

Questions related to the call:

Q:

- Where the proposed key experts have substantial relevant experience gained through previous senior academic, quality assurance, programme validation and professional roles, may comparable assignments undertaken in those capacities be submitted as evidence of relevant experience, provided that the role of the individual, scope of the assignment, delivery period and appropriate verification details are clearly identified?

A:

- Yes, they may.
-

Q:

- Whether EIT Food would be open to proposals that include revised deliverable deadlines, and if so, whether these should be submitted as part of our proposal or discussed beforehand.
- Whether the dates marked as indicative in section 2.3 can be adjusted.
- Whether the level of effort allocated to Service 1 is fixed, or whether it can be reviewed in light of the scope of work.

A:

- There is no flexibility in regard to timelines and deadlines, as other actions rely on them.
 - The level of effort is fixed. However, if you think it worth justifying, feel free to submit an option B. It will not be a decisive criterion in the selection of the provider.
-

Q:

- Two different deadlines are mentioned: 24th October 2026 on the webpage <https://www.eitfood.eu/open-calls/quality-assurance-services-for-eit-community-education-2026-2028> and 26th October 2026 on page 12 of the RfP. Which one is the actual deadline?
- Can a consortium submit a proposal? In that case will the consortium need to be a completely new legal entity, or will an internal consortium agreement suffice?
- If the contractors for the two services are different, will the contractor for Service 1 still be contactable after submission of their last deliverable?
- What happens if something recommended by Service 1 turns out not to be feasible or operationalisable within the timeframe of this project?
- Are in person meetings expected or participation at in person events?

A:

- Please take 26th as the date of the deadline.
- Yes, a consortium can submit the proposal. In this case, a consortium agreement should suffice.
- Yes. Where Service 1 and Service 2 are awarded to different contractors, the Service 1 contractor is expected to remain available for reasonable clarification and handover support after submission of its final deliverables, where necessary to enable the Service

2 contractor to correctly interpret and implement the frameworks, requirements and other outputs developed under Service 1. This does not extend the Service 1 contractor's role to the operational implementation activities assigned to Service 2. The detailed handover and coordination arrangements will be agreed with EIT Food and reflected in the handover plan.

- As long as the deliverables are fulfilled on time and the given situation does not affect the run of the WPs, this can be granted per WP leads' approval.
- Currently, the entire scope of work is expected to be delivered online. Should travel subsequently be required by EIT Food, any associated travel and accommodation costs would be agreed separately with EIT Food and invoiced in addition to the agreed service fees, in accordance with the applicable contractual provisions.

.....
Q:

Service 1 Phase 2

- Do WPs 1 and 3 work with the same QA systems (WordPress) as WP2? Are there work packages that don't have any systems support for QA?
- WP3 activities, phase 2 lists many activities that 'may include' items such as KIC analysis, credential architecture and Europass feasibility. Which are mandatory and which are optional?

A:

Service 1 Phase 2:

- WPs 1 & 3 do not have systems for QA, how this will be implemented will need to be clarified with the WP leads.
- This again will need to be clarified with the WP lead.

.....
Q:

Service 2 WP1

- Who is carrying out the EIT Label accreditation assessment for GGS courses? Is it EIT directly for all different subject areas of the different courses?
- Can you confirm that the work for GGS does not include the issuing of micro credential but rather create micro-credential ready GGS courses?

A:

Service 2 WP1

- **EIT Label accreditation assessment**

The selected contractor is expected to explore and assess the feasibility of GGS applying for the EIT Label, including researching the relevant requirements, potential recognition pathways and the steps needed to pursue accreditation. The scope does not presuppose that the EIT itself will carry out an assessment of all GGS courses or subject areas.

- **Micro-credentials**

In 2026, the selected contractor is expected to research and develop a micro-credential framework for the Girls Go STEM (GGS) learning programme, aligned with the Union of Skills and the Skills Portability Initiative, and explore compatibility with the European Digital Credentials Infrastructure (EDCI). In 2027-28, the contractor will support GGS in

planning and implementing the framework.

The issuing of micro-credentials to learners is envisaged for 2027–28, as part of the subsequent launch and scaling of the validated framework. The contractor is not expected to issue micro-credentials directly on behalf of GGS. When assessing options and recommending a roadmap towards the implementation and issuance of micro-credentials, the selected contractor shall take into account GGS's existing digital infrastructure, including the functionalities associated with the current Moodle Workplace platform and digital credentials provider. The roadmap should build on existing capabilities where feasible, identify any gaps or additional technical requirements, and clearly outline the associated costs to ensure that the proposed approach is technically feasible and cost-effective.

.....
Q:

Service 2 WP2

- Is there an expectation that the contractor will carry out all quality checks or can it be assumed that capability will be built (through training) within the EIT Education Community or each KIC and that quality checks for the EIT Community to be independent on this aspect?
- Are the quality checks considered to be a “mock EIT label” or will they be at a lower level of scrutiny? In other words, will this activity be a support for training providers to reach the EIT label or rather an additional (lower) level of quality check and seal?
- Is there an expectation to have a Quality Check Panel and do this involve members outside of EITFood?
- What is the anticipated volume of courses expected?

A:

Service 2 WP2:

- The contractor will carry out all the quality checks for the courses.
- The checks, formally called now "quality endorsement"s are a lower level of scrutiny.
- There is a requirement to have 2 independent reviewers to be available for the review windows and a quality administrator who will manage the course submissions and publications, as well as questions from course providers.
- We expect again about 200-300 courses, but that calculation is based on what we have received in Deep Tech Talent Initiative and is not a certain number.

