



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
Directorate-General for Internal Market, Industry, Entrepreneurship and SMEs

## **CALL FOR TENDERS**

**No 793/PP/GRO/IMA/19/1131/11057**

### **REVIEW STUDY ON THE RECREATIONAL CRAFT DIRECTIVE 2013/53/EU**

**Open procedure**

#### **TENDER SPECIFICATIONS**

#### **Part 2: Technical specifications**

# **1. TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS**

## **1.1. DESCRIPTION OF TASKS**

### **1.1.1 General background and reference documents**

#### **1.1.1.1 Background**

Recreational Craft Directive 94/25/EC<sup>1</sup> was adopted by the European Parliament and the Council in June 1994 and is applied from June 1996. It ensures the free movement of boats (recreational craft) used for sport and leisure purposes within the internal market and a high level of protection of the health and safety for users. The Directive harmonizes the provisions related to recreational craft and it is based on the principles of the "New Approach to Technical Harmonization and Standards". In line with this new approach, the design and manufacturing of recreational craft and personal watercraft is subject to essential health and safety requirements.

Directive 2003/44/EC amended the Recreational Craft Directive in 2003. This amendment introduced a set of exhaust and sound emission requirements as well as added the provisions for post-construction assessment.

Directive 2013/53/EU<sup>2</sup> replaced the Directive 94/25/EC in 2013. It introduced a new set of exhaust emission requirements, aligned its structure to the New Legislative Framework<sup>3</sup> and modified some of the essential safety requirements. It is applicable from January 2016.

The Directive applies in three different areas:

- the design and construction of recreational craft, personal watercraft, partly completed boats, watercraft that are subject to major craft conversions and certain components as listed in Annex II of the Directive;
- exhaust emissions produced by propulsion engines installed on or in recreational craft and by personal watercraft;
- noise emissions produced by recreational craft with stern drive engines without integral exhausts or inboard propulsion engines, by personal watercraft and by outboard engines and stern drive engines with integral exhaust.

The Directive does not apply to certain craft, such as: racing craft, canoes, kayaks or gondolas, surfboards or sailing surfboards, original and individual replicas of historical craft, or experimental craft, as well as engines fitted, or intended to be fitted, to such craft. Craft intended to carry passengers for commercial purposes are also excluded.

---

<sup>1</sup> Directive 94/25/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 June 1994 on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States relating to recreational craft (OJ L 164, 30.6.1994, p. 15).

<sup>2</sup> Directive 2013/53/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 November 2013 on recreational craft and personal watercraft and repealing Directive 94/25/EC (OJ L 354, 28.12.2013, p.90).

<sup>3</sup> See: [http://ec.europa.eu/growth/single-market/goods/new-legislative-framework/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/growth/single-market/goods/new-legislative-framework/index_en.htm)

Review clause set out in Article 52 of the Directive 2013/53/EU requires the Commission to submit a report to the EP and the Council. The report shall address the technical feasibility for further reducing of exhaust emissions from marine propulsion engines, and the feasibility to introduce requirements for evaporative emissions. While evaluating technical feasibility and listing the options of reduction of exhaust emissions and introduction of evaporative emissions, the report shall take into account cost efficiency of technologies and the need to agree globally harmonised values for the sector. Further, the review clause requires evaluating the impact of current set up of boat design categories on manufacturers and consumers with a possibility to suggest additional specifications and sub-categories of boat design categories, if needed.

#### 1.1.1.2 Reference documents and past studies

Several studies have been carried out before 2013. Some findings and conclusions of these studies materialised into the revision of the Recreational Craft Directive (Directive 2013/53/EU). Some of the issues, which are supposed to be evaluated now, have been addressed in these past studies already. The most important study in this respect is ***“Stocktaking study on the current status and developments of technology and regulations related to the environmental performance of recreational marine engines<sup>4</sup>”*** made by TNO Automotive and finalised on 10<sup>th</sup> January 2004. The study analysed the engine and emission reduction technologies existing at that time and proposed the possible scenarios of exhaust emission reduction from marine engines. The study also addressed the issues of evaporative emissions and specifications of boat design categories.

