



**EUROPEAN COMMISSION**  
DIRECTORATE GENERAL  
ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL AFFAIRS  
International economic and financial relations, global governance  
**Neighbourhood countries - Macrofinancial assistance**

Brussels,  
D(2018)

**TERMS OF REFERENCE ECFIN 2018 013/D**

**Request for Services**

**In the context of the DG ECFIN Framework Service Contracts on  
the provision of evaluation and related services in the  
field of macro-financial assistance (MFA)**

**Ex-post evaluation of Macro-Financial Assistance operation in  
Georgia over the period 2013 - 2017**

- |         |   |
|---------|---|
| Part 1: | Technical description   |
| Part 2: | Administrative details  |
| Part 3: | Assessment and award of a specific contract   |
| Part 4: | Draft specific contract   |
| <br>    |   |
| Annex 1 | Timetable   |
| Annex 2 | Statement on ability to carry out the services and absence of conflict of interests |
| Annex 3 | Document template   |

## **PART 1: TECHNICAL DESCRIPTION**

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

The Directorate-General for Economic and Financial Affairs (DG ECFIN) (the awarding authority) wishes to establish a specific service contract for the ex-post evaluation of a Macro-Financial Assistance (MFA) operation to Georgia. This contract will be awarded under the terms of the DG ECFIN Multiple Framework Service Contracts for the provision of evaluation and evaluation-related services in the field of macro-financial assistance at a cost not exceeding € 130,000.

Procedures for responding to this request for service are indicated in Article 5.3 of Annex I of the aforementioned Framework Contract.

The work will commence on the day of the signing of the contract by the last signing party and will be completed within not more than 8 months from that date. The specific contract will be managed by unit D2 of DG ECFIN, the unit responsible for neighbourhood countries – macro-financial assistance.

### **2. DESCRIPTION OF THE OPERATION TO BE EVALUATED**

Macro-Financial Assistance (MFA) is a policy-based financial instrument of untied and undesignated balance-of-payments support to partner third countries. It takes the form of medium/long-term loans or grants, or a combination of these, and generally complements financing provided in the context of an International Monetary Fund's reform programme.

The evaluation will assess the MFA operation to Georgia that was governed by Decision No 778/2013/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 August 2013 providing further macro-financial assistance to Georgia<sup>1</sup>. Under the MFA operation that ran over the period 2013-2017, a total of EUR 46 million, of which EUR 23 million in the form of grants and EUR 23 million in the form of loans, was disbursed to Georgia as a response to the aftermath of the armed conflict with Russia in 2008 and the international financial crisis in 2009.

The MFA to Georgia was provided with a view to support the restoration of a sustainable external financial situation of the country, to alleviate its balance of payments and budgetary needs and thereby support its economic and social development.

Further information can be obtained on the website of the DG for Economic and Financial Affairs at:

[https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/economic-and-fiscal-policy-coordination/international-economic-relations/enlargement-and-neighbouring-countries/neighbouring-countries-eu/neighbourhood-countries/georgia\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/economic-and-fiscal-policy-coordination/international-economic-relations/enlargement-and-neighbouring-countries/neighbouring-countries-eu/neighbourhood-countries/georgia_en)

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 218, 14.08.2013, p. 15

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1487267047919&uri=CELEX:32013D0778>

### 3. SCOPE AND FOCUS OF THE EVALUATION

#### 3.1. Reasons for the evaluation and its objectives

Decision 778/2013/EU (Article 7 par. 2) says that: "*No later than two years after the expiry of the availability period referred to in Article 1(4), the Commission shall submit to the European Parliament and to the Council an ex post evaluation report.*"

In order to assess the results and the efficiency of the MFA operation in line with Article 7(2) of the legislative decision, (i) the impact of MFA on the economy of the beneficiary country and in particular on the sustainability of its external position will have to be analysed and (ii) the added value of the EU intervention will have to be assessed *inter alia*. The evaluation should also draw lessons with respect to the EU's financial assistance:

- whether the ex-ante considerations determining the design and terms of the operation were appropriate, taking due account of the economic, political and institutional context;
- and whether the outcome of the programme met the objectives set in the legislative decision.

