



Explanatory Note to the EFF Axis 4 Tender Assessment Grid

| | | |
|---|---|----|
| 1 | BASIC PRINCIPLES..... | 1 |
| 2 | TECHNICAL CRITERIA AND THEIR RATING PRINCIPLES..... | 1 |
| 3 | GENERAL CRITERION AND ITS RATING PRINCIPLE..... | 8 |
| 4 | SUMMARY..... | 10 |
| 5 | ASSESSMENT GRID..... | 11 |
| 6 | APPENDIX – OPERATIONAL LOGIC DIAGRAM..... | 16 |

1 BASIC PRINCIPLES

Within the framework of the tender assessment and particularly in view of the experimental nature of the Request for Proposals, it was decided to use a rating system based on a restricted number of criteria, divided as follows:

- 5 technical criteria;
- 1 general criterion.

2 TECHNICAL CRITERIA AND THEIR RATING PRINCIPLE

• **Definition of the five technical criteria** and their sub-indicators as shown in the assessment grid on pages 11-13.

TECHNICAL CRITERION 1: QUALITY OF THE OPERATIONAL LOGIC (SECTIONS I TO IV OF THE TENDER)

A tender must present an operational intervention with a global view. **This criterion involves verifying the ‘linearity’ of the intervention, namely its logical links and coherence.** The purpose of this criterion is to assess the **internal and external relevance and coherence** of the strategy.

Regarding internal coherence, it is a question of observing that there are logical links between the various sections of the tender:

- the **analysis and issues**: from the status report to the SWOT (and/or systemic) analysis and to the definition of the development issues;
- the **operational objectives** that must address the development issues as identified;
- the expected **outcomes** for each **operational objective**;
- the **‘typical’ actions**, in varying degrees of detail, which, through their effects, help achieve the expected outcomes. These ‘typical’ actions are recorded in the action sheets. For the record, the action sheets define an initiative framework rather than a specific list of projects.

It involves verifying the continuity between these components, while demonstrating logical reasoning: **each follows the next**. During the operational logic assessment, the links between the action sheets and various components of the initiative strategy will be specifically assessed.

Regarding external coherence, the strategy will be assessed with regard to the interactions with other ongoing initiatives in the territory and that do not directly or specifically concern the strategy defined in the tender: more general territorial initiatives, other strategic initiatives of the fishing industry. This criterion notably refers to sections IV ‘Convergence and synergy with other initiatives in the zone’ and II ‘Issues and strategies of territorial, fishing and aquaculture development’ in the tender specifications.

Regarding issues relating to the scope, the coherence and relevance of the tender (and, more particularly, the strategy) will be examined with regard to the scope proposed for the zone covered by the initiative. These will be assessed on the basis of three components:

- coherence between the operational logic and the definition of the scope, in view of the issues identified;
- reasoning behind the scope according to the entry chosen (partnerships, issues or territory), bearing in mind that an integrated management approach should cross all three entries;
- the local nature of the zone defined.

Sub-indicator 1.1: Internal relevance and coherence of the strategy

Internal relevance and coherence result from the logical links at the core of the strategy. It involves identifying and assessing the links between the analysis, the issues, the strategy and the action sheets.

Assessment questions:

- Does the analysis present the issues relating to the coastal nature of the territory (land and sea)?
- Is the SWOT analysis multisectoral?
- Do the problems identified result from the ‘weaknesses’ and ‘threats’ identified in the SWOT analysis?
- Have the causes and consequences of these problems been clearly identified?
- Do the issues correspond with the results of the SWOT analysis, in both the strong points/opportunities and weak points/threats?
- Do the issues integrate the land-sea and ‘cross-sector’ aspect?

- Is the strategy coherent with the issues identified?
- Do the strategic focus areas defined permit a cross-cutting approach?
- Within the focus areas, are the strategic objectives clearly defined? ¹
- Do the operational objectives result from the strategic objectives? ¹
- Are the actions defined coherent with the objectives? ¹

Cf. attached intervention diagram.