Another study is ***“Study on The Feasibility and Impact of Possible Scenarios for Further Emission Reduction Measures for Recreational Craft Engines in the Context of Directive 94/25/EC, as Amended by Directive 2003/44/EC: Impact Assessment Report<sup>5</sup>”***, made by ECNI and delivered on 26 October 2006. The study assessed the impact of possible further reduction of marine engine’s exhaust emissions by aligning these exhaust emission rules with the regulations applicable to non-road mobile machinery.

The last study on the issue of reduction of exhaust emissions was ***“Complementary Impact Assessment study on possible emission reduction measures for recreational marine craft engines<sup>6</sup>”*** made by ARCADIS and delivered in June 2008. This complementary impact assessment study respected the reduction scenarios from the previous studies but it added also the possibility of taking over the exhaust emission regulations applied in the United States. All these scenarios were compared and their economic, social and environmental impact were assessed.

The issue of watercraft design categories has been analysed in ***Study on Design Categories of Watercrafts*** made for the European Parliament by Mr Alexandre Cocheril in 2012. It was a sectorial expert’s opinion study investigating consequences of removing the link between design categories, as described in Directive 94/25/EC, and intended use, according to geographical location, and using wind strength and wave heights as the main two parameters. It was also proposing an alternative solution of division of design categories.

---

<sup>4</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/growth/content/study-environmental-performance-recreational-marine-engines-0\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/growth/content/study-environmental-performance-recreational-marine-engines-0_en)

<sup>5</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/growth/content/further-emission-reduction-measures-recreational-craft-engines-0\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/growth/content/further-emission-reduction-measures-recreational-craft-engines-0_en)

<sup>6</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/growth/content/complementary-impact-assessment-study-possible-emission-reduction-measures-recreational-0\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/growth/content/complementary-impact-assessment-study-possible-emission-reduction-measures-recreational-0_en)

### 1.1.1.3 Market situation

European nautical sector creates up to 234 000 jobs and generates € 28 billion annual revenue. It encompasses about 4,500 manufacturing enterprises and the production value of boat manufactures is € 6.5 billion. The biggest boat producing countries in the EU are Italy, the Netherlands, Germany, UK and France. Poland is also gaining market share due to the shift of production activities towards the Polish industry.

About 48 million EU citizen participate regularly in water sports, out of which 36 million participate regularly in boating activities. About 6 million boats are kept in European waters. The EU is a frontrunner with respect to innovation and technological processes e.g. in electric propulsion. Recreational craft's average lifespan has been estimated at 30 years, although in some instances this may stretch to 40-45 years.

Approximately 95% of the companies in the boat building sector are small and medium enterprises (SMEs), however the high-end of the market is dominated by a small group of major boat manufactures.

Engine manufacturers are mainly large multinational companies, such as Volvo Penta, Mercury, Yamaha, and Honda. It is noted that there are a few manufacturers in Europe that produce engines that have been developed by themselves. Examples in this category are Volvo Penta and Selva Marine. There are multiple players which are so called 'marinisers', like for example OXE and Seven Marine. In such business model, engines from Asian, European and American car and truck manufacturers are imported and made fit for maritime purposes ('marinised').

### 1.1.1.4 Rules on exhaust emissions in other legislations

There are other sets of regulations on the EU level, limiting the exhaust emissions from other transport means. The most important are Regulation (EU) 2016/1628 introducing the exhaust emission limits for internal combustion engines for non-road mobile machinery<sup>7</sup> and Regulation (EU) 595/2009 on type-approval of motor vehicles and engines with respect to emissions from heavy duty vehicles<sup>8</sup>.

Exhaust emissions produced by recreational craft are also regulated in other jurisdictions. Far most important EU's trading partner in the sector are the USA. The exhaust emissions applicable for compression ignition (CI or diesel) engines are regulated by rule of the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) 2008 Category 1 and 2 Marine Engine Rule, signed on March 14, 2008, Recreational Watercraft up to a displacement of 7 l/cyl covered in Category 1, compliance shown by label on engine acc. to 40 CFR § 94.212<sup>9</sup>.

