a Financial Identification Form and supporting documents. Only one form per offer should be submitted (no form is needed for subcontractors and other joint tenderers). The form is available on: [http://ec.europa.eu/budget/contracts\\_grants/info\\_contracts/index\\_en.cfm](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/contracts_grants/info_contracts/index_en.cfm)

Tenderers must provide the following information if it has not been included with the Legal Entity Form:

- For legal persons, a legible copy of the notice of appointment of the persons authorised to represent the tenderer in dealings with third parties and in legal proceedings, or a copy of the publication of such appointment if the legislation which applies to the legal entity concerned requires such publication. Any delegation of this authorisation to another representative not indicated in the official appointment must be evidenced.
- For natural persons, where applicable, a proof of registration on a professional or trade register or any other official document showing the registration number.

## 2 EVALUATION AND AWARD

### 2.1 EVALUATION STEPS

The evaluation is based on the information provided in the submitted tender. It takes place in three steps:

- (1) Verification of non-exclusion of tenderers on the basis of the exclusion criteria
- (2) Selection of tenderers on the basis of selection criteria
- (3) Evaluation of tenders on the basis of the award criteria

Only tenders meeting the requirements of one step will pass on to the next step.

### 2.2 EXCLUSION CRITERIA

All tenderers shall provide a declaration on their honour (see Annex 1), duly signed and dated by an authorised representative, stating that they are not in one of the situations of exclusion listed in the Annex 1.

The successful tenderer shall provide the documents mentioned as supporting evidence in Annex 1 before signature of the contract and within a deadline given by the contracting authority. This requirement applies to all members of the consortium in case of joint tender.

*The model declaration to be inserted in Annex is available on BUDGWEB:*

[http://www.cc.cec/budg/imp/procurement/doc/doc/declaration\\_honour/declaration-honour-en.doc](http://www.cc.cec/budg/imp/procurement/doc/doc/declaration_honour/declaration-honour-en.doc)

### 2.3 SELECTION CRITERIA

Tenderers must prove their economic, financial, technical and professional capacity to carry out the work subject to this call for tender.

The evidence requested should be provided by each member of the group in case of joint tender. However a consolidated assessment will be made to verify compliance with the minimum capacity levels.

The tenderer may rely on the capacities of other entities, regardless of the legal nature of the links which it has with them. It must in that case prove to the Contracting Authority that it will have at its disposal the resources necessary for performance of the contract, for example by producing an undertaking on the part of those entities to place those resources at its disposal.

#### 2.3.1 Economic and financial capacity criteria and evidence

In order to prove their economic and financial capacity, the tenderer (i.e. in case of joint tender, the combined capacity of all members of the consortium and identified subcontractors) should provide the following evidence:

- Copy of the profit & loss account and balance sheet for the last two years for which accounts have been closed,
- Failing that, appropriate statements from banks,
- If applicable, evidence of professional risk indemnity insurance;

If, for some exceptional reason which the Contracting Authority considers justified, a tenderer is unable to provide one or other of the above documents, he or she may prove his or her economic and financial capacity by any other document which the Contracting Authority considers appropriate. In any case, the Contracting Authority must at least be notified of the exceptional reason and its justification in the tender. The Commission reserves the right to request any other document enabling it to verify the tenderer's economic and financial capacity.

### **2.3.2 Technical and professional capacity criteria and evidence**

#### **a. Criteria relating to tenderers**

Tenderers (in case of a joint tender the combined capacity of all tenderers and identified subcontractors) must comply with the following criteria:

- The tenderer must prove experience in the field of theory and practice of socio-economic analysis and evaluation with at least two projects delivered in this field in the last three years.
- The tenderer must have knowledge of fundamental features of public support to enterprise (including large firms and foreign direct investment) and Cohesion Policy.
- The tenderer must prove capacity to draft analytical reports in English.
- The tenderer must prove experience in case studies, interviews and collection of data.

#### **Criteria relating to the team delivering the service**

The team delivering the service should include, as a minimum, the following profiles:

Project Manager: At least 10 years' experience in project management, including overseeing project delivery, quality control of delivered service, client orientation and conflict resolution experience in project of a similar size and coverage, with at least one year's experience in management of team of at least 5 people.

Language quality check: at least two members of the team should have native-level language skills in English or equivalent, as guaranteed by a certificate or past relevant experience.

#### **b. Evidence**

The following evidence should be provided to fulfil the above criteria:

- List of relevant services provided in the past three years, with sums, dates and recipients, public or private. The most important services shall be accompanied by certificates of satisfactory execution, specifying that they have been carried out in a professional manner and have been fully completed; services carried out for DG Regional and Urban Policy need not be accompanied by certificates.
- The educational and professional qualifications of the persons who will provide the service for this tender (CVs) including the management staff. Each CV provided should indicate the intended function in the delivery of the service.