The evaluation consists of an ex post assessment of the objectives, content and results of the MFA operations. Further to Article 3(1) of Decision No 778/2013/EU, the Commission on behalf of the Union agreed with the Georgian authorities on economic conditions of the assistance; these conditions were laid down in the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). The economic policy and financial conditions set out in the MoU were consistent with the agreements or understandings referred to in Article 1(3) of Decision No 778/2013/EU, including the macro-economic adjustment and structural reform programmes implemented by Georgia, with the support of the International Monetary Fund.

The outcome of the evaluation will be used to inform a report to the European Parliament and Council. In addition conclusions will be used to inform future MFA operations.

The evaluation is included in the 2016-2020 ECFIN multi-annual evaluation plan:

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/economy\\_finance/evaluation/pdf/maep\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/economy_finance/evaluation/pdf/maep_en.pdf)

The evaluation will be undertaken on the basis of the requirements of Decision 778/2013/EU as well as on more general principles on evaluations laid out in the Better Regulation Guidelines:

<https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/better-regulation-guidelines.pdf>

#### 3.2. Scope of the evaluation and focus of the work

This evaluation focuses on assessing ex post the contribution of EU Macro-Financial Assistance facility to macro-economic and structural adjustment of the recipient country.

The ex-post evaluation of MFA to Georgia is expected to assess the extent to which the intervention was effective, efficient, relevant, coherent and has

achieved EU added value. To this extent, the evaluation is expected to address, at minimum, the following evaluation questions:

- To what extent was the MFA operation design (including adequateness of financing envelope, focus of conditionality) appropriate in relation to the outputs to be produced and the objectives to be achieved? This question mainly aims at assessing the **relevance** of the intervention;
- To what extent have the objectives of the MFA operation been achieved? This question aims at assessing the **effectiveness** of the intervention and considers the global picture (macroeconomic developments, fiscal policy, structural reforms, other sector reforms, etc.) to determine what have been the quantitative and qualitative effects. It will also assess to what extent the operation contributed to achieving its specific objectives outlined in the Decision and the Memorandum of Understanding.
- In what way has the design of the MFA assistance conditioned the performance of the operation in respect to its cost and its objectives? Was the disbursement of the financial assistance appropriate in the context of the prevailing economic and financial conditions in the beneficiary country? To what extent did the MFA operation design enable the intervention to be carried out **efficiently**?
- What is the additional value resulting from an EU intervention compared to what could reasonably have been expected from Member States acting at a national level? To what extent did the MFA operation add value compared to other interventions by other international development partners, and notably the International Monetary Fund (IMF)? This question aims to assess the **EU added-value** of the intervention;
- To what extent was the MFA operation in line with key principles, objectives and measures taken in other EU external actions in the context of the European Neighbourhood policy towards Georgia? This question aims to assess the **coherence** of the intervention with other EU policies within the framework of the EU's cooperation with Georgia.

In addition to the abovementioned questions and methodological orientations, the ex-post evaluation will separately address the following issues:

- An analysis of social impact of the MFA operation (more specifically in relation to the policy measures included in the Memorandum of Understanding relating to the social sector and by including social variables in the analysis), including in combination with IMF programme measures.
- An analysis of the impact of the MFA operation (also in combination with the IMF programme) on the debt sustainability of the country, possibly by drawing on the IMF's debt sustainability analysis (DSA).

The evaluation will be based on a consultation strategy including stakeholder interviews undertaken in Georgia with legislators, implementers and beneficiaries. The external contractor will conduct these interviews and may complement them with case studies of selected structural reforms included in

the MFA operation. The specific case studies shall be approved by an inter-service steering group. Triangulation of data sources will be further enhanced by contributions from NGOs.

