



OPEN INVITATION TO TENDER

AO/ECVL/TB/Quality-in-VET/021/08

“Quality approaches for assuring the quality of training and services provision”

REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATIONS Nr. 2 (RS/PRO/2008/1016)

Participants to the call have requested the following clarifications:

Question 1 from a participant:

We would like to apply for the above tender and we were wondering if there is any given format for this tender. We read through the tender documents, but we have not seen a template neither for budget nor for the technical proposal. Are we free to choose the format we want?

Cedefop clarification 1:

There is no specific template for submission of the Technical Proposal (please refer to point 5.2 of the Tendering Specification).

As far as the Financial Proposal is concerned, and as indicated in point 5.4 “Financial proposal” of the Tendering Specifications, the tenderers must fill in table 1 - price schedule table and present a detailed breakdown of the price offered.

Question 2 from a participant:

Is there a need for all the partners in the tender to provide Cedefop with legal and financial forms?

Cedefop clarification 2:

In accordance with point 3.3 of the Tendering specifications, the legal entity form as well as the Financial Identification Form have to be submitted only by the organisation responsible to sign the contract with Cedefop in case of contract award, that is, by the tenderer or the consortium leader.

Question 3 from a participant:

Is there the need for all the partners to provide Cedefop with balance sheets or extracts from balance sheets for the last two years for which accounts have been closed and the statement of overall turnover?

Cedefop clarification 3:

In Point 4.1 of the Tendering Specifications it is explicitly stated that “In addition, each member of the consortium must provide the required evidence for the exclusion and selection criteria. Concerning the selection criteria ‘technical and professional capacity’, the evidence provided by each member of the consortium will be checked to ensure that the consortium as a whole fulfils the criteria”.

In point 4.2 of the Tendering specifications, it is stated that “In addition, each subcontractor must provide the required evidence for the exclusion and selection criteria. Concerning the selection criteria ‘technical and professional capacity’, the evidence provided by the subcontractor(s) will be checked to ensure that the tenderer with the subcontractor(s) as a whole fulfil the criteria”.

Which of the two above points applies to each particular case depends on the working arrangements between the tenderer and his partners, that is, on whether they are consortium members or subcontractors.

Question 4 from a participant:

Is there the need for all the partners to provide Cedefop with the exclusion criteria declaration as requested in point 3.1 and the Annex C template?

Cedefop clarification 4:

In accordance with point 3.1 of the Tender specifications, “all tenderers, all consortium members (if any) and all subcontractors (if any) shall provide the self-declaration found in Annex C duly signed and dated”.

Question 5 from a participant:

We are preparing the tender for AO/ECVL/TB/Quality-in-VET/021/08. For this tender we would like to know where to find or if Cedefop could provide us information about the two previous pilots mentioned at the call for tender:

Cedefop launched in 2006 and 2007 two pilot studies on quality approaches (QAs) in training followed by SMEs in three important sectors for the economic growth and employment: the Food processing, Retail and Tourism industry (hotels and restaurants included) in Ireland, Germany and Greece on one hand and in Bulgaria, Romania, Slovakia and the Czech Republic.

Cedefop clarification 5:

The first study is under publication and its conclusions can be consulted in the Virtual Communities on Quality Assurance in VET (<http://communities.trainingvillage.gr/quality>), in the folder SMEs.

The second study is not yet available, since it is still ongoing.

Question 6 from a participant:

After reading the tender more than once, it's not clear, from our point of view if the study focus on accreditations that show someone has a title and the respective competences for doing his profession, or if it's focusing in the accreditation of VET providers. It means we have to analyze the different accreditation processes in the different sectors and countries to access the accreditations to provide Vocational training (the requirements the VET providers have to be able to provide this VET). Is it?

Can you clarify a bit more the focus of the tender?

Cedefop clarification 6:

As it is clearly mentioned in the title the focus is on the accreditation of the providers, and not of the individual persons as receivers of VET.

Question 7 from a participant:

The Definition of VET providers relates to training services. It is that definition of what constitutes training services that is not clear. They clearly include employers but do not make clear anywhere, that we have read, whether courses at academic establishments are definitely excluded. In the last two paragraphs of 2.3.2 p16 they seem to draw a distinction between the two but whether sector based training organisations in Universities would be counted in or out and whether NVQ courses at further education establishments are excluded is unclear.

For this study, we need to confirm

- 1) supplementary to and totally separate from HE accreditation (even when VET based) and from programmes that link HE to VET accreditation
- 2) therefore restricted to these providers who are not recognised as educational establishments or part of the educational community.

Cedefop clarification 7:

Although the above “question” seems to be an internal communication of the potential tenderer, included by oversight in an e-mail addressed to Cedefop requesting clarification, here below is the position of Cedefop:

The focal point is the accreditation in the world of VET, not of HE. Sector training organisations based in HE establishments could be included but may not monopolize the analysis. The HE-VET accreditation could be included but again not monopolize the analysis. Concerning NVQ, only structured and constant accreditation practices should be mentioned.