## 2.4 AWARD CRITERIA

The tender will be awarded according to the best-value-for-money procedure. The quality of the tender will be evaluated based on the following criteria. The maximum total quality score is 100 points.

- **Quality of the proposed methodology** (50 points – minimum threshold 50%)

This criterion will assess the appropriateness of the methodology of the whole evaluation and of the specific methodology for each task including the final report, as specified below.

- **Organisation of the work** (30 points – minimum threshold 50%)

This criterion will assess how the roles and responsibilities of the proposed team and of the economic operators (in case of joint tenders, including subcontractors if applicable) are distributed for each task. It also assesses the global allocation of time and resources to the project and to each task or deliverable, and whether this allocation is adequate for the work. The tender should provide details on the allocation of time and resources and the rationale behind the choice of this allocation.

- **Quality control measures** (20 points – minimum threshold 50%)

This criterion will assess the quality control system applied to the service foreseen in this tender specification concerning the quality of the deliverables, the language quality check, and continuity of the service in case of absence of the member of the team. The quality system should be detailed in the tender and specific to the tasks at hand; a generic quality system will result in a low score.

Tenders must score above 50% for each criterion and sub-criterion, and above 50% in total. Tenders that do not reach the minimum quality thresholds will be rejected and will not be ranked.

After evaluation of the quality of the tender, the tenders are ranked using the formula below to determine the tender offering best value for money. A weight of 0.7/0.3 is given to quality and price respectively.

score for tender X	=	$\frac{\text{cheapest price}}{\text{price of tender X}}$	*	price weighting (in absolute value)	+	$\frac{\text{total quality score (out of 100) for all award criteria of tender X}}{100}$	*	quality criteria weighting (in absolute value)
--------------------	---	--	---	-------------------------------------	---	--	---	--

## 2.5 TECHNICAL OFFER

The technical offer must cover all aspects and tasks required in the technical specification and provide all the information needed to apply the award criteria. Offers deviating from the requirements or not covering all requirements may be excluded on the basis of non-conformity with the tender specifications and will not be evaluated.

## 2.6 FINANCIAL OFFER

The price for the tender must be quoted in euro. Tenderers from countries outside the euro zone have to quote their prices in euro. The price quoted may not be revised in line with



exchange rate movements. It is for the tenderer to assume the risks or the benefits deriving from any variation.

Prices must be quoted free of all duties, taxes and other charges, including VAT, as the European Union is exempt from such charges under Articles 3 and 4 of the Protocol on the privileges and immunities of the European Union. The amount of VAT may be shown separately.

The quoted price must be a fixed amount which includes all charges (including travel and subsistence). Travel and subsistence expenses are not refundable separately.

### **3 TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS**

#### **3.1 OVERALL PURPOSE AND CONTEXT OF THIS EVALUATION**

The European Commission, Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy intends to undertake an ex post evaluation of cohesion policy programmes financed by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), the Cohesion Fund (CF) and IPA projects in Croatia during the period 2007-2013 in regions covered by the Convergence, Regional Competitiveness, Employment and European Territorial Co-operation objectives in 28 Member States<sup>2</sup>.

The ex post evaluation is an important instrument to inform national and regional authorities, the general public, the European Parliament and other stakeholders involved about the outcomes of the 2007-2013 generation of cohesion policy programmes. The evaluation will examine the extent to which the resources were used, the effectiveness and the socio-economic impact. The evaluation shall identify factors contributing to the success or failure of programmes and identify good practice.

During the 2007-2013 programming period, a stronger focus on accountability for what has been achieved with Cohesion Policy resources has become apparent, stimulated by the publication of the ex post evaluation for the 2000-2006 period and the debate on the requirements for Cohesion Policy for the 2014-2020 period and the economic and financial crisis. This ex post evaluation will deepen the analysis undertaken on the 2000-2006 period, exploring in more depth the achievements of the policy and evaluating themes not covered before.

As required by the regulation, the ex post evaluation must be completed at the end of 2015. This is a special challenge, as programmes are still being implemented until the end of 2015. Results and interim results of the study will be used to improve programmes in the 2014-2020 programming period and will feed into debate on the future policy on economic, social and territorial cohesion after 2020.

---

<sup>2</sup> Council regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 of 11 July 2006 laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund

## 3.2 SPECIFIC CONTEXT OF THIS CONTRACT

Large enterprises are a cornerstone of the modern economy and the focus of many regional innovation systems. Some of the most dramatic development success stories are attributed to attracting large enterprises and over the period 2007-13 such support accounted for a considerable proportion of spending in certain member states (see annex 3 for an indication<sup>3</sup>).