Evaluation work will include, but not be limited to, the assessment of GDP, Balance of Payments, exchanges rates and fiscal balances.

Detailed methodological orientations including required profile and status of experts are provided in Annex I section 3 of the Framework Contract as well as in annex 4 to annex I "*Guidelines for the Ex Post Evaluation of Macro-Financial Assistance and Balance of Payments Assistance Operations*".

#### 4. ORGANISATION, TIMETABLE AND REPORTING

##### 4.1. Inter-service Steering Group composition and role

An inter-service steering group (ISG) has been established consisting of officials with experience and knowledge of the activities being evaluated and policy and programme evaluation. It has been charged with preparing and overseeing the evaluation exercise. During the evaluation the ISG will, amongst other things, facilitate the access of the contractor to appropriate sources of data, check the factual accuracy and focus of the work as it progresses, participate in the formulation of conclusions with the evaluator and be responsible for the quality assessment of the final report.

The ISG will meet in the presence of the contractor at the launch meeting of the evaluation and also, again, no later than 15 days after the receipt of each deliverable (inception report, intermediate report, draft final report and final report) to provide feedback to the evaluator about the contents of each document. The contractor must take account of the steering group's observations and comments and keep it informed of the progress of the work.

The steering group is coordinated and chaired by Unit D2, responsible for MFA operations in the DG for Economic and Financial Affairs.

##### 4.2. Deliverables and their contents and meetings

All reports shall be drafted in English.

###### *4.2.1. Deliverables and their contents<sup>2</sup>*

In addition to the information provided in Section 4 of Annex I to the Framework Contract, it should be noted that:

- The **inception report** will enable the steering group to validate the finalised evaluation methodology and assess the level of understanding of the contractor of the activities being evaluated before the start of the fieldwork<sup>3</sup>. The inception report should include a detailed evaluation framework that presents indicators, judgement criteria, proposed qualitative and quantitative analysis to be undertaken along with sources

---

<sup>2</sup> See also Part 2 "Administrative details", in particular section 4, page 30.

<sup>3</sup> It is important to note that primary data collection in the recipient country should not commence until the inception report has been approved by the steering group.

of information to be used in answering the evaluation questions. In addition, the inception report should include a consultation strategy<sup>4</sup>. The consultation strategy should follow the structure presented in the Better Regulation Guidelines toolbox<sup>5</sup> and the guidance given at the kick-off meeting.

- The **intermediate report** will provide the steering group with a basis for interaction with the contractor on the results of the work conducted so far and allow the group to assess that the work is both on schedule and remains focused on answering the evaluation questions in the terms of reference.
- The structure and content of the **draft final report** should be aligned with the Staff Working Document that must be drafted by the Commission at the end of the evaluation<sup>6</sup>. The draft final report will provide complete answers to all evaluation questions, including conclusions and lessons learned. Conclusions and lessons learned will be clearly underpinned by the results of analysis.
- The **final report** will take into account the observations and comments of the steering group on the draft final report, as well as the outcome of the workshop with stakeholders, insofar as they do not impinge on the independent judgement of the evaluator. The structure of the final report will align with the structure of the Staff Working Document. The final report will also contain an abstract of no more than 200 words and an executive summary of maximum 6 pages, both in English and Georgian.
- Appended to the final report will be a series of annexes presenting detailed information on the methodology and analytical models employed as well as evidence / data used along with any other relevant background information. One of the annexes should provide a synopsis report on the consultation process and the results of the consultation activities<sup>7</sup>.
- The final report will not exceed 100 pages in length. The report should be drafted in a clear and understandable way, in English.
- Five paper copies of the above mentioned final report shall be provided.

