European Union The European Regional Development Fund

The Interreg IVB North Sea Region Programme

Terms of Reference (ToR)

Invitation to evaluate specific 'themes' of the programme

FINAL - January 2011

INVITATION TO EVALUATE SPECIFIC 'THEMES' OF THE PROGRAMME

The Interreg IVB North Sea Region Programme 2007 – 2013 is inviting you to submit a bid for a short term contract regarding the ongoing evaluation of specified 'themes' of the North Sea Region Programme 2007 - 2013.

The procurement is conducted through an open procurement procedure. The bid should be submitted in English. The title shall be marked "*ToR – Specified Themes for Evaluation of the North Sea Region Programme 2007 – 2013*".

Interested evaluators are advised to read this document in detail before drafting and submitting an evaluation bid.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Interreg IVB North Sea Region Programme 2007-2013 is a European territorial co-operation programme financed under the European regional development fund. Its focus is on regional development in the North Sea Region. Specific information about the Programme can be found on the Programme website: www.northsearegion.eu

AIMS OF THE ONGOING PROGRAMME EVALUATION

The programme carries ongoing evaluation out as a key business tool to understand strength and weaknesses in current working models of the North Sea Region Programme 2007-2013. The evaluation will be used to improve programme implementation and should assess the existing strategy, management and implementation of the Programme and suggest any appropriate changes for improving the quality and relevance of the Programme activities and management in order to ensure the achievement of objectives.

EVALUATION PLAN FOR THE NORTH SEA REGION PROGRAMME 2007 - 2013

In order to capture and react as soon as possible on various demands relevant to programme implementation, the programme has developed a plan for 'ongoing evaluation' where internal evaluation exercises are held on a regular basis, with input from external evaluators when needed and appropriate. In accordance with the general provisions laid down in Article 47 of Council Regulation (EC) 1083/2006 the purpose of evaluations is to improve the quality, effectiveness and consistency of the operational programme.

'Ongoing evaluations' will be carried out with respect to the specific structural problems affecting the member states and Norway participating in the North Sea Region Programme. The overall evaluation plan for the North Sea Region programme focuses on specific issues that are of special interest to the programme, such as institutional capacity and administrative performance; added value and publicity and communications. The ongoing evaluations should also possibly create a link to the future programming period, including the potential need for adjustment of the SWOT.

EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

The 3 themes and 9 sub-themes of the evaluation are:

Institutional capacity and performance

Regulative
- Financial and control systems set-up

Administrative
- Efficiency of programme organisational structures
- Application procedures and project development

Added value
- Programme impact and coverage
- Transnational cooperation
- Legacy

Publicity and communication
- Programme visibility
- Relevant and effective communication measures for the future on project level, Connection between communications & content results in projects = well communicated projects
- Programme and project cooperation in communication

The evaluation assignment will consists of three case studies campaigns and four surveys, taking into account the different cross-cutting content sub-themes, as described in the 'Evaluation Plan'. For a more detailed overview, please see table 1.

The methodology will follow the same procedure for all three case studies campaigns. All campaigns kicks-off with a meeting between the Evaluation Steering Group (ESG) and the external evaluators. During the initial phase questionnaires, covering a specific set of questions each will be developed and presented. They will be sent out to a minimum number of projects and in some relevant cases, also to - for the first time in June 2011 newly approved - cluster projects, covering the relevant themes, which are the focus for the current case study campaign. These projects will be selected after a discussion between the Evaluation Steering Group (ESG) and the external evaluators.

These questionnaires will be submitted through the Interreg IVB North Sea Regions web tool. The Programme uses a web tool to build online questionnaires and surveys, which is integrated into the content management system (CMS) of the Programme website. The tool allows questionnaires to be published either as hidden links (to be sent out to a predefined user group) or through a pop-up on the website. It has a number of different functions in terms of the setup of questions and answers, ranging from free text entries to checkboxes to multiple choice answers and drop-down lists. The data is collected within a separate section of the CMS and can be exported to Excel or CSV (Comma Separated Values) format is the most common import and export format for spreadsheets and databases. These questionnaires will be initiated and implemented by the external evaluators in close relationship with the Evaluation Steering Group (ESG).