However, empirical evidence so far using counterfactuals (e.g. Mouqué 2012 – reference in Annex 5) has tended to question the impact of public financial support to large enterprises. Moreover, large enterprises are often geographically mobile, prompting questions about whether the impacts of support will stay in the region.

This is one of three work packages on enterprise support (see Annex 2). Since it is the intention that the three reports run roughly in parallel, successful tenderers will be expected to keep up to date with developments in the other two packages (notably by reading reports). They may cite from the other packages, but should still come to their own conclusions.

### **Financial and output data**

Member States and the Commission exchanged more detailed data in the period 2007-2013 compared to previous programming periods in relation to the planned and actual use of the funds and the reporting of "core" indicators for the ERDF and the Cohesion Fund.

In relation to tracking financial inputs, the Member States report annually on progress in project selection using the "categorisation system"<sup>4</sup>. This system comprises 86 priority theme codes (the most widely used element of the categorisation system) but also has information on "form of finance", "Territorial dimension", "economic dimension" and "location".

The system of ERDF/CF core indicator reporting (41 indicators) was set out in working documents from 2007 and 2009<sup>5</sup>. It has led to annual reporting at OP level (sometimes also at priority axis level) of cumulative figures for achieved outputs often in relation to initial target value. Work package zero under the programme of ex-post evaluation 2007-2013 will gather and quality assess physical data reported by Managing Authorities in their Annual Implementation Reports. That work package will therefore provide updated data during the implementation of this contract.

---

<sup>3</sup> These spending codes also include SMEs – the lack of clarity as to the exact proportion of support to large enterprises will be one of the challenges for contractors to resolve.

<sup>4</sup> Regulation EC N° 1828/2006, Article 11, requires the reporting of categorisation information in the Annual Implementation Reports (AIRs). The background reference documents on the use of the categorisation system are: 1) Information Note COCOF 09/0008/00-EN of 18 May 2009 - [LINK](#) and 2) The questions and answers sheet (public SFC2007 webpage) updated in early 2012: [LINK](#)

<sup>5</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/information/evaluations/guidance\\_en.cfm#3](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/information/evaluations/guidance_en.cfm#3)

The categorisation and core indicator data reported in the 2012 AIR in its raw form is provided in the excel tables on this webpage.

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/impact/evaluation/data\\_en.cfm](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/impact/evaluation/data_en.cfm)

However, one issue which the contractor will have to resolve is that many of the expenditure codes which cover large enterprise also include SMEs, so that it is not always obvious where one form of spending ends and the other begins. For case study countries it will therefore be necessary to check beneficiary lists<sup>6</sup> and to consult the managing authorities.

### 3.3 SUBJECT OF THE CONTRACT

To assess the rationale, implementation and evidence of effectiveness of Cohesion Policy support to large enterprises. Policy rationales and the literature will be examined to develop typical theories of change for why and how such support works. These narratives will be critically assessed using evidence from case studies. Such evidence will be confronted with counterfactual impact evaluations (where available).

A distinction will be made between developing large enterprises already present in the region and attracting foreign direct investment (FDI). What role do these have to play in a regional enterprise strategy? How to move from an export-led, FDI-based strategy to a strong indigenous enterprise base?

### 3.4 SCOPE OF THE CONTRACT

Support to large enterprises<sup>7</sup> over the period 2007-13 in the following eight countries:

- The seven countries with the greatest absolute spending in the relevant expenditure codes (05, 07 and 08): these are Poland, Germany, Portugal, Spain, Hungary, Italy and the Czech Republic (see Annex 3), and
- Austria, which has the highest proportion of spending in these codes (Annex 3).

Indicatively, there are 119 programmes in these countries reporting some enterprise spending<sup>8</sup>. But, as noted above, it should be remembered that these codes include SME spending – it is possible that many of these programmes did not give support to large enterprises.

---

<sup>6</sup> Managing authorities publish lists of beneficiaries. For analysis of the possibilities and limits of this data, see Czarnitzki, Bento and Doherr (2011), especially pages 10-19 at: [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/information/evaluations/pdf/impact/ciewp2\\_final.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/information/evaluations/pdf/impact/ciewp2_final.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> Large enterprises [as defined in EU law](#).

<sup>8</sup> Programmes can be consulted here: [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/country/prordn/index\\_en.cfm?gv\\_pay=ALL&gv\\_reg=ALL&gv\\_obj=ALL&gv\\_the=ALL&gv\\_per=2](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/country/prordn/index_en.cfm?gv_pay=ALL&gv_reg=ALL&gv_obj=ALL&gv_the=ALL&gv_per=2)

The eight countries above account for just under EUR 23 billion of spending under these codes in the current period, i.e. 75% of this spending for the EU as a whole. With appropriate caution, they can therefore usually be taken as representative of EU spending in this field.