---

<sup>7</sup> Regulation (EU) 2016/1628 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 September 2016 on requirements relating to gaseous and particulate pollutant emission limits and type-approval for internal combustion engines for non-road mobile machinery amending Regulations (EU) No 1024/2012 and (EU) No 167/2013, and amending and repealing Directive 97/68/EC (OJ L 252, 16.9.2016, p.53)

<sup>8</sup> Regulation (EU) 595/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 June 2009 on type-approval of motor vehicles and engines with respect to emissions from heavy duty vehicles (Euro VI) and on access to vehicle repair and maintenance information and amending Regulation (EC) No 715/2007 and Directive 2007/46/EC and repealing Directives 80/1269/EEC, 2005/55/EC and 2005/78/EC (OJ L 188, 18.7.2009, p.1)

<sup>9</sup> [40 CFR Part 9, 85 et al.][73 FR 88 25098-25352, 6 May 2008]

The exhaust emissions applicable for spark ignition (SI or petrol) inboard engines are regulated by rule of the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) 2008 Non Road SI rule - Source: Control of Emissions from Non road Spark-Ignition Engines and equipment<sup>10</sup>.

The exhaust emissions applicable for spark ignition outboard engines and personal watercraft are regulated by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) 2008 Non Road SI rule - Source: Control of Emissions from Non road Spark-Ignition Engines and equipment<sup>11</sup>.

#### 1.1.1.5 Rules on evaporative emissions in other legislations

Rules on evaporative emissions are set out in the US legislation. The rules cover fuel tanks, pumps, stop valves, fuel hoses & fittings etc. of spark ignition (petrol) engines. There are no evaporative emission standards for compression ignition (diesel) engines, or engines using other non-volatile or non-liquid fuels (LNG)<sup>12</sup>.

### **1.1.2 Objectives of the study**

**General objective** of the study is to collect information in order to draft the report required by Article 52 of the Directive 2013/53/EU.

To fulfil the general objective, the **specific objectives** therefore are:

- (1) To quantify the share of exhaust emissions produced by recreational marine engines in the EU comparing to exhaust emissions produced by boats in general as well as comparing to absolute number of transport exhaust emissions.
- (2) To find out if it is technically feasible and cost-beneficial to further reduce the emissions of pollutants from marine propulsion engines (nitrogen oxides NO<sub>x</sub>, hydrocarbons HC, particulates PT and carbon monoxide CO). The cost efficiency of technologies and the goal to approximate the exhaust emission limits from marine engines worldwide have to be taken into account.
- (3) To find out if other engine testing procedures would suit better to recreational marine propulsion engines, including hybrid installations as well as if these procedures would better contribute to reduction of pollutant's emissions.
- (4) To list the possible options of further reduction of exhaust emissions from recreational marine propulsion engines.

---

<sup>10</sup> [40 CFR Parts 9, 60, 80 et al.][73 FR 59033-59380, 8 Oct 2008] Relevant part: Marine SI engines under 40 CFR part 1045, pages 59194-59231 Exhaust emission limits: SD/I engines 40 CFR part 1045.105, page 59197-59198

<sup>11</sup> [40 CFR, Parts 9, 60, 80 et al.][73 FR 59033-59380, 8 Oct 2008], Relevant part: Marine SI engines under 40 CFR part 1045, pages 59194-59231 Exhaust emission limits: OB and PWC engines 40 CFR part 1045.103, page 59197

<sup>12</sup> 33 CFR, Part 183 deals with Boats and Associated Equipment and Subpart J is for Fuel Systems

- (5) To assess the possibility to set out requirements on evaporative emissions and fuel systems. To list possible options and accompany them by cost/benefit analysis.
- (6) To assess the adequacy and impact of the current specification of watercraft design categories (based on combination of resistance to wind force and to significant wave height) on manufacturers and consumers.
- (7) To assess the need to introduce further specifications, eventually to introduce further subdivision of the current design categories. Potential option to modify current specification of watercraft design categories shall be accompanied by cost/benefit analysis.

### **1.1.3 Example of tasks and questions**

#### **Exhaust emissions**

Task: Investigate if further reduction of exhaust emissions of marine propulsion engines would be cost/benefit efficient.