Sub-indicator 1.2: External relevance and coherence of the strategy

Assessing the external relevance and coherence involves identifying the relationships between the intervention (the core of the strategy) and the initiatives and other ongoing actions in the territory (other EFF initiatives, coastal development plans, ICZM, other territorial initiatives, etc.).

This sub-indicator should particularly make it possible to **assess the added value of the Axis 4 initiative** in relation to other existing or future territorial initiatives outside the intervention (the strategy defined in the tender).

Assessment questions

- Does the analysis present the existing territorial, sectoral and local development initiatives in the territory?
- Does the analysis mention broader initiative frameworks with greater levels of convergence (charters, analyses on wider scales or wider issues)?
- More specifically, does it present the territorial initiatives impacting the fishing trades, the issues of which either complement or are distinct from the strategy defined in the tender?
 - o identification of the objectives of the various territorial initiatives existing in the territory, the themes of which concern the fishing trades;
 - o identification of the problem areas of these initiatives in relation to the fishing trades (consultation, effective participation, identification and recognition of the constraints, problems with implementing projects, etc.).
- Have the stakeholders currently and potentially connected or interacting with the defined strategy been identified?
- Have the stakeholders outside the strategy, but usually (generally) connected with the problems defined, been identified?
- Have the points of convergence with existing initiatives been identified?
- Has the added value of the EFF Axis 4 initiative in the territory, in relation to existing initiatives, been clearly presented?

Sub-indicator 1.3 The scope of the tender

The relevance of the scope of the tender will essentially be assessed with regard to the expectations of the Request for Proposals (issues, territories, stakeholders).

¹ *If the tender makes the distinction between strategic and operational objectives*

Assessment questions

- Does the scope defined seem coherent with the operational logic with regard to the issues identified?
- Is the scope clearly justified?
- Has the defined zone retained its local nature?

TECHNICAL CRITERION 2: OPERATIONAL RESPONSE (ASSESSMENT OF THE ACTION SHEETS (AS))

This mainly involves assessing the action sheets and, more specifically, their quality and coherence:

- in their response to the issues/operational objectives (strategic focus areas);
- between the expected effects and the types of initiatives identified;
- between the financial framework and the types of initiatives identified in the responses given (strength of the financial partnership);

At this stage, the absence of careful deliberation regarding performance indicators is not unacceptable.

Sub-indicator 2.1: Coherence of the ASs in addressing the issues/operational objectives (strategic focus areas)

Assessment questions:

- Do all ASs cover the goals presented in the strategy?
- Does each AS offer a concrete response that is coherent with one or more of the operational objectives?

Sub-indicator 2.2: Coherence of the ASs between the anticipated effects and the types of action identified in the ASs

Assessment questions:

- Are the types of action identified in each AS coherent with the effects expected as worded in the tender?

Sub-indicator 2.3: Coherence of the ASs between the financial framework and the types of action identified (strength of the financial partnership)

Assessment questions:

- Does the distribution of the amounts between the ASs allow for the operational objectives set out in the strategy to be met?
- Does the financial partnership appear coherent with the types of action identified?
- Has the distribution of the co-financing been optimised?

The general balance between the development plans will also be examined (weight of the various ASs, general balance).

Sub-indicator 2.4: Relevance and quality of the types of action proposed (intrinsic reading of the ASs)

Assessment questions:

- Are the ASs sufficiently detailed and operational?
- Do the ASs use concrete examples and projects?
- Are the ASs sufficiently open to projects and stakeholders not yet identified?

TECHNICAL CRITERION 3: STRENGTH OF THE PARTNERSHIP (TECHNICAL AND OPERATIONAL GOALS OF THE PARTNERSHIP) (SECTIONS V AND VI OF THE TENDER)

The aim of this technical criterion is to identify the goals relating to the partnership and to examine the way in which the territory stakeholders were involved in the strategy development and will be involved in its implementation. This notably involves assessing:

- the involvement of the partners in designing the tender;
- the composition and nature of the strategy implementation partnership and, more particularly, of the programming committee (quality and coherence of the partnership, its composition and its methods of operating);
- the methods for implementing and sustaining the partnership over the programming period.