Based on the analysis of the questionnaires case studies' interviews will be held. Together with the Evaluation Steering Group (ESG), the external evaluators will choose (a minimum of) two case studies' interviews. For case studies campaigns no 2 and no 3, the case studies' interviews will consist of two projects and one cluster. For the surveys, the similar procedure for the case studies campaigns will be followed. The main difference here is that it's not only projects or clusters that will be involved in answering questionnaires and interviews, but also other relevant stakeholders to the programme will be involved within these surveys.

After the questionnaire and the interviews, interim reports will be presented for each case study campaign.

For the case study campaigns, these evaluations will be carried out twice during the lifetime of the ongoing evaluation cycle. The reason for this is to measure data over time, and also allowing the programme to respond to any significant change that might occur during the period of evaluation.

The second round for the case study campaigns will follow the same procedure as for the first campaigns. The questionnaires will be revised and will be sent out to additional five projects, subsequently followed by additional case studies interviews. On the basis of the findings from the interim reports and from the second campaign data collection, these findings will be submitted into final reports towards the end of each campaign.

Once the three evaluation volumes are available, summaries of these reports might also be used for presentation through podcasts at the programme website. The producing of podcasts will be initiated by other external resources. In addition, the interim and final reports will also be available at the Programme series of e-publications about the North Sea Region titled "North Sea Region Programme Papers". The papers are registered under the ISSN 1904-4704. They are presented on http://northseapapers.northsearegion.eu.

The themes and questions that the evaluator should address are specified below under the chapter 'Terms of Reference: ToR'.

TIMEFRAME

Bids must be received by 28.02.2011, a final decision on which bid(s) to accept will be made in March 2011 and the contract(s) for carrying out the evaluations will be awarded in April 2011. On acceptance of a bid, all relevant data and information will be made available to the contractor, and evaluators will also be allowed to require all statistical, technical, administrative, financial and other relevant information from project partners, including the Joint Technical Secretariat (JTS).

METHODOLOGY

'Ongoing evaluations' will be carried out by experts or bodies, internal or external, functionally independent of the authorities referred to in Article 59 (b) and (c) of the Council Regulations (EC) 1983/2006. In order to carry out an effective evaluation, the close links with the programme monitoring system is essential. Three case studies campaigns and two surveys will be carried out. The three case studies campaigns will be carried out twice during the ongoing evaluation period, while the two surveys will be carried out once during the evaluation cycle. Online- questionnaires and telephone-interviews will be used as a method for data collection.

Evaluators should select the methodology that they consider most appropriate for answering the questions in the Terms of Reference (ToR), see further down below. They should, however, ensure that their collection of primary data includes consultation with a wide range of project and programme stakeholders and that the insights of these groups are included in the reports.

SOURCES OF MATERIAL

For the bidding process information provided on the programme's website will be relevant. In addition and once an evaluator has been chosen relevant sources of material for the evaluations to be carried out will include:

- Evaluation Plan for the North Sea Region Programme
- EC Working Paper No 5 Indicative Guidelines on Evaluation Methods: Evaluation during the programming period
- The INTERACT Handbook: Practical Handbook for Ongoing Evaluation of Territorial Cooperation Programmes
- Regulations on the Structural Funds (General and ERDF) for 2007 – 2013
- Commission Strategic Guidelines on Cohesion Policy 2007 – 2013
- Lisbon and Gothenburg Agendas
- Project applications
- 6 monthly project activity and expenditure reports
- Project Activities Implementation Reports
- Annual Reports
- GAPs analysis
- Handbook of Standard Procedures (Latest edition)
- Minutes from relevant Programme Committees meetings

Programme website: **www.northsearegion.eu**

For the implementation of each case study campaign, including the surveys, the evaluators will also have the possibility to make use of a questionnaire, developed as a joint action between different Interreg programmes and co-ordinated by INTERACT, which is part of an initiative that aims to gather data from all projects that are financed by the cross-border, transnational and inter-regional programmes (INTERREG strands A, B and C). The initiative intends to provide Territorial Cooperation Programme stakeholders and EU policy makers with a comprehensive overview of the achievements of the European Territorial Cooperation programmes. In order to establish a bigger picture, projects have already been asked to provide information on their most important achievement.

Additional material (mainly from the programme's database) will be forwarded to the evaluator(s). The material will be available upon the Terms of Reference (ToR) has been signed.