1. Are there technologies which would enable fulfilment of stricter exhaust emission limits from marine propulsion engines than these currently required by Directive 2013/53/EU?
2. Would stricter exhaust emission limits enable reduction of fuel/energy consumption?
3. Are there other testing procedures than those required by Directive 2013/53/EU which could be applied on marine propulsion engines and would reduce their exhaust emissions?
4. Are there other test cycles than those required by Directive 2013/53/EU which could be applied on marine propulsion engines, in particular on hybrid installations?
5. Which engines could fulfil stricter exhaust emission requirements?
6. Which air pollutants could be reduced by using new technologies, new test procedures or new test cycles?
7. Is there a set of exhaust emission limits from engines in other EU legislation which could apply for marine propulsion engines?
8. Is there any international regulation (existing or planned) on exhaust emissions from marine propulsion engines which could apply for marine propulsion engines used in the EU?
9. What is the share of exhaust emissions produced by recreational marine engines in the EU comparing to exhaust emissions produced by boats in general?
10. What is the share of exhaust emissions produced by recreational marine engines in the EU comparing to absolute number of transport exhaust emissions?
11. What would be the cost of reducing exhaust emissions?
12. How big would be the benefits of reducing exhaust emissions?
13. What would be a trade-off between cost and benefits if new exhaust emissions requirements are introduced?

## **Evaporative emissions from fuel systems**

Task: Investigate if introduction of rules for evaporative emissions from fuel systems of marine propulsion engines would be cost/benefit efficient.

1. Are there technologies, which would enable to limit evaporation of emissions from fuel systems of recreational craft?
2. Is there a set of evaporative emission rules from engines in other EU legislation which could apply for fuel systems of marine propulsion engines?
3. Is there any international regulation (existing or planned) on evaporative emissions which could apply for fuel systems of marine propulsion engines used in the EU?
4. What would be the cost of reducing evaporative emissions from fuel systems of recreational craft?
5. How big would be the benefits of reducing evaporative emissions from fuel systems of recreational craft?

## **Watercraft design categories**

Task: Investigate if the current set up of watercraft design categories should be modified, eventually what would be costs and benefit of such modification.

1. Are sectorial boat manufacturers satisfied with current specification of watercraft design categories?
2. Are sectorial small and medium boat manufacturers satisfied with current specification of watercraft design categories?
3. Are sectorial consumers satisfied with current specification of watercraft design categories?
4. Do the current criteria (resistance to wind force and significant wave height) provide for a sufficient and clear information to divide design categories?
5. Would different criteria describing the current design categories be appropriate?
6. Should the current design categories be further sub-divided?
7. Would further sub-division of the current design categories better reflect the reality in the sector?
8. Would further sub-division of the current design categories better inform the consumers on differentiation of type of boat designs?
9. Would further sub-division of the current design categories help the boat manufacturers, in particular SMEs?
10. What would be the cost and benefits of modification of criteria describing the current design categories?
11. What would be the cost and benefits of further sub-division of the current design categories?
12. Is there a support among boat manufacturer/small and medium boat manufacturers/consumers for modification of criteria describing the current design categories or further sub-division of the current design categories?

13. Is there a support among boat users / small and medium boat manufacturers / consumers for modification of criteria describing the current design categories or further sub-division of the current design categories?

#### **1.1.4 General guidance on methodology**

*The proposal shall include a methodological approach for the achievement of each of the following tasks, which may include the use of such tools as:*

##### **Data collection tools**

Desk research/literature review

- Qualitative and quantitative analysis of existing data (analysis of EU as well as international legislation on exhaust and evaporative emission requirements, analysis of international standardisation on watercraft design categories, market data)
- Analysis of existing documents (analysis of studies made before 2013 as a support for the revision of Directive 2013/53/EU)
- Collection, grouping and analysis of statistical data.

##### **Consultation strategy**

The contractor shall provide a detailed consultation strategy that will allow all stakeholders to be duly consulted. Particular attention should be paid to balance coverage of stakeholders consulted (companies (including all sizes), authorities, consumer organisations), geographical coverage, product coverage. The commission guidelines on stakeholder consultation should be followed<sup>13</sup>.