.....
Q:

Service 2 WP3

- WP3 (page 6 of the RfP) appears to be responsible for the digital delivery and the framework for digital credentials. Does WP3 already have an idea of the architecture? And can any architecture documents be shared to inform the work and timescale proposed in our bid?
- What two KICs will be involved in the pilot credential pathways?

A:

Service 2 WP3:

- No, there is no fixed plans for this yet; technical possibilities are currently being explored for how the micro-credentials will be explored (whether to use an existing tool or build internally).
- No, the KICs are not yet decided.

.....
Q:

- I would be interested in a paid specialist contribution within an experienced supplier team, particularly in research assessment, AI-related learning and digital credentials. Could you kindly advise on the appropriate participation route and whether the procurement allows a supplier to include an independent specialist in these areas?

A:

- Unfortunately, we do not have the liberty of organising consortiums ourselves once the RfP is closed and the said consortium is selected. If you wish to apply, and operate under a legal entity such as your company, feel free to submit a proposal yourself. Otherwise, you can also join a consortium yourself given that you have a legal entity or invoice the said consortium should you reach an agreement.

.....
Q:

1. Phase 1 refers to "overarching quality standards and accreditation frameworks supporting EIT Label accreditation for non-degree education", including criteria, minimum requirements, evidence and documentation requirements, and assessment logic. Given that the EIT Label manual on accreditation for non-degree education already includes many of these things, could you clarify which of the following best describes the intended scope:
 - a. defining quality criteria, minimum requirements and assessment logic for individual courses, modules and trainings, derived from the existing EIT Label requirements;
 - b. developing guidance, templates and tools to support the application of the existing EIT Label requirements, without defining new criteria (presumably by extending or adding to existing templates);
 - c. modifying or extending the EIT Label framework itself, for example to cover additional education levels or credential types.
 - d. If a combination is intended, could you indicate the relative emphasis? Should the requirements set out in the EIT Label Handbook (2022) be treated as fixed?
2. Could you confirm the expected start date of Service 2, and the dates of the WP2 reports (currently 31/01/2027 and 31/12/2027 – should these read 2028)? As Service 2 excludes design, what is expected of the Service 2 provider for the milestone "Micro-credentials and EIT Label frameworks designed and validated" (30/11/2027)?
3. Piloting is referred to in Service 1 (WP3) and in Service 2 (WP1 credential roll-out; WP3 credential pathways and Skills Passport). What should piloting cover? In particular, does it include issuing digital credentials to real learners and, if so, approximately how many learners and in which programmes? Are other elements expected, such as user testing

with learners or employers, evaluation of the pilots, or integration with the EIT Campus portal?

4. May a single tenderer be awarded both Service 1 and Service 2? If so, would the handover deliverables still apply, and will the combined-award evaluation referred to in Section 3.9 be used?
5. Could you indicate the approximate number of courses, modules, trainings and Pledger trainings to be reviewed per year in WP1 and WP2, and whether reviews are expected for every course or on a sample basis?
6. Is the contractor expected to provide credential issuing infrastructure and to develop the Skills Passport prototype, or to specify requirements and support the EIT Campus and KIC teams responsible for their development? If a tenderer is able to provide these within the scope and price of its offer, will this be taken into account in the technical evaluation?

A:

1. "defining quality criteria, minimum requirements and assessment logic for individual courses, modules and trainings, derived from the existing EIT Label requirements" best describes the scope. We do expect these to be in line with EIT Label, whilst following programmes' individual needs.
2. It is only the redesign of the overarching quality criteria that is excluded from Service 2. We do expect the provider to review the "credential-readiness checklist" deliverable for Service 1, turn that into a full framework and validate the feasibility of the framework.
3. Piloting in these cases should cover testing the framework with the current users/learners existing in different WPs and will include all users in the said WPs, the timespan and/or the sample size of learners for piloting can be agreed upon with WP leads. Pilots should be evaluated and the framework & implementation methodology should be revised if changes are needed. Only for WP3 are we expecting an integration into EIT Campus platform but that is again to be discussed, validated, and tested with the WP3 team.
It is important to note that it is of course necessary to validate the framework before piloting. If issuing digital credentials are not possible for any reason, for example, then this should be reported.
4. A single tenderer indeed can be awarded for both Services 1 & 2. In this case, the deliverables still apply but only and only Handover Package deliverables can be discussed once after the tender is awarded.
5. WP1 has 32 courses and there will be added 6 more by 2028 (4 in 2027 and 2 in 2028); this is a fixed number. They are ready to be reviewed once the framework is in place. For WP2, we have received about 300 courses over the span of 2.5 years; but this number for EIT STEM is merely indicative, also courses will not come all at once. We expect all courses to be reviewed. For WP2 specifically, we have put in place a solution as the initiative is launched and the courses need to be reviewed, and that is quite a light touch one to speed up & ease the process. The provider will be welcome to review and propose changes after selection to this procedure.
6. The contractor is not expected to provide the underlying credential-issuing infrastructure. However, the contractor is expected to support the definition and translation of the relevant functional and technical requirements needed to implement

the credentialing frameworks, pathways, badges and Skills Passport components within the relevant infrastructure, working closely with EIT Campus and participating KICs. The contractor will also support prototype development, integration and testing as foreseen in the RfP. Tenderers may propose additional technical capabilities where these support delivery of the required scope and can be provided within the proposed price; these will be considered within the published technical evaluation criteria rather than as a separate evaluation criterion.