FINANCES

For orientation the Programme has calculated €116,000,- for the ongoing evaluation. This calculation includes:

16 meetings with the Evaluation Steering Group (ESG)	€16,000
3 questionnaire and interview rounds including 6 interim reports	€40,000
2 questionnaire and interview rounds including 3 final and 1 interim report(s)	€20,000
3 additional questionnaire and interview rounds including 6 final reports	€40,000
Total	€116,000

ROLE OF THE EVALUATION STEERING GROUP (ESG) & MONITORING COMMITTEE

The Monitoring Committee (MC) has commissioned the evaluation and will discuss recommendations and approve the interims and final reports before they will be sent to the European Commission. Members of the Monitoring Committee will be kept informed of the progress of the evaluation but have delegated direction of the evaluation to the Evaluation Steering Group. The Evaluation Steering Group (ESG) is responsible for:

- Facilitating and monitoring the ongoing evaluation process;
- Addressing technical issues that arise during the ongoing evaluation;
- Select appropriate projects and clusters to be involved in the 'case studies' in close cooperation with the external evaluator(s);
- Ensuring delivery of answers to the questions asked and that the evaluation team(s) does not diverge from the guidelines in the Terms of Reference (ToR);
- Approving the draft reports and/or requiring any additional work to be done;
- Presenting the questionnaires (surveys), case studies and the evaluation reports to the Monitoring Committee and possibly making recommendations in addition to those of the evaluators (should it be appropriate);
- Liasing with the European Commission at all relevant stages (when necessary and appropriate).

The evaluation team(s) will address questions, requests and comments from the Evaluation Steering Group (ESG) and will also inform to the Evaluation Steering Group (ESG) as soon as possible of any delays or changes that could have an impact on delivery of the evaluations.

TERMS OF REFERENCE (ToR)

The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the on-going evaluation of the Interreg IVB North Sea Region Programme are divided into 3 case studies campaigns and 4 surveys. The specific ToR for each part of the evaluation are set out below.

CASE STUDIES CAMPAIGN 1: Programme impact and coverage | Regulations (A)
Programme impact and coverage:
The first part of campaign 1 is focusing on the programme impact and coverage in terms of what has been delivered through the projects. In terms of impact of the programme's specific themes (socio-economic aspects, contribution to EU and national policies and the visibility of programme priorities) are all covered here.

The evaluation should comment on recent developments in the economy and any new information which would materially change the current programme SWOT – analysis. Is the programme still relevant to the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats identified in the North Sea Region (through the SWOT – analysis) or do events since the SWOT – analysis was carried out require adjustments to the strategy?

- Assess and comment how far did projects adopted good practices in terms of addressing the programme's specific themes (as described above). Examine the visibility of programme's priorities.
- In terms of the SWOT – analysis of the Joint Transnational Strategy (as described in the Operational Programme), including the Ex-Ante evaluation, analyse how the added value of each programme priority affected or influenced the implementation of the programme's SWOT – analysis?
- Examine how has the projects affected or influenced the implementation of the programme's SWOT – analysis?
- Assess and comment which relevant measures or activities that needs to be updated for the following SWOT – analysis for the remaining current programme period, and possibly, also for the future programming period? Suggestions for improvements are also to be made if appropriate.

- SEA – assess the intent of the Strategic Environmental Assessment as instrument on Programme level. .

This evaluation is also addressing the new set-up of the public – private partnerships in terms of the project's set-up and delivery of outcomes and results in terms of the programme impact and coverage.

- Assess and comment the involvement of private sector integration and the set-up of public-private partnerships in projects. Assess and comment the added value of having private beneficiaries involved in the programme's projects' and its impact on outcomes and results. Assess and comment on the set-up of public – private partnerships and how they affected or influenced the implementation of the programme's SWOT – analysis? Suggestions for improvements are also to be made if appropriate.

Regulations (A):
The second part of the campaign is addressing the financial management and control set-up. In close relationship with the impact of the programme's specific themes, how did the project's respond to the increased set-up of financial control, did it affect the implementation of project outcomes and results? As the first projects are being closed by 2011, it would be possible to make an initial analysis on how these issues have been dealt with by the projects. The partcipation of private partners in projects should be considered. Results might be used to influence the ongoing project implementation.