For each proposed consultation tool and for each category of stakeholder the contractor shall detailed the potential gaps and propose mitigation strategy. Such strategy will be completed after finalisation of each step of consultation process. Analysis of possible overlapping between the different tools shall also be put forward.

##### **a) Public Consultations**

The contractor shall prepare a questionnaire for Public Consultation, which has to be agreed with the Steering Group. The survey shall run on the Commission infrastructure (EU Survey).

The questionnaires will be translated by the Commission services into the 6 EU languages (EN, FR, DE, ES, IT, PL). The minimum time for public consultation is 12 week. Additional time should be given in case they run during major holiday periods.

The contractor shall respect the European Commission standards for data protection when analysing responses.

---

<sup>13</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/index_en.htm)



**b) Targeted consultations** aim at:

- (1) bridging the balanced coverage gap of Public Consultations;
- (2) gather more detailed and technical knowledge from certain stakeholders including those that provided interesting responses to public consultations. The list of targeted stakeholders shall be subjected to agreement of the Commission and should comprise at least 10 consultations.

Questionnaires shall be customised to different stakeholder groups such as industry associations, individual boat builders, engine manufacturers, marinisers (special attention to small and medium manufacturers), consumers, market surveillance authorities, notified bodies etc.– taking into account their different level of engagement and experience with the legislative requirements (tentatively around 10 to 20 open questions per group).

Method: via survey designed and conducted by the contractor with input and agreement from the Commission. The translation of the survey, both for the questions and the answers collected (limit to 6 languages as well (EN, FR, DE, ES, IT, PL), will be provided by the Commission services.

**c) Interviews:**

The contractor shall conduct in-depth telephone or face-to-face interviews to clarify the answers received in the above consultation rounds (at least 40). The selection of interviewees should be based on quality of their answers and knowledge of the subject and should be agreed with the Commission.

The consultations shall ensure that replies (either from Public or targeted consultations) are available at least for:

- The competent authorities of the 28 Member States that are responsible for the implementation of the Recreational Craft Directive including market surveillance authorities;
- 3-5 representatives of European Committee for Standardisation (CEN), e.g. the relevant CEN programme manager, the Chairman of the Technical Committee CEN/TC188 + SC2, HAS consultant;
- 5-10 Notified Bodies that are designated to carry out conformity assessment tasks under the Recreational Craft Directive which are listed in NANDO database<sup>14</sup>;
- other stakeholders where deemed relevant, consumer organisations;
- 5-10 representatives from industry, industry associations and SMEs within the recreational craft sector;
- 50 sectorial companies (boat builders / engine manufacturers) from different MS, also non-EU (EFTA countries and Switzerland)

---

<sup>14</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/growth/tools-databases/nando/index.cfm?fuseaction=directive.notifiedbody&dir\\_id=153461](http://ec.europa.eu/growth/tools-databases/nando/index.cfm?fuseaction=directive.notifiedbody&dir_id=153461)

Any other tools deemed appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation e.g. Focus groups/ Expert panels.

## **Data analysis**

- Intervention logic analysis
- Indicators

The evaluator is requested to propose indicators to assess all the questions of section (“Tasks and questions”), and go beyond the indicative examples presented there. Each indicator should be accompanied by relevant sources of information (i.e. how/by, which means data for each of the indicator will be gathered).

- Triangulation of information

The evaluator shall ensure robustness of information by trying to acquire it from more than one source. In particular, findings from consultations should be supported when possible by official statistics and studies.

- Cost-effectiveness, cost-benefit analysis

When conducting cost analysis, the contractor shall use Standard Cost model. Costs should be acquired to specific actions necessary. The contractor should follow at least methods described in Chapter 8 of Better Regulation Toolbox<sup>15</sup>.

Contractor shall try to estimate benefits of proposed modifications and scenarios, at minimum by estimating cost saved due to replacement of the current requirements by the new ones. Contractor shall try to estimate other benefits of the proposed modifications and scenarios that will emerge during the course of analysis.

- Case studies

The contractor shall use case studies in order to provide practical examples of issues related to application of stricter exhaust emissions, evaporative emissions and another specification or division of watercraft design categories. These could also be used to present examples of costs and benefits for manufactures of specific products (success stories) or for best practices in enforcement of rules.