Sub-indicator 3.1: Involvement of the partners in preparing the tender (design partnership)

Assessment questions:

- Does the tender contain a presentation of the way in which the principal stakeholders were involved?
- Do the methods used and terms decided to bring these stakeholders on board allow for a collective definition of the strategy? (simple consultation or real joint development?)
- Are the stakeholders involved at this stage representative of the development issues identified and the themes to be approached?

Sub-indicator 3.2: Quality and coherence of the composition of the partnership and of the nature of the implementation partnership (programming committee)

A critical reading of the composition of the programming committee will be carried out.

Assessment questions:

- Are the stakeholders that the tenderer plans to involve representative?
- Are the principal stakeholders that were involved in the tender design phase present in the implementation partnership?
- Does the tender present original methods for coordinating the programming committee? Does it foresee frameworks to involve wider stakeholders?
- Have the PC's operating rules been specified at this stage? If so, do they appear to allow the PC to carry out its function as a decision-making body?

Sub-indicator 3.3: Relevance of the methods for implementing and sustaining the partnership

Assessment questions:

- Do the planned implementation methods permit the programming committee to be a forum for discussion and exchange on the directions taken?

TECHNICAL CRITERION 4: GROUP'S CAPACITY TO SPONSOR (SECTIONS V AND VI OF THE TENDER)

The aim of this criterion is to appraise the strategy's operational feasibility, namely the operational aspects such as the group's organisation, coordination, monitoring and assessment.

It specifically targets and assesses the capacities in terms of the actual means of the proposed sponsoring body. The following capacities are assessed in particular:

- means (human, financial (extent of operating and coordination funds), technical, etc.);
- coordination and monitoring;
- management (capacity to pool management means in the event of direct management).

Furthermore and more generally, this criterion also involves assessing the links between the programming committee and the other bodies provided for with regard to the quality and relevance of the means planned for the implementation.

Sub-indicator 4.1: Clear division of roles between each entity in the EFF group

The aim of this sub-indicator is to assess the definition and clear division of the roles of each of the entities in the EFF group.

Assessment questions:

- Have the roles of each entity been clearly defined? Has the 'who does what?' been clarified, outlined?

Sub-indicator 4.2: Sponsoring body's capacity to sponsor

Assessment questions:

- Does the sponsoring body currently have sufficient owned or pooled human, financial and technical means to sponsor the strategy defined? Does it plan to?
 - o its capacity to coordinate (employment of a facilitator anticipated, communication media envisaged, sufficient coordination time anticipated, etc.);
 - o its project tracking capacity (self-assessment, definition of performance indicators envisaged?);
 - o if the body is new: additional backing/support for the sponsoring body (**in terms of actual means**: administrative, coordination, financial, resource pooling, clarified with any letters of support, etc.);
 - o if the structure is pre-existing: past experience
 - o nature of the partnerships / support / internal expertise in territorial initiatives (**in terms of actual means**).

Sub-indicator 4.3: Link between the programming committee and the group's other bodies

Assessment questions:

- Are points of convergence foreseen between the programming committee and the sponsoring body?
- Are points of convergence foreseen between the programming committee and the other consultation bodies planned?
- Are they relevant?

Sub-indicator 4.4: Quality and relevance of the means planned for implementing the strategy?

This sub-indicator targets the aspects relating to the organisation envisaged for the implementation of the strategy and the planned functioning of the group. It involves identifying, in particular:

- the coherence of the kick-off planning;
- the coherence of the envisaged methods of operating.

Assessment questions:

- Do the planned means (technical, human and financial) make it possible to envisage a sustainable operation?
- Are the strategy implementation kick-off methods clearly defined and relevant?

TECHNICAL CRITERION 5: WRITTEN QUALITY OF THE TENDER

The overall quality of the tender is an important criterion in view of the tender response methodology. This criterion involves verifying that the tender complies with the original tender specification (that the various components are present) so that the tenders can be dealt with fairly.

Sub-indicator 5.1: Capacity to summarise

Sub-indicator 5.2: Writing quality

Sub-indicator 5.3: Compliance with the specification requirements (follows the standard layout, etc.).