*All reports will be structured around the evaluation criteria presented in section 2.2. They will be sufficiently complete and well written as to allow meaningful exchanges between the steering group and the evaluator to take place on their content.*

---

<sup>4</sup> See pages 69-78 of the Better Regulation guidelines:

[http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/swd\\_br\\_guidelines\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/swd_br_guidelines_en.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/file\\_import/better-regulation-toolbox-53\\_en\\_0.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/file_import/better-regulation-toolbox-53_en_0.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/file\\_import/better-regulation-toolbox-49\\_en\\_0.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/file_import/better-regulation-toolbox-49_en_0.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> This annex should be in line with the requirements of 5.1 of tool 49 of the toolbox ([https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/file\\_import/better-regulation-toolbox-49\\_en\\_0.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/file_import/better-regulation-toolbox-49_en_0.pdf)) and the Better Regulation Guidelines on Consultation.

#### *4.2.2. Meetings*

Four meetings between the steering group and the contractor are foreseen. Meetings will take place in Brussels and will be as follows:

- a kick-off meeting;
- an inception meeting where the inception report will be presented;
- an intermediate meeting where the intermediate report will be presented;
- and a final meeting where the draft final report will be presented.

In addition, the contractor will organise a consultation workshop with stakeholders in Brussels. This workshop will be facilitated by a videoconference link to enable stakeholders in Georgia to participate. The **draft final report** will be made available to stakeholders 10 days prior to this workshop.

In addition to the meetings with the steering group, the contractor may also be required to undertake an oral presentation of the evaluation results in Brussels to Commission services.

Additional meetings may be called by the Commission as deemed required.

### **4.3. Scheduling of work**

The evaluation will be completed **within not more than 8 months** from the signature of the contract. The work is composed of the following 4 phases, each one culminating in the production of a deliverable which is to be presented by the contractor to the steering group.

#### *4.3.1. Inception*

This phase will commence with the entry into force of the contract; the kick-off meeting shall be held no later than **10 days** after the signing of the contract.

During this period the contractor will develop a thorough understanding of the activities of the MFA operation to be evaluated and draw up a fully operational evaluation method that allows the evaluation questions to be answered.

This phase will draw to a close with the delivery of an inception report no more than **1 month** after the signing of the contract.

#### *4.3.2. Data collection and initial analyses*

This phase will start once the inception report is confirmed by the European Commission to have been accepted as satisfactory following the "inception meeting" of the steering group. It will consist of the first stage of field work involving the collection and analysis of data from stakeholders.

This phase will terminate with the delivery of an intermediate report no more than **2 months** after the delivery of the inception report.

#### *4.3.3. Close of data collection, final analyses and judgment*

Data collection and analysis will continue after the intermediate meeting with the steering group. It will be followed by a full analysis of data collected and the drawing of conclusions.

This phase will culminate in the production of a draft final report that will be delivered no more than **2 months** after the delivery of the intermediate report.

#### *4.3.4. Finalisation and feedback*

No later than **2 months** after the delivery of the draft final report, the contractor will deliver the definitive final report and executive summary.

Part of the finalisation process will be a consultation workshop with stakeholders, organised by the contractor, which will take place in Brussels at the premises of the Commission and will be facilitated by a videoconference link to enable stakeholders in Georgia to participate.

After approval of the final report by the Commission and not later than **1 month** after the delivery of the final report, the contractor will make a presentation of the results to Commission services (optional; to be decided during the evaluation process). At the end of this phase, the evaluation process will be closed.

The table in Annex 1 summarises the timetable for the evaluation work and the reports to be submitted.

### **4.4. Quality assessment**

As specified in the Annex 3 of the General Terms of Reference (Annex I of the Framework Service Contract) the output of the specific contract will be subject to quality requirements.



#### 4.5. Proposed team

The tender must include a description of the proposed team, its composition, its expertise<sup>8</sup> and the work effort planned for each member in terms of man/days for each phase of the project.

Name of Expert	Position/Expertise	Category	Languages	Working days

Man/days	Category I	Category II	Category III	Category IV	Total days
Inception					
Data Collection and analysis					
Close of data collection, final analysis and judgement					
Finalisation and feedback					
<b>Total days</b>					

It is recommended to include a Category III expert in the team speaking Georgian.