### 3.5 TASKS

#### **Task 1: Taking stock of support, selecting case studies**

The contractors will examine programmes in the eight countries under 3.4 to identify support to large enterprises. They should:

- Outline the rationale underlying large enterprise support – and how it fits in the broader enterprise strategy for the region.
- Outline how much support and in what main forms/packages of support (including significant non-financial support, ie not giving money directly to the firm). What were they supported to do? What kind of large enterprises are targeted (eg FDI vs indigenous, sector, how large, etc...).
- Quantify<sup>9</sup> the support (number of enterprises, nature and conditions of support, total investment, total approved public support broken down into ERDF/national/etc, payments to end 2013, etc) broken down by the main forms of support (grant, loans, non-financial support, etc) and by whether the enterprise was FDI or already present in the region. Set out other descriptive statistics as available, including monitoring indicators and achievements reported.

This will require not just an examination of the data (programmes, beneficiary lists, major projects lists, work package zero of the ex post evaluation), but telephone interviews (and other contacts where appropriate). In some countries it will be sufficient to contact the national level, but in some cases (including for example Germany and Italy) it will be necessary to contact the regional managing authorities.

The contractor should propose one case study programme from each of the eight countries above – the Commission will make the final decision. Case studies should be proposed on the following criteria:

1. The programme provides significant support to large enterprises.
2. The forms/packages of support and rationale are broadly representative of large enterprise spending at the national level.
3. The extent to which data is available for the tasks to be carried out in the case studies, availability of counterfactual impact evaluations for comparison (see below)

---

<sup>9</sup> Here, and throughout the study, the contractor must undertake to preserve confidentiality and commercial sensitivity. Notably, data must only be presented in a suitably aggregated form, so that individual enterprises cannot be identified.

## **Task 2: Literature review**

Contractors should examine the existing literature (including evaluations) for examples of where and why support to large enterprises works and doesn't work. In each case, the theory of change and contribution stories<sup>10</sup> should be made explicit, including what support, for whom, how it works, the context and the results that would be expected. The aim is to provide the main theories of change and contribution stories – and then use the case studies to assess evidence for and against each one.

The offer should specify key examples of the literature the contractors will use. This should cover a variety of methods (theory based impact evaluation, counterfactuals etc).

However, a particular concern is that counterfactuals so far have not tended to favour support to large enterprises. The review should therefore include an examination of counterfactual studies where available: where this covers a case study country, the study should be compared with context evidence gathered in task 1 to throw further light on the findings and whether they are likely to generalize elsewhere. In particular, the following counterfactual studies should be reviewed (all references and links in bibliography in annex 5):

- Denmark: Centre for Economic and Business Research, Denmark (2010)
- Italy: Martini and Bondonio (2012)
- Poland: Trzcinski (forthcoming – due early 2014).
- Portugal: Mamede (2013)
- UK: Criscuolo, Martin, Overman and Van Reenen (2012)

## **Task 3: The Case Studies**

For each programme, the contractor should:

- Quantify the main forms of support/packages to large enterprises (including foreign direct investment)? Describe the full package of support (including non-ERDF support such as tax-breaks and help with the planning process) as well as the typical conditions of the grant agreement.
- Examine the targeting of support: how do enterprises qualify, what is the size distribution of the large enterprises supported? To what extent is support general vs targeted on strategic firms, for firms already in the region vs FDI? Which markets and where do the firms serve? For foreign-owned firms, what are their main countries of origin?

---

<sup>10</sup> For further explanation of theories of change and contribution stories, see Leeuw “Theory based evaluation” (link in the bibliography).

- Set out the explicit and/or implicit rationale(s) for support and the expected outcomes. These should be compared to the theories of change and contribution stories developed in task 2. All of these should then be assessed in the light of evidence (evaluations, evidence collected by the contractors, etc) for actual outcomes. Of particular interest are questions such as:
  - Effectiveness in terms of investment, productivity, production and employment?
  - Sustainability of the impacts and the quality of the jobs?
  - Wider benefits, eg in terms of bringing technology or better business practices, stimulating skills or productivity? Effects on local enterprises?
  - Is there a difference in the terms above between support to firms new to the region and those already present?
  - Are there elements of the rationale and/or theory of change/contribution stories which systematically fail to materialize, eg firm behaviour does not change (“deadweight”) or wider benefits are promised but prove difficult to detect?
- Based on interviews and evidence already gathered in the above tasks, assess how and to what extent support to large enterprises contributes to the more general strategy for enterprise in the programme area. In other words, moving from support to large enterprises (whether already in the area or FDI) to the general economic health of the region and the SME base. Are the outcomes efficient, in that they are worth the financial cost? Does the region have a risk management strategy for FDI (which may move in the longer term)?