- Assess and comment on programme level the financial control set-up and its control mechanisms. Examine also the relevant links to Article 71 (Group of Auditors). Based on the analysis of effectiveness at programme level, assess and comment on allocation of resources to projects represent as an effective response to the needs and expected impacts identified.
- Assess and comment on the project's financial control set-up, the project's delivery of financial control and the project's administrative capacity of its organisational set-up in terms of financial management. What are the effective strategies to manage the delivery of financial control on project level?
- Assess and comment on control mechanisms and procedures on the basis of audit reports, including the results from the system controls. Suggestions for improvements are also to be made if appropriate.

There will also be a 'Regulations (B)' evaluation as part of Surey I, which will focus on programme stakeholders instead of project stakeholders (see below).

CASE STUDIES CAMPAIGN 2: Transnational cooperation | Programme-Project Communication
Transnational Cooperation:
The first part of campaign 2 is focusing on the aspects of added value of transnational cooperation on project and on cluster level.

- Assess and comment the relevant measures and activities which were carried out by the projects and clusters in order to create a critical mass for creating a strong environment for genuine transnational cooperation.
- Examine how transnational the projects and the clusters are in reality. How has the project- and the clustering approach fed into the potential impact of the programme in a long-term perspective?

Programme-Project Communication:
The second part of the campaign is addressing transnational cooperation in terms of project and programme cooperation on communication

- Assess and comment on if there are clear connections between what would be considered strong transnational projects/clusters on the content side and what would be considered strong projects in communication, it would indicate that relevant communications have an impact on overall outputs and results. Examine if such connections exist and if the conclusion is relevant, indicating the strategic value of communications and its relevance as a business development tool (on transnational level).

CASE STUDIES CAMPAIGN 3: Legacy | Communication Measures
Legacy:
The first part of the campaign is addressing the project's legacy, its follow-up activities and what kind of an added value, has been created both on project and programme level in terms of contributing to EU policies, innovation and communication and publicity.

- Assess and comment on what kind of relevant measures and activities has the projects undertaken in order to safeguard the legacy and follow-up impact on project and cluster level.
- Assess and comment the projects' contributions to EU policies.
- Assess and comment the projects' approach towards innovation. What kind of innovation projects enhanced the impact of the programme? In this respect, what kind of relevant actions could be identified as good practice?

Communication Measures:
The third part of the campaign is addressing the connection between communications and content results in projects, which generates well communicated projects.

- Assess and comment the relationship in terms of well communicated projects through project themes, clusters, or from the programme's priorities in terms of measuring and analysing activities carried through in projects' work package 2 activities. Are the results dependent of theme, priority or cluster? Are there any good practice models? Suggestions for improvements are also to be made if appropriate.
- Assess and comment on what kind of communication tools on project and cluster level has been used in order to generate relevant and effective communications that will have long-term effect?
- Examine the methodological measures which have been generated between project and programme level in order to generate a stronger and more effective cooperation in communication. Identify any relevant thematic-, cluster- and generic approaches. Are there any good practice models? Suggestions for improvements are also to be made if appropriate.

SURVEY I: Programme structures | Regulations (B)
Programme Structure:
This first part of the Survey is focusing on the efficiency of programme organisational structures.

- Assess and comment on the roles and functioning of the Joint Technical Secretariat, the Monitoring and Steering Committees and the Managing and

Paying Authorities. How do they complement each other in terms of management of the programme?

- Assess and comment how efficiency can be maintained and improved for the next programming period. In terms of the committees of the programme, how do they complement each other in terms of management of the programme?

The second part of Survey I is addressing the financial management and control set-up. In close relationship with the impact of the programme's specific themes, seen from the first case study campaign on Regulations (A), how would you on programme level, take into the account of the increased set-up of financial control, did it affect the implementation of project outcomes and results on a programme level?

- Assess and comment on programme level the financial control set-up and its control mechanisms. Examine also the relevant links to Article 71 (Group of Auditors). Based on the analysis of effectiveness at programme level, assess and comment on allocation of resources to projects represent as an effective response to the needs and expected impacts identified.
- Assess and comment on the project's financial control set-up, the project's delivery of financial control and the project's administrative capacity of its organisational set-up in terms of financial management. What are the effective strategies to manage the delivery of financial control on project level?
- Assess and comment on control mechanisms and procedures on the basis of audit reports, including the results from the system controls. Suggestions for improvements are also to be made if appropriate.

SURVEY II Application procedures & project development | Programme Visibility:
The first part of this survey is addressing the programme visibility in terms of communication aspects on programme level.

