



EUROPEAN UNION

DELEGATION TO GEORGIA

The Ambassador

Tbilisi
CH (D)/(2019)

Mr. Branislav Ondruš
State Secretary
Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Family of the Slovak Republic
Špitálska ulica 4-8, 816 43 Bratislava Slovakia
Tel.: 421 2 2046 1310
E-mail: branislav.ondrus@employment.gov.sk

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 Mr. Ondruš,


With reference to the above call for proposals we are pleased to inform you that the proposal submitted by you has been selected to implement jointly the above mentioned twinning project.

Attached please find the summary scores of your proposal.

The proposed date of the start of the implementation (the arrival of RTA) is October 7, 2019, subject to the signature of the contract by all parties.

Please confirm your agreement regarding the start of the implementation within 1 week from the receipt of this notification.

Yours sincerely,



Carl Hartzell

CC: MS NCP, PAO, Tamila Barkalaia (MolDPOTLHSA), 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

1.1	How adequate is the expertise of the proposed RTA to the task foreseen? (Knowledge of the issues to be addressed and experience in implementing the acquis communautaire/area of cooperation)	7.33	/2 x 5
1.2	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)?	5.00	/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?	4.67	/5
1.4	How satisfactory is the previous project management experience of the Project Leader and the administration to which the PL belongs?	4.67	/5
Total Score		21.67	/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"	3.67	/5
1.6	How satisfactory is the technical expertise of the proposed Component Leaders?	4.00	/5
Total Score		7.67	/10

C MS Junior Partner

1.7	How good is the complementarity with the Lead MS Partner	4.00	/5
1.8	How adequate is the expertise of the proposed MS Junior Partner for the tasks foreseen to be covered by them?+B39	4.00	/5
Total Score		8.00	/10

Total for operational capacity (if < 27, the proposal is eliminated) : **37.33** **/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?	4.33	/5
2.2	How relevant are the plans for initial and subsequent work-plan preparations including the plans/ideas for communication and visibility actions?	4.33	/5
2.3	How well does the MS administration administrative model correspond to the needs identified in the Twinning Project Fiche?	4.33	/5

2.4	How does the proposal take into account other sector initiatives and/or – previous projects avoiding duplication and creating synergies?	4.00	/5
Total for relevance (if < 16, the proposal is eliminated) :		17.00	/20

3 Methodology

3.1	Is the overall concept behind the ideas and the proposal coherent?	4.67	/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	4.33	/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?	4.33	/5
Total for methodology:		17.67	/20

4 Sustainability

4.1	Is the action likely to have a tangible impact on its target groups?	4.33	/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.)	4.33	/5
4.3	Are the expected results of the proposed action sustainable and are ideas/strategies for sustaining results realistic?	4.33	/5
		13.00	/15

SUMMARY SCORES STATEMENT

1	<i>Operational Capacity</i> (if < 27, the proposal is eliminated)	37.33	/45
	<i>A. Resident Twinning Adviser and Project Leader</i>	21.67	/25
	<i>B. Component Leaders</i>	7.67	/20
	<i>C. MS Junior Partner</i>	8.00	/
2	<i>Relevance</i> (if < 16, the proposal is eliminated)	17.00	/20
3	<i>Methodology</i>	17.67	/20
4	<i>Sustainability</i>	13.00	/15
TOTAL SCORE:		85.00	/100

5. STRONG POINTS:

Good proposal. Functional, balanced team. RTA experienced in EU project management. Full spectrum of issues covered. Concrete deliverables exemplified (campaigns, training centre). Relevant twinning track record. Good understanding of Georgian reality in the sector.

WEAK POINTS:

Component leader 1 would need backing up in the policy / lawmaking and labour rights/ gender issues. The RTA has comparatively less hands-on practice at home country administration. The junior Project Leader has strong international cooperation experience but limited twinning experience. The division of labour for details of each component could be more elaborated between EUMS.

PARTICULAR COMMENTS

none

ASSESSMENT & CONCLUSION

Selected