#### **Task 4: Seminar and final report**

The contractor will organise a seminar with representatives of the Managing Authorities of the 8 case study programmes, external experts (including the three advising on this evaluation, see below) and Commission officials to discuss and deepen analysis on the emerging findings of the report and case studies (around 25 persons).

The evaluator will be responsible for the organisation and content of the seminar. This means preparing the basis for discussion, including a summary of the evaluation evidence and their tentative conclusion. It also means identifying participants, leading discussions, writing up the event and consolidation the findings into the draft final report.

The seminar will take place in Brussels. It will be organised by using support from Work Package 1 of the ex post evaluation (“Synthesis”) and the contractor of Work Package 1 will:

- cover travel and accommodation costs for participants from public authorities (maximum 1 night stay, train, flights economy class),
- cover travel and accommodation costs for participants not from public authorities (up to 2 nights, train, flights economy class), as well as a fee appropriate to the level of expertise.

Following the seminar, the contractor will draft a final report, with (1) a main body critically comparing the main sources of evidence (in particular the cross case study analysis, but also the literature survey, results of seminar etc) and (2) eight country annexes summarising the results of tasks 1 and 3. The report will draw conclusions on all the questions above, but will focus in particular on assessing:

- What is the extent and nature of large enterprise support under Cohesion Policy? How does it fit into regional or national enterprise strategies more generally, what contribution does it make?
- Which of the narratives draw up in task 2 (and rationales from task 1) are actually borne out by the case studies in task 3? Evidence for and against each narrative should be examined.
- When, where, how support to large enterprise works – and when it doesn't work. This should be compared to other evidence, notably counterfactuals – where a case study coincides with a counterfactual evaluation, what light does the case study shed on the context and effectiveness of the scheme?
- What is a good strategy for developing large enterprises already present in the programme area and what is a good strategy for attracting foreign direct investment (FDI)? How does this fit into an overall enterprise strategy for the region, including developing local SMEs? How to move from an export-led, FDI-based strategy to a strong indigenous enterprise base? Should FDI-based strategies be time bound, and over what period?

### **3.6 METHODOLOGY**

A combination of methods will be used in this evaluation, some of which have been signalled in the tasks description above. They include:

- Theory based impact evaluation (see Leeuw, in bibliography)
- Case study methodology (see Gaffey (2009), in bibliography)
- Literature review
- Desk research – including evaluations undertaken for the Commission and Member States Annual Implementation Reports,
- Interviews with Member States, Managing Authorities, enterprises and other actors where necessary,
- Other methodological approaches as appropriate, to be specified in the tender documentation.

The tender documentation should outline how these methods will be combined to deliver the various tasks and answer the evaluation questions. The tender should analyse the major challenges foreseen in this contract and outline strategies to tackle them.

### **3.7 WORK ORGANISATION**

As part of the tender documentation, the team to be involved in this evaluation should be identified, describing their skills and qualifications, quantifying the input of each member of the team in terms of days and explaining the distribution of tasks between the different

team members involved. The attention of tenderers is drawn to the need for strong co-ordination, guidance and quality control which will be needed for the successful delivery of this contract.

### 3.8 TIME SCHEDULE

The duration of the tasks is 15 months, starting from the signature of the contract. The deliverables and their timing are specified below.

#### Reports and meetings required by the Terms of Reference

End Month	Output	Meeting
0		Kick-Off Meeting with DG REGIO
Within 1 month	Inception report	Meeting with Steering Group
Within 4 months	First interim report	Meeting with Steering Group
Within 7 months	Two pilot case studies	
Within 10 months	Second interim report	Meeting with Steering Group
Within 11 months	Seminar	
Within 14 months	Draft final report	Meeting with Steering Group
Within 15 months	Final report	

### 3.9 DELIVERABLES

The deliverables of this study will be:

- **Deliverable 1:** one methodological inception report covering all Tasks.  
**Deadline:** within one month after the signature of the contract.
- **Deliverable 2:** the first intermediate report presenting the results of Task 1 and Task 2.  
**Deadline:** within four months of the signature of the contract.
- **Deliverable 3:** the two pilot case studies  
**Deadline:** within seven months of the signature of the contract.
- **Deliverable 4:** the second interim report, covering task 3  
**Deadline:** within ten months of the signature of the contract.
- **Deliverable 5:** the draft final report responding to Tasks 1-4 of these specifications  
**Deadline:** within fourteen months of the signature of the contract.
- **Deliverable 6:** one final report.  
**Deadline:** within fifteen months of the signature of the contract.