---

<sup>8</sup> Please refer to annex 6 of Annex I (tender specifications of the framework contract) for the description of categories

#### 4.6. Budget

The tender must include a detailed proposed budget including travel<sup>9</sup> expenses following the model below:

		Category I	Category II	Category III	Category IV	TOTAL (€)
Person days per category						
Fees: € per day						
Total Consulting fees	€					
Reimbursable travel expenses other than for services provided on the contractor's premises, in the Commission's offices in Brussels and Luxembourg.						TOTAL(€) Price travel
Destination						
Destination						
Destination						
Total expenses						€
TOTAL COSTS						

The overall travel plan will depend on the methodology proposed by the contractor.

#### 5. PLACE OF PERFORMANCE

The place of performance of the tasks shall be the contractor's premises and/or any other place indicated in the tender, with the exception of the Commission's premises.

#### 6. PUBLICATION

The European Commission retains all rights relating to evaluation reports produced under this contract and to their reproduction and publication. Any document based in full or in part on the work carried out under these contracts may be disseminated or published only with the European Commission's permission.

Publication of the final report or its results can be accompanied by a quality assessment of the evaluation by the Commission's staff.

---

<sup>9</sup> The personnel fees **must also include the travel and subsistence costs** for services provided on the contractor's premises, in the Commission's offices in Brussels and Luxembourg.

## **PART 2: ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS**

### **1. SUBCONTRACTORS**

In accordance with Article II.7 of the Framework Contract, subcontracting shall require the previous written authorisation of the Commission. Subcontracting may be authorised in duly justified cases, such as:

- Need for highly specialised methodologies or very restricted field of expertise
- Special linguistic needs

Failure to declare subcontracting may result in termination of the contract concluded with the Commission. In particular the bid must *clearly identify the subcontractor(s), specify the share (in %) of the services* that will be executed by the subcontractor(s) and document their willingness to accept the tasks and their acceptance of the terms and conditions set out in these specifications including the Annexes.

Where, in a bid, the amount of the services executed by a subcontractor is equal to or exceeds 20% of the contract, the subcontractor must provide all the necessary documents for assessing the bid as a whole with regard to the exclusion criteria, selection criteria (as a whole) and award criteria.

### **2. PAYMENTS**

Payments shall be made in accordance with Article I.4 of the Framework Service Contract.

### **3. CONTENT OF THE TENDER**

The offer will provide a well-structured, concise and detailed **description** of:

- The tenderer's understanding of the key issues underlying the evaluation areas
- How the evaluation will be carried out in the allotted time schedule
- The composition of the team: names, categories of expertise, CV's (for those not already included in the Framework Service Contract) and number of working days for each category
- How the team's work will be structured from the kick-off meeting to the delivery of the final report
- The technical means, methods and sources of data that will be used to answer the evaluation questions
- The planned missions or visits as part of the evaluation

The offer will also include the **price (maximum 130 000€)**, presented as a lump-sum on the basis of the established unit costs in the Framework Service Contract and broken down by categories of experts using the format given in Annex 6 of Annex I. The price offer must be signed by a representative of the tenderer.

#### **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>10</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/>

#### **4.1. Content**

##### **4.1.1. Final study report**

The final study report shall include:

- a summary presenting a synthesis of the conclusions and lessons learned, if needed, found in the main body of the report, an abstract of no more than 200 words and an executive summary of maximum 6 pages, both in English and Georgian;
- 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.

##### **4.1.2. Publishable executive summary**

---

<sup>10</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)

The publishable executive summary shall be provided in both in English and Georgian 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 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.

#### **4.2. Structure**

The structure of the final report (or alternatively of the synthesis report) should be aligned with the structure of the Staff Working Document that must be drafted by the Commission at the end of the evaluation<sup>11</sup>.