### **1.1.5 Performance and quality requirements**

**The quality of the final report will be assessed and rated based on the following quality criteria (poor-satisfactory-good-very good or excellent):**

- **Relevance:** Does the evaluation respond to information needs, in particular as expressed in the terms of references?
- **Appropriate design:** Is the design of the evaluation adequate for obtaining the results needed to answer the evaluation questions?

---

<sup>15</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/toc\\_tool\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/toc_tool_en.htm)

- **Reliable data:** Are the collected data adequate for their intended use and reliable?
- **Sound analysis:** Are data systematically analysed to answer evaluation questions and cover other information needs in a valid manner?
- **Credible findings:** Are findings logical and justified, based on the appropriate analysis and interpretations of given criteria?
- **Valid conclusions:** Are conclusions non-biased and fully based on findings?
- **Helpful recommendations:** Are the identified recommendations in coherence with the conclusions? Are the suggested options realistic and impartial?
- **Clarity:** To what extent is the report well structured, balanced and written in an understandable manner?
- **Overall assessment of the final evaluation report:** Is the overall quality of the report adequate, in particular:
  - Does the evaluation fulfil contractual conditions?
  - Are the findings and conclusions of the report reliable, and are there any specific limitations to their validity and completeness?
  - Is the information in the report potentially useful for designing intervention, setting priorities, allocating resources or improving interventions?

#### **1.1.6 Delivery time and progress meetings**

The evaluator is to provide the required reports and documents in accordance with the conditions agreed. The tender must include a proposed timeframe for the required deliverables.

The evaluator will keep the Commission informed about progress of the execution of the contract and any issues that may emerge. Within one week after every meeting with the Commission services, the evaluator shall provide by email short meeting minutes including a summary of the discussions and a list of action points.

The following deliverables will be produced following the timeframe specified below in point 1.3.

- **Within 2 weeks after the signature** of the contract, a **Kick-off meeting** between the evaluator and the Commission steering group will be held in Brussels in the Commission premises. Among other things, the draft outline approach and the work plan, the suggested methodology, the priorities, and the first proposal for the set of indicators to assess the technical feasibility for further reducing of exhaust emissions, introducing requirements for evaporative emissions, and evaluating the impact of watercraft design categories on manufacturers and consumers. It will be subject to discussion and comments, in the light of which these shall be elaborated for the execution of the contract. The evaluator may be requested to participate in the Recreational Craft Working Group and to present the outline of the project.
- **Within 2 months after the signature** of the contract, an **Inception report** will be delivered. It will include a detailed work plan for the evaluation and describe the methodological and empirical approaches to be used for the tasks defined (in particular

the data collection methodology and approach, data collection tools, interview and surveys' targets, as well as lists of contacts to be surveyed or interviewed, expected response rates, interview guides, survey questionnaires, outline of the workshops, if any).

The Inception report shall include a draft evidence table (cross-reference of evaluation questions, indicators, data sources). It will outline main risk/challenges to the assignment and propose concrete ways to address them. The report will also include any additional need for information to be collected during the evaluation. The Inception report will take the form of a draft document to be discussed with the steering group in order to finalise the evaluation methodology in **a meeting that will take place 15 days following its delivery.**

- On the 3<sup>rd</sup> month **the Public consultations** based on questionnaires agreed with the Commission shall start and will last for 12 weeks.
- **Within 5 months after the signature** of the contract, **a first Progress report** will be delivered. It will summarise progress on all the points to be evaluated and raise any problems encountered. It will demonstrate how the existing data has been analysed, what preliminary conclusions have been drawn from the desk research phase, and how the evaluator is planning to proceed for the collection of external data. In particular it will present the outcome of Public Consultation. The contractor will present its data collection, methodology and approach, data collection tools as well as lists of contacts to be surveyed or interviewed, interview guides and survey questionnaires. It will take the form of a draft document to be discussed with the steering group during the first progress meeting **that will take place 1 month following its delivery.** The contractor may be requested to participate in the Recreational Craft Working Group meeting to make a presentation on the status of the project.
- **Within 8 months after the signature** of the contract, a **First Findings and Recommendations Report** will be submitted to the Commission. This document will follow the structure of the final report and will include the first findings and analysis. **It will be discussed with the steering group in a meeting that will take place 1 month following its delivery.**
- **Within 10 months after the signature** of the contract, the **Final report** will be delivered to the Commission, taking account of the comments made by the steering group on the First Findings. It shall include sound analysis of findings and factually based conclusions in line with the purpose and objectives described above. **It will be discussed with the steering group in a meeting that will take place 1 month following its delivery.**
- **Within 12 months after the signature** of the contract, the contractor will also make an interactive audio-visual **presentation or workshop in Brussels**, presenting their findings, conclusions and recommendations to Commission staff and also to stakeholder groups.
- All data created and purchased for the purpose of this study will become the property of the European Commission. The Contractor shall submit it to the Commission in a format agreed with the Commission; the data should be accompanied by an explanatory document for its interpretation