Besides the above mentioned deliverables, the contractor will submit a progress report of 2 pages maximum every month.

A hard copy and an electronic version of each report are required. For final reports one hard copy and an electronic version (three CD, Word format and PDF format or equivalent application compatible with MS Office) are required. The Commission will provide details for the layout of the reports.

The contractor will provide presentation material for each of the reports in English (PowerPoint or equivalent application compatible with MS Office) for the use of Commission services.

All reports will be delivered in English. **Tenderers should note that a high standard of written English and capacity for clear and concise expression of complex ideas is required in all deliverables.** An executive summary of the final report specified above will be delivered in English, French and German.

The contractor may be invited to present the results of the evaluation to the Member States and the Commission services (three meetings in Brussels). The travel costs for these presentations will be paid separately.

The quality of the evaluation will be assessed by the Commission services using the quality criteria set out in annex 4. The assessment of the quality will be published by the Commission.

### **3.10 ORGANISATION OF THE STUDY**

There will be a single contract with the Directorate General for Regional and Urban Policy for this evaluation.

As part of the **tender documentation**, the tenderer should identify the members of the core team and experts responsible for the Member State work. Effective planning of the fieldwork is essential and this should be reflected in the days allocated to the core team as well as the Member State experts. The person responsible for the quality of the content of each deliverable (including proper editing of the draft final report in terms of its content) should be identified. In addition the tender documentation should describe for each member of the team his/her skills and qualifications and quantify the input in terms of days and explain the distribution of tasks between the different team members involved. The tenderer should prove that their team has the capacity and knowledge to work in the fields of expertise required and in the languages which may be needed for the analysis and interviews.

The contractor will propose in the tender 3 experts to give advice throughout the evaluation, comment on the deliverables, and participate in the seminar. These experts should have indepth knowledge of the field of enterprise support, one of them being expert in theory-based evaluation. The Commission will make the final choice of experts.

The Directorate General for Regional and Urban Policy will establish a steering group representative of the relevant Directorates of the Directorate General as well as other interested Directorates General. The contractor will provide documentation for and attend

four meetings of the steering group. It is anticipated that the meetings will take place in order to discuss the inception report, the first intermediate report, the second intermediate report and the draft final report.

The contractor will be expected to attend a kick-off meeting plus three or four progress meetings with the Evaluation Unit of the Directorate General for Regional and Urban Policy in Brussels reviewing the progress of the study and resolving any problems arising. These meetings will be arranged according to needs arising.

### **3.11 VOLUME OF THE CONTRACT**

EUR 450,000 maximum (lump sum, including fees, travel expenses and other costs).

### **3.12 TERMS OF PAYMENT**

The Contractor shall submit requests for all payment, expressed in euros, to the Commission.

Payments under the contract shall be made as follows:

**A first interim payment** equal to 10 % of the total amount within 30 days of the date on which a valid request for payment is registered following approval by the Commission of the inception report.

**A second interim payment** equal to 30 % of the total amount within 30 days of the date on which a valid request for payment is registered following approval by the Commission of the first interim report.

**A third interim payment** equal to 30 % of the total amount within 30 days of the date on which a valid request for payment is registered following approval by the Commission of the second interim report.

**Payment of the balance** equal to 30 % of the total amount within 30 days of the date on which a valid request for payment is registered following approval by the Commission of the final report and the previous deliverables, and the organisation of the report's presentations.

### **3.13 DOCUMENTATION FOR THE TENDERERS**

- List of themes to be covered by work packages in the 2007-2013 Ex post evaluation in Annex 2
- Allocation to spending codes including large enterprise in Annex 3.
- Bibliography in Annex 5

The quality of the evaluation will be assessed by the Commission services using the quality criteria set out in Annex 4. The assessment of the quality will be published by the Commission.

## 4 CONTENT, STRUCTURE AND GRAPHIC REQUIREMENTS OF THE FINAL DELIVERABLES

All studies produced for the European Commission and Executive Agencies shall conform to the corporate visual identity of the European Commission by applying the graphic rules set out in the European Commission's Visual Identity Manual, including its logo<sup>11</sup>.

The Commission is committed to making online information as accessible as possible to the largest possible number of users including those with visual, auditory, cognitive or physical disabilities, and those not having the latest technologies. The Commission supports the [Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.0](#) of the W3C.