- In terms of programme visibility, what measures are relevant and have functioned during the programme period? What measures might have an impact for the future? In terms of the effectiveness and user-friendliness of the programme's website, how has this measure contributed to the programme's visibility? In addition, in terms of the programme communication strategy, what kind of measures needs to be addressed for future transnational cooperation activities? Suggestions for improvements are also to be made if appropriate.

The second part of Survey II is focusing on the institutional capacity and administrative performance, addressing the efficiency of application procedure and project development.

- Assess and comment the efficiency of application procedure and project development. How can efficiency be maintained and what have been relevant measures and activities to develop good and transnational projects? Suggestions for improvements are also to be made if appropriate.
- The efficiency and the set-up of the application procedure is an important tool for the delivery of the projects in terms of the implementation of the programme. Assess and comment the set-up of the application procedure. How can they be maintained and what have been the relevant measures and activities to develop good transnational projects?
- Assess and comment on whether transparent, competitive and common procedures and criteria for project selection are in operation. Examine common

project selection criteria to ensure their quality and application, and that they reflect the objectives of the *Joint Transnational Strategy* and also incorporate the *principle of assistance* criteria (Sustainable development, innovation, territorial cohesion, equal opportunities, transnationality and additionality).

	Case Studies Campaign 1 Regulations (A) | Programme Impact	**Case Studies Campaign 2** Transnational Cooperation | Programme-Project Communication	**Case Studies Campaign 3** Legacy | Communication Measures	**Surveys** Programme Structures | Programme Visibility | Application Procedures & Project Development | Regulations (B)	
Apr 11	First meeting			First meeting	
Jun 11	Questionnaire Regulations Questionnaire Impact – min. 10 projects			Structures' | Regulations' Questionnaires Programme Stakeholders	
Sep 11		First meeting			First meeting
Oct 11	Case studies' interviews 2 projects			Structures' | Regulations' Interviews Stakeholders and Programme Authorities	
Nov 11	Second meeting			Second meeting	
Dec 11	**Interim Reports** Institutional Capacity and Performance 1 (A) Added Value 1	Questionnaire Coopperation Questionnaire Communication – min. 10 projects		**Interim Report** Institutional Capacity and Performance 1 (B) **Final Report** Institutional Capacity and Performance 2	Application Procedures & Project Development Questionnaire | Visibility Questionnaire Stakeholders
Jan 12			First meeting		
Apr 12		Case studies' interviews 2 projects and 1 Cluster			Visibility Interviews Stakeholders | Application Procedures & Project Development Interviews min. 15 projects plus Stakeholders
May 12		Second meeting	Questionnaire Legacy Questionnaire Communication - min. 10 projects		Second meeting
Jun 12		**Interim Reports** Added Value 2 Publicity and Communication 1			**Final Report** Publicity and Communication 1 + 2 **Final Report** Institutional Capacity and Performance 3

	Case Studies Campaign 1 Regulations (A) | Programme Impact	**Case Studies Campaign 2** Transnational Cooperation | Programme-Project Communication	**Case Studies Campaign 3** Legacy | Communication Measures	**Surveys** Programme Structures | Programme Visibility | Application Procedures & Project Development | Regulations (B)	
Oct 12	Third meeting		Case studies' interviews 2 projects and 1 Cluster		
Nov 12			Second meeting		
Dec 12	Revised questionnaires – min. 5 projects		**Interim Reports** Added Value 3 Publicity and Communication 3		
Apr 13	Case studies' interviews - 2 projects	Third meeting			
May 13	Fourth Meeting				
Jun 13	**Final Reports** Institutional Capacity and Performance 1 Added Value 1	Revised questionnaires - min. 5 projects			
Oct 13		Case studies' interviews 2 projects + 1 cluster	Third meeting		
Nov 13		Fourth Meeting			
Dec 13		**Final Reports** Added Value 2 Publicity and Communication 1	Revised questionnaires – – min. 5 projects		
Apr 14			Case studies' interviews 2 projects and 1 Cluster		
May 14			Fourth Meeting		
Jun 14			**Final Reports** Added Value 3 Publicity and Communication 3		

Table 1: Overview and preliminary time plan for case studies campaigns and surveys

STRUCTURE OF EVALUATION(S)

