



EUROPEAN UNION

DELEGATION TO GEORGIA

The Ambassador

Tbilisi CH(2019)

Ministry of Social Security and Labour of the Republic of Lithuania (MSSL)
A Vivulskio street, 11
LT-03610 Vilnius, Lithuania
Tel: +370 5 266 4201
e-mail: post@spocmin.lt

Our ref.: EuropeAid/163731/ACT/GE

Subject: Improving the standards of employment conditions/relations as well as health and safety at work in Georgia

Twinning ref: GE 17 ENI OT 02 19

Dear Sir / Madam,

Thank you for your interest and participation in the above-mentioned twinning call for proposals. Following the meetings of the selection committee held on 26/06/2019 and 28/06/2019 at the Delegation of the European Union to Georgia, we regret to inform you that your proposal has not been selected for award of a contract financed by the European Union for the following reasons:

- The understanding of Georgian state of play not expressed/defined sufficiently;
- Comparatively less twinning experiences in the past, none as a consortium.

For your information the Selection Committee has recommended awarding the contract to the consortium of Slovakia / Spain / Estonia.

Although we have not been able to make use of your services on this occasion, I trust that you will continue to take an active part in our future initiatives.

Attached please find the table with cumulative scores for your proposal.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Carl Hartzell', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the left.

Carl Hartzell

CC: MS NCP, PAO, Tamila Barkalaia (MoDPOTLHSA), V. Rey (EU Delegation to Georgia), Lali Chkhetia (EU Delegation to Georgia), V. Juodsnukyte (EU Delegation to Georgia), NEAR TWINNING; Ela Horoszkó (HQ).

1 Operational capacity

A Resident Twinning Adviser and Project Leader

	How adequate is the expertise of the proposed RTA to the task foreseen?		
1.1	(Knowledge of the issues to be addressed and experience in implementing the acquis communautaire/area of cooperation)	6.67	/2 x 5
	How satisfactory is the management experience and capacity of the EU proposed Project Leader and the administration to which the PL belong (Including staff and its ability to handle the project budget)?	3.67	/5
1.3	How satisfactory is the previous project coordination and management experience of the Resident Twinning Adviser? Could any potential lack of experience (although meeting minimum) be considered by other members of the team?	4.00	/5
1.4	How satisfactory is the previous project management experience of the Project Leader and the administration to which the PL belongs?	3.67	/5
Total Score		18.00	/25

B Component Leaders and their Availability

1.5	How adequate for the tasks (specific expertise) are the proposed Component Leaders from the Member States and do they all come from "own staff"	4.00	/5
1.6	How satisfactory is the technical expertise of the proposed Component Leaders?	3.67	/5
Total Score		7.67	/20

C MS Junior Partner

1.7	How good is the complementarity with the Lead MS Partner	4.33	/5
1.8	How adequate is the expertise of the proposed MS Junior Partner for the tasks foreseen to be covered by them?+B39	4.33	/5
Total Score		8.67	/10

Total for operational capacity (if < 27, the proposal is eliminated) : **34.33** **/45**

2 Relevance

2.1	How relevant are the concepts and ideas behind the strategy and methodology presented to the needs of the beneficiary administration and how does it link with the Twinning Project Fiche?	3.67	/5
2.2	How relevant are the plans for initial and subsequent work-plan preparations including the plans/ideas for communication and visibility actions?	4.00	/5
2.3	How well does the MS administration administrative model correspond to the needs identified in the Twinning Project Fiche?	4.00	/5

2.4	How does the proposal take into account other sector initiatives and/or – previous projects avoiding duplication and creating synergies?	3.67	/5
Total for relevance (if < 16, the proposal is eliminated) :		15.33	/20

3 Methodology

3.1	Is the overall concept behind the ideas and the proposal coherent?	4.33	/5
3.2	Is the proposed methodology adequate for the needs as expressed in the project Fiche?	4.33	/5
3.3	Are the results (in terms of concrete mandatory results / outputs to impact on specific and overall objectives) possible to measure	4.00	/5
3.4	Do the Member State(s) foresee to cover all Components areas stated in the twinning Project Fiche? Are there examples of key activities proposed which are consistent with the mandatory results / outputs and the objectives?	3.67	/5
Total for methodology:		16.33	/20

4 Sustainability

4.1	Is the action likely to have a tangible impact on its target groups?	4.00	/5
4.2	Is the proposal likely to have multiplier effects? (including scope for replication and extension of the outcome of the action and dissemination of information.)	3.33	/5
4.3	Are the expected results of the proposed action sustainable and are ideas/strategies for sustaining results realistic?	4.33	/5
		11.67	/15

SUMMARY SCORES STATEMENT

1	Operational Capacity (if < 27, the proposal is eliminated)	34.33	/45
	A. Resident Twinning Adviser and Project Leader	18.00	/25
	B. Component Leaders	7.67	/20
	C. MS Junior Partner	8.67	/
2	Relevance (if < 16, the proposal is eliminated)	15.33	/20
3	Methodology	16.33	/20
4	Sustainability	11.67	/15
TOTAL SCORE:		77.67	/100

5. STRONG POINTS:

Good proposal. Technically robust RTA. Broad spectrum of issues covered by proposal. Some useful extra ideas (such as digital system, dispute settlement)

WEAK POINTS:

Complex set up between EU MS team members. The understanding of Georgian state of play could be better expressed/defined RTA communication / presentation skills leave room for improvement. Some individual twinning experiences in the past but not as a consortium. Component Leader 2 would need to be backed up for the implementation / enforcement aspects.

PARTICULAR COMMENTS

none

ASSESSMENT & CONCLUSION

Not selected