For full details on Commission policy on accessibility for information providers, see: [http://ec.europa.eu/ipg/standards/accessibility/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/ipg/standards/accessibility/index_en.htm)

Pdf versions of studies destined for online publication should respect W3C guidelines for accessible pdf documents. See: <http://www.w3.org/WAI/>

### Content

#### ➤ Final study report

The final study report shall include:

- an abstract of no more than 200 words and an executive summary of maximum 6 pages, in English, French and German;
- the following standard disclaimer:

*“The information and views set out in this [report/study/article/publication...] are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the Commission. The Commission does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this study. Neither the Commission nor any person acting on the Commission’s behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein.”*

- specific identifiers which shall be incorporated on the cover page provided by the Contracting Authority.

#### ➤ Publishable executive summary

The publishable executive summary shall be provided in English, French and German and shall include:

–the following standard disclaimer:

*“The information and views set out in this [report/study/article/publication...] are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the*

---

<sup>11</sup> The Visual Identity Manual of the European Commission is available upon request. Requests should be made to the following e-mail address: [comm-visual-identity@ec.europa.eu](mailto:comm-visual-identity@ec.europa.eu)

*Commission. The Commission does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this study. Neither the Commission nor any person acting on the Commission's behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein."*

–specific identifiers which shall be incorporated on the cover page provided by the Contracting Authority.

➤ **Graphic requirements**

➤ For graphic requirements please refer to the template provided in the Annex 6. The cover page shall be filled in by the contractor in accordance with the instructions provided in the template. For further details you may also contact [comm-visual-identity@ec.europa.eu](mailto:comm-visual-identity@ec.europa.eu).

**Annex 1: Declaration of honour**

See separate document

## **Annex 2: Themes for Work Packages of the Ex Post Evaluation**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Work package</b>
0	Data collection and quality assessment
1	Synthesis
2	Small and medium-sized enterprises, innovation, ICT
3	Financial instruments for enterprise support
4	Large enterprises
5	Transport
6	Environment
7	Modelling the effects of transport projects
8	Energy efficiency
9	Culture, Tourism
10	Urban development and Social Infrastructure
11	European Territorial Cooperation
12	Delivery system
13	Geography of expenditure
14	Macroeconomic models

### **Annex 3: ERDF allocation to spending codes containing large enterprise, 2007-14**

<b>Categories / Member States</b>	<b>Total ERDF and CF funding (EUR) (A)</b>	<b>Advanced support services for firms and groups of firms</b>	<b>Investment in firms directly linked to research and innovation (...)</b>	<b>Other investment in firms</b>	<b>Total for codes which include large enterprise (EUR) (B)</b>	<b>Selected codes as % of total funding (B) / (A)</b>
Codes		05	07	08		
PL	57,178,151,307	1,087,954,310	3,788,938,185	1,790,363,049	6,667,255,544	<b>12%</b>
DE	16,107,574,792	290,425,652	333,339,676	2,869,199,227	3,492,964,555	<b>22%</b>
PT	14,558,172,647	387,405,736	1,866,458,708	980,482,485	3,234,346,929	<b>22%</b>
ES	26,595,884,632	89,807,986	342,140,130	2,336,027,602	2,767,975,718	<b>10%</b>
HU	21,292,060,049	375,852,080	218,515,814	2,035,673,688	2,630,041,582	<b>12%</b>
IT	21,015,971,700	676,963,076	1,419,353,730	380,762,929	2,477,079,735	<b>12%</b>
CZ	22,751,854,293	244,145,710	603,868,893	541,401,856	1,389,416,459	<b>6%</b>
RO	15,528,889,094	168,584,206	54,358,316	1,028,371,012	1,251,313,534	<b>8%</b>
UK	5,392,019,735	347,634,308	208,913,372	660,733,592	1,217,281,272	<b>23%</b>
EL	15,846,461,042	500,052,200	190,105,250	469,345,562	1,159,503,012	<b>7%</b>
FR	8,054,673,061	345,624,003	229,634,288	407,938,904	983,197,195	<b>12%</b>
BG	5,488,168,381	112,206,463	75,669,718	369,959,241	557,835,422	<b>10%</b>
BE	990,283,172	67,801,068	7,759,247	246,918,266	322,478,581	<b>33%</b>
SI	3,345,349,266		199,134,088	120,042,680	319,176,768	<b>10%</b>
LT	5,747,186,096	62,144,065	93,750,823	161,665,894	317,560,782	<b>6%</b>
AT	680,066,021	41,953,569	120,382,645	125,058,154	287,394,368	<b>42%</b>
CB	7,893,300,818	174,792,245	32,259,211	39,102,751	246,154,207	<b>3%</b>
SK	9,998,728,328	50,745,920	103,751,034	87,437,117	241,934,071	<b>2%</b>
SE	934,540,730	88,806,209	48,230,571	102,499,441	239,536,221	<b>26%</b>
FI	977,401,980	43,832,704	85,022,039	99,506,682	228,361,425	<b>23%</b>
LV	3,947,343,917	15,320,000	146,310,000	58,480,000	220,110,000	<b>6%</b>
EE	3,011,942,552	15,135,365	80,671,839	85,834,623	181,641,827	<b>6%</b>
NL	830,000,000	27,271,000	26,194,000	26,388,000	79,853,000	<b>10%</b>
CY	492,665,838	2,805,000		69,445,000	72,250,000	<b>15%</b>
IE	375,362,372			40,000,000	40,000,000	<b>11%</b>
DK	254,788,620	25,980,691	2,812,343	2,812,343	31,605,377	<b>12%</b>
MT	728,123,051	12,937,610	5,950,000	4,250,000	23,137,610	<b>3%</b>
LU	25,243,666	504,873	252,437		757,310	<b>3%</b>
<b>EU27 + cross-border</b>	<b>270,042,207,160</b>	<b>5,256,686,049</b>	<b>10,283,776,357</b>	<b>15,139,700,098</b>	<b>30,680,162,504</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>EU 15</b>	<b>112,638,444,170</b>	<b>2,934,063,075</b>	<b>4,880,598,436</b>	<b>8,747,673,187</b>	<b>16,562,334,698</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>EU 12</b>	<b>149,510,462,172</b>	<b>2,147,830,729</b>	<b>5,370,918,710</b>	<b>6,352,924,160</b>	<b>13,871,673,599</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>Case study 8</b>	<b>180,179,735,441</b>	<b>3,194,508,119</b>	<b>8,692,997,781</b>	<b>11,058,968,990</b>	<b>22,946,474,890</b>	<b>13%</b>