1. The evaluation reports should reflect the following general structure:

2. Summary of conclusions and recommendations (maximum 5 pages)

3. Methodology – outlining the evaluators' approach and to include a description of original research undertaken and sources of data and information. The methodology should also include a statement of the evaluators' assessments of strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation report

4. Conclusions answering the questions asked in the Terms of Reference (ToR).

5. Summary of the principle achievements and deficiencies of the programme

6. Recommendations of the evaluation team clearly graded in order of their importance (in terms of usefulness)

7. For all case study campaigns and surveys, suggestions for improvements are also to be made on a long-term basis, including future aspects and various scenarios that might be useful for the next programming period

8. Key issues should be identified at the end of every section and the conclusions drawn should be based upon them.

9. It is expected that evaluation reports will be easy readable, illustrative and well structured. The experts are not expected to provide scientific research, including voluminous theoretical considerations.

SELECTION AND AWARD CRITERIA – BIDDING PROCESS: REQUIRED QUALIFICATIONS FOR EVALUATORS

1. To ensure the independence of the evaluations, evaluators who have been involved in the Programme area or are direct beneficiaries of the Programme (grant recipients) will not be considered.

2. Evaluators should outline their experience of the Programme's geographical area.

3. The Programme would be especially interested to work with evaluators having relevant links/background to applied research on regional development, European regional politics and/or other areas, relevant for the Programme.

4. The working language of the Programme is English and bids must be submitted in English.

5. Proposals must include contact details of two referees for whom the evaluator has worked in the past 12 months.

6. Proposals must include CVs of all of the members of the evaluation team who will actually carry out the evaluation.

7. Proposals from evaluators meeting the above requirements will be assessed on value for money, taking into account of their understanding of the evaluation issues raised in relation to the Programme, the quality of research design and methodology,

the expertise and experience of the evaluation team and their ability to deliver the evaluation required within the stated timeframe.

8. Potential evaluators will have the possibility of submitting bids for 1) the entire evaluation or 2) for different case studies campaigns and/or the package of surveys. Should you use the second option, you should indicate an overall budget (arguing for the best potential added value).

STRUCTURE OF PROPOSALS

1. Proposals must be written in English.

2. They must include a comprehensive and detailed description of the methodologies to be used in answering the points raised in the ToR, and

3. A detailed description of the tasks to be undertaken, the quantity of the staff input and their expertise including their language skills, and

4. A detailed programme of work, identifying tasks and milestones, together with target dates and associated costs.

5. In addition, proposals must illustrate appropriate consideration of issues raised in the relevant Programme and Commission documents and the Evaluation Plan (see enclosure 1 and 2).

6. Proposals must also include the evaluators name, address, telephone, fax and e-mail address.

7. Evaluations must be submitted in one complete set of print documents and one complete set of electronic documents.

All bids submitted until **28 February 2011** will be assessed. However, bids which do not meet the formal criteria may be exempt from the assessment. Applications should be clearly marked "*ToR – Specified Themes for Evaluation of the North Sea Region Programme 2007 – 2013*" and must be sent as a paper copy to:

The Interreg IVB North Sea Region Programme
Att. *Carsten Westerholt*
Jernbanegade 22
DK-8800 Viborg
DENMARK

Please send also an electronic copy to info@northsearegion.eu.

PAYMENT ARRANGEMENTS

1. The contract will be on a fixed price basis.

2. Payment will be made on delivery of key milestones, such as receipt of the interim reports, with full payment on satisfactory completion of the final reports. Applications should include suggestions for appropriate payment milestones. Any deviation from these milestones must be agreed in advance and confirmed in writing.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. The contractor(s) is required to observe confidentiality when dealing with information and data made available for evaluation purposes. Failure to observe confidentiality will lead to the immediate termination of the contract without compensation.

2. During the bidding process, it will not be possible to obtain additional information to that stated in these Terms of Reference (ToR) and the Programme documentation provided. Should the need arise for clarification or interpretation, address a written request to the Programme Secretariat by e-mail (carsten.westerholt@northsearegion.eu). A copy of the reply will be forwarded to all bidders to guarantee fair competition. No other form of contact is to be made during the bidding process.

3. All data generated during the evaluation must be made freely available to all interested parties involved in the programme.

ENCLOSURES

Appendix 1: Evaluation Plan for the Interreg IVB North Sea Region Programme