#### **4.3. Graphic requirements**

See section 4.5 of Annex I of the Framework Service Contract.

---

<sup>11</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/better-regulation-toolbox-49\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/better-regulation-toolbox-49_en)

## **PART 3: ASSESSMENT AND AWARD OF A SPECIFIC CONTRACT**

### **AWARD CRITERIA**

In accordance with the Annex 1 to the General Terms of Reference (Annex I of the Framework Service Contract), the specific contract will be awarded with regard of the following criteria.

#### **Quality criteria**

QC.1, max 20 points: Understanding of the services and general approach to the work to be performed

QC.2, max 30 points: Proposed methodology and tools

QC.3, max 20 points: Approach proposed for the management of the work

QC.4, max 30 points: Qualifications, experience and expertise of the team

Tenders which do not obtain at least 50% of the maximum score for each award criterion and at least 60% of the overall score for all criteria, will not be admitted to the next stage of the evaluation procedure.

#### **Financial criteria**

Each offer will be assessed in terms of the total price for the proposal on the basis of the specific unit prices set in the Framework Service Contract, broken down by categories of experts and travel and mission expenses.

#### **Contract award**

The contract will be awarded to the most economically advantageous tender. This will be determined on the basis of the price and the quality of the tender by means of computation of the final score according to the following formula:

*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 60/40 is given to quality and price.*

<b>Final Score</b>
<b>Score for tender X</b> = (cheapest price/price of tender X * 40) + (total quality score (out of 100)/100*60)

## **PART 4: DRAFT SPECIFIC CONTRACT**



**EUROPEAN COMMISSION**  
DIRECTORATE GENERAL  
ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL AFFAIRS  
International economic and financial relations, global governance  
**Director**

### **SPECIFIC CONTRACT No [complete]<sup>12</sup> implementing DG ECFIN Framework Contract No ...**

The European Union (hereinafter referred to as "the Union"), represented by the European Commission (hereinafter referred to as "the Commission"), which is represented for the purposes of the signature of this contract by Elena Flores, Director, Directorate International economic and financial relations, global governance,

of the one part,

and

[official name in full]  
[official address in full]

hereinafter referred to as "the Contractor", represented for the purposes of the signature of this contract by [forename, surname and function,]

of the other part,

HAVE AGREED

### **ARTICLE III.1: SUBJECT**

- III.1.1** This specific contract implements DG ECFIN Framework Service Contract No [complete] signed by the Commission and the Contractor on xxx.
- III.1.2** The subject of this specific contract is the ex-post evaluation of a Macro Financial Assistance operation to Georgia.
- III.1.3** The Contractor undertakes, on the terms set out in the Framework Contract and in this specific contract and the annex[es] thereto, which form an integral part thereof, to perform the following tasks specified in Annex A (Tender specifications).

---

<sup>12</sup> Options [*in italics*] to be deleted where not applicable.

Options [in roman] to be completed.

## **ARTICLE III.2: DURATION**

**III.2.1** This specific contract shall enter into force on the date on which it is signed by the last contracting party.

**III.2.2** The duration of the tasks shall not exceed 8 months. Execution of the tasks shall start from date of entry into force of this specific contract. The period of execution of the tasks may be extended only with the express written agreement of the parties before such period elapses.

## **ARTICLE III.3: PRICE**

**III.3.1** The total amount to be paid by the Commission under this specific contract shall be EUR [amount in figures and in words] covering all tasks executed.

**III.3.2** In addition to the price [*no reimbursable costs are foreseen*] [*costs up to an amount of EUR ... will be reimbursed according to the provisions of the Framework contract*]

*[For Contractors established in Belgium, the provisions of this contract constitute a request for VAT exemption No 450, provided the Contractor includes the following statement in his invoice(s): "Exonération de la TVA, article 42, paragraphe 3.3 du code de la TVA" or an equivalent statement in the Dutch or German language.]*

**III.3.3.** Payments under this specific Contract shall be made in accordance with the instructions laid down in Article I.5 of the Framework Service Contract.