The tender must comply with applicable environmental, social and labour law obligations established by Union law, national legislation, collective agreements or the international environmental, social and labour conventions listed in Annex X to the Directive 2014/24/EU.

## **1.2. BACKGROUND**

In accordance with Article 52 of Directive 2013/53 /EU, the Commission shall submit a report to the European Parliament and to the Council on:

- the technical feasibility for further reducing the emissions of marine propulsion engines and introducing requirements for evaporative emissions and fuel systems that apply to propulsion engines and systems taking into account the cost efficiency of technologies and the need to agree globally harmonised values for the sector, taking into account any major market initiatives;
- the impact on consumer information and on manufacturers, in particular small and medium-sized enterprises, of the watercraft design categories listed in Annex I, which are based on resistance to wind force and significant wave height, taking into account developments in international standardisation. That report shall include an evaluation of whether the watercraft design categories require additional specifications or subdivisions, and shall suggest additional sub categories, as appropriate.

## **1.3. REPORTS AND DOCUMENTS**

The Contractor is to provide the required reports and documents in accordance with the conditions of paragraph 1.1.6.

The contractor must ensure that the inception, progress and first findings reports under this contract are clear, concise and focused on their purpose. Each report must contain a synopsis and clearly report on what is new, the status of any findings/conclusions/ recommendations (e.g. whether they are tentative or more final), any problems encountered and how they will be surmounted, and the next steps and timetable.

The final report shall conform to the following basic schema:

- Title page
- Table of Contents
- Introduction
- Background of the initiative
- Evaluation questions
- Research Methodology
- Implementation state of play
- Answers to the evaluation questions

- Conclusions and recommendations
- Annexes
- The final report should include:
  - The intervention logic (in a form of a diagram or table) for the activity under evaluation, complete with observed results/impacts of the intervention.
  - An evidence table cross-referencing: evaluation questions, key findings, supporting sources of evidence and corresponding recommendations.
  - An annex on the stakeholder consultation in line with the requirement of annex 2 of tool 47 of the toolbox<sup>16</sup> and the Better Regulation Guidelines on Consultation, of not more than 10 pages.
  - An annex on the methods and models used in preparing the evaluation, in line with the requirement of annex 3 of tool 47 of the toolbox
- The final report will be written in English and delivered both in paper (3 copies) and electronic form. It will include an executive summary providing the full picture of the evaluation and key findings and recommendations of no more than 2 pages.
- As all evaluation reports shall be available to the public, no form of confidential data shall be contained in the final report.
- Evaluations performed in or commissioned by the European Commission shall comply with the evaluation standards in force (see Annex).
- When approved, the final report will be published on DG GROW website.

Time-line	Meetings	Reports	Approval of reports	Payments
Contract signature				
1 month	Kick off meeting	Minutes+List of action points		
2 months		Inception report		
3 months	Inception report meeting	Minutes+List of action points		
4 months				
5 months		First progress report		Interim payment (40%)
6 months	Progress report meeting	Minutes+List of action points		

<sup>16</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/toc\\_tool\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/toc_tool_en.htm)

7 months				
8 months		First findings & recommendations report		
9 months	First findings & recommendations report meeting	Minutes+List of action points		
10 months		Final report		
11 months	Final report meeting	Minutes+List of action points		
12 months				Balance payment (60%)