In their assessment of this criterion, the assessors will attempt to take into account the group's initial situation (capacity to set up projects) and the use or otherwise of external expertise.

• Rating principle of the technical criteria and sub-indicator rating principle:

Quantitative rating (from 1 to 5) of the technical criteria:

- 1: Very weak
- 2: Weak
- 3: Average
- 4: Good
- 5: Very good
-

Qualitative description of the sub-indicators:

- Weak
- Average
- Good

The technical criteria are rated in connection with the qualitative assessment of the sub-indicators. In other words, the technical criterion rating is not the result of the overall sum of the opinions on the sub-indicators. The sub-indicators simply support a more ‘intuitive’ approach to the criterion rating and promote dialogue between the two members of the assessment team.

Weighted, these technical criteria give way to a technical summary, which is combined with the rating awarded to the general criterion at the end of the assessment phase.

3 GENERAL CRITERION AND ITS RATING PRINCIPLE

• **Definition of the general criterion**

There are four major findings concerning the fishing sectors:

- defining and difficult economic contexts;
- little consideration and difficult involvement of fishing and aquaculture stakeholders in territorial initiatives and as stakeholders in territorial development;
- local professional and inter-professional organisations lack the human and financial means to be involved in initiatives;
- current marginalisation (loss of influence in their territory, emergence of new competitive uses (spatial, resources, etc.) and new stakeholders in coastal zones, both on land and on sea fringes).

The overall objective of Axis 4 reflects a crucial need for those working in the fishing sector to become reinvolved in their territory and to be included in territorial initiatives that incorporate the land-sea link, for three key reasons:

- to obtain greater institutional recognition;
- to become a driver of territorial development;
- to participate to initiatives and anticipate changes in their territory.

This opening up between the sea and the land, coupled with greater consideration of stakeholders from the fishing sectors among stakeholders of territorial development and within initiatives will enable fishing stakeholders to effectively participate in the joint development of the territorial project and will help make these activities in coastal zones sustainable.

To achieve this, territorial stakeholders must be made aware on the skills, role and issues of fishing and aquaculture stakeholders. Conversely, fishing and aquaculture professionals must also undertake to open up to the territorial stakeholders in order to become more involved in their territory and to know their representatives, no longer just as financial backers.

This opening up between the sea and land areas will lead to greater consideration of fishing and aquaculture stakeholders in territorial initiatives, greater involvement in the development of their territory, institutional recognition and, consequently, opportunities for sustaining their activities in coastal zones.

Experimenting with this new EFF Axis 4 initiative, therefore, will give fishing professionals a greater responsibility (capacities to sponsor, negotiate, etc.), will help reinforce and/or create new partnerships and will open up their industry to a territorialised approach to management and territorial development, components that are essential to their continuity.

The general criterion is rated with reference to the overall objective defined for the EFF Axis 4, which, on agreement with the assessors, is as follows:

“Greater involvement of fishing industry professionals in territorial initiatives, which include issues connected with the fishing and aquaculture sectors.”

Therefore, this methodological approach aims to first analyse the tenders on the basis of the five key technical criteria, then establish the necessary critical distance for an overall examination of this initial approach with regard to the overall objective as introduced and defined above. This measure should allow to rate the tenders according to three key categories (see below).

Each of the assessors in the ‘local/fishing development’ team gives a rating for the general criterion.

• General criterion rating scale:

- A : tenders considered as meeting the overall objective defined for Axis 4 and assessed as ‘excellent to good’ on numerous points, with coherent initiative strategies that can be rapidly implemented.
- B : tenders presenting interesting components with regard to the overall objective, but certain points of which (such as the partnership, development plan or strategy as defined by the tenderers) would need reworking.
- C : tenders falling under Axis 4 of the EFF, but that are insufficient or incomplete (lack of action sheets, financial plan, strategy or definition of partnership); tenders outside the area of the fields covered by Axis 4 of the EFF, under Community regulation no. 1198/2006 and the Operational Programme.

4 SUMMARY

Combining the technical summary rating (weighting of the technical criteria between themselves) and the rating awarded to the general criterion make it possible to **establish a project ranking**.