## **ARTICLE III.4: ANNEXE[S]**

**Annex A** – Request for an offer/Tender specifications (no [*complete*] of [*complete*])

**Annex B** – Contractor's specific Tender (no [*complete*] of [*complete*])

## **SIGNATURES**

For the Contractor,  
[*Company name/forename/surname/function*]

For the Commission,  
Elena Flores  
Director

signature[s]: \_\_\_\_\_

signature[s]: \_\_\_\_\_

Done at [Brussels], [date]

Done at [Brussels], [date]

In duplicate in English.



## **ANNEX 1 – TIMETABLE**

<b><u>Month</u></b>	<b><u>Tasks and deliverables</u></b>
<i>N</i>	<i>Signing of contract by last signing party.</i>
<i>N + 10 days max</i>	Kick-off meeting of the Contractor with the steering group. Presentation of the evaluation method by the contractor.
<b><i>N + 1 month</i></b>	<b><i>Submission of the inception report.</i></b>
<i>N + 1 month + 10 days max</i>	Meeting of the contractor with the steering group to discuss the inception report.
<i>N + 1 month + 20 days max</i>	Delay for EC to approve, to approve under the condition of the integration of its remarks in the Intermediate report, or to ask for a review of the inception report based on its comments.
<i>(N + 1 month + 20 days max + 20 days max)</i>	<i>(Delay for the contractor to submit a new report taking into accounts the comments of the Commission).</i>
<b><i>N + 3 months</i></b>	<b><i>Submission of the intermediate report.</i></b>
<i>N + 3 months + 10 days max</i>	Meeting of the contractor with the steering group to discuss the intermediate report.
<i>N + 3 months + 20 days max</i>	Delay for EC to approve, under the condition of the integration of its remarks in the draft final report, or to ask for a review of the intermediate report based on its comments.
<i>(N + 3 months + 20 days max + 20 days max)</i>	<i>(Delay for the contractor to submit a new report taking into accounts the comments of the Commission).</i>
<b><i>N + 5 months</i></b>	<b><i>Submission of the Draft final report.</i></b>
<i>N + 5 months + 10 days max</i>	Meeting of the contractor with the steering group to discuss the Draft final report.
<i>N + 5 months + 20 days max</i>	Consultation workshop with stakeholders, to be organised by the contractor in Brussels in the premises of the Commission with a videoconference link to enable stakeholders in Georgia to participate.
<i>N + 5 months + 20 days max</i>	Delay for EC to approve, under the condition of the integration of its remarks in the final report, or to ask for a review of the draft final report based on its comments.
<i>(N + 5 months + 20 days max + 20 days max)</i>	<i>(Delay for the contractor to submit a new report taking into accounts the comments of the Commission).</i>
<b><i>N + 7 months</i></b>	<b><i>Submission of the Final report and PowerPoint presentation.</i></b>
<i>(N + 7 months + 10 days max)</i>	Delay for EC to approve or to ask for a review of the final report based on its comments.
<i>(N + 7 months + 20 days max)</i>	Delay for the contractor to submit a new report taking into account the comments of the Commission.
<i>N + 7-8 months</i>	<i>(Optional) Presentation of evaluation results to Commission services.</i>

**ANNEX 2 – Statement on ability to carry out the services and absence of conflict of interests**

The undersigned [*name of the signatory of this form, to be completed*]:

representing

states that the company or organisation that he/she represents / he/she:

shall be able to carry out the services and to submit the reports at the indicated deadline;

has no conflict of interest in connection with the contract; a conflict of interest could arise in particular as a result of economic interests, political or national affinities, family or emotional ties or any other relevant connection or shared interest;

he/she will inform the contracting authority, without delay, of any situation considered a conflict of interest or which could give rise to a conflict of interest.