#### **Annex 4 - Quality Control: Output Quality Criteria**

- Meeting needs as laid out in Terms of Reference
- Relevant scope and coverage
- Defensible design and methods
- Reliable data used
- Sound analysis
- Credible results that relate to analysis and data
- Impartial conclusions showing no bias and demonstrating sound judgement
- Clear report with executive summaries and annexed supportive data



## **Annex 5: Bibliography**

Centre for Economic and Business Research, Denmark (2010) “An Analysis of Firm Growth Effects of the Danish Innovation Consortium Scheme”

<http://fivu.dk/en/publications/2010/an-analysis-of-firm-growth-effects-of-the-danish-innovation-consortium-scheme>

Criscuolo, Martin, Overman and Van Reenen (2012) “The causal effects of an industrial policy” <http://www.nber.org/papers/w17842>

Gaffey (2009) “Case studies in the framework of ex post evaluation 2000-2006: expectations and experiences of the DG for Regional Policy”

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/archive/conferences/evaluation2009/abstracts/gaffey.doc](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/archive/conferences/evaluation2009/abstracts/gaffey.doc)

Leeuw for DG Regional Policy: Guidance on theory-based evaluation.

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/information/evaluations/pdf/impact/theory\\_impact\\_guidance.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/information/evaluations/pdf/impact/theory_impact_guidance.pdf)

Mamede (2013) “Análise contrafactual dos impactos dos incentivos do POE/PRIME na sobrevivência e no crescimento das empresas”

[http://www.pofc.qren.pt/ResourcesUser/2013/Monitorizacao\\_Avaliacao/Relatorios/Analise\\_contrafactual\\_impactos\\_incentivos\\_empresas.pdf](http://www.pofc.qren.pt/ResourcesUser/2013/Monitorizacao_Avaliacao/Relatorios/Analise_contrafactual_impactos_incentivos_empresas.pdf)

Martini and Bondonio (2012) “Counterfactual impact evaluation of Cohesion Policy: impact and cost-effectiveness of investment subsidies in Italy”

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/information/evaluations/impact\\_evaluation\\_en.cfm#1](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/information/evaluations/impact_evaluation_en.cfm#1)

Mouqué (2012) “What are counterfactual impact evaluations teaching us about enterprise and innovation support?”

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/focus/2012\\_02\\_counterfactual.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/focus/2012_02_counterfactual.pdf)

### **Commission reference material**

Ex Post Evaluations of the 2000-2006 Programming period:

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/information/evaluations/archives\\_2000\\_2006\\_en.cfm](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/information/evaluations/archives_2000_2006_en.cfm)

Guidance:

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/information/evaluations/guidance\\_en.cfm#3](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/information/evaluations/guidance_en.cfm#3)

Expert Evaluation Network Reports:

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/information/evaluations/index\\_en.cfm#1](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/information/evaluations/index_en.cfm#1)

Strategic Report, 2013:

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/how/policy/strategic\\_report\\_en.cfm](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/how/policy/strategic_report_en.cfm)

**Annex 6: Template for graphic requirements**

See separate document