



# Playfood

## Request for Proposals (RFP)

### Design & Development of the PLAYFOOD Digital Game-Based Platform

Reference: **PLAYFOOD-DIGITAL-PLATFORM-2025-01**

Date: **5 January 2026**

Contracting Authority: **EDUQUEST (BEN2)**, on behalf of the **PLAYFOOD** consortium EU Programme:  
**SMP-CONS-2024-EDU**

Grant Agreement No.: **101196354 – PLAYFOOD**

### Introductory Invitation

EDUQUEST, acting on behalf of the PLAYFOOD consortium, invites qualified suppliers to submit an offer for the **design and development of the PLAYFOOD digital game-based platform (MVP)** as described in this Request for Proposals (RFP).

Interested suppliers are requested to carefully read and follow all instructions. By submitting an offer, the supplier accepts the conditions of this RFP and its annexes.

# Contents

1. Background.....	3
1.1 PLAYFOOD project .....	3
1.2 Role of this assignment .....	3
2. Instructions to Tenderers.....	4
2.1 Planning .....	4
2.2 Submission of offers .....	4
2.3 Closing date .....	5
2.4 Questions and communication.....	5
2.5 Complaints .....	5
2.6 Costs of participation .....	5
2.7 Conditions and legal framework.....	5
2.8 Award decision and standstill.....	6
3. Evaluation Procedure.....	6
3.1 Principle.....	6
3.2 Steps .....	6
3.3 Tie-breaking.....	6
4. Programme of Requirements .....	7
4.1 Assignment summary .....	7
4.2 Scope of work.....	7
A. Concept & Co-Design .....	7
B. Design & Build of the MVP.....	8
C. Pilot Readiness & Handover .....	8
4.3 Timeline and coordination.....	8
4.4 Key requirements .....	9
4.4.1 Functional .....	9
4.4.2 Non-functional .....	9
4.5 Acceptance Criteria .....	10
4.6 Commercial framework.....	10
5. Award Criteria .....	11
5.1 Overview .....	11
5.2 Criterion 1 – Plan of Approach (50 pts) .....	11
5.3 Criterion 2 – Co-design quality and gameplay–learning fit (20 pts) .....	11
5.4 Criterion 3 – Expertise team (20 pts) .....	12
5.5 Criterion 4 – Value for money (10 pts) .....	12
5.6 Scoring scale for criteria 1–3 .....	13

# 1. Background

## 1.1 PLAYFOOD project

The PLAYFOOD project aims to make food sustainability education both accessible and appealing to primary school children. More specific, it helps children in **primary education** to become **more aware, critical and empowered food consumers**. Its goal is to help shape the responsible consumers of tomorrow through playful, digital game-based learning, while addressing major global challenges such as increasing household food waste and the impact of food consumption on climate change.

Recognizing that children are both influential agents of change and vulnerable consumers, PLAYFOOD equips them with essential knowledge and practical skills related to food waste reduction, local and seasonal eating, climate change, circular economy and growing their own food. At the same time, the project seeks to positively influence family consumption habits and strengthen the capacity of teachers to integrate these topics into their teaching.

The project combines knowledge-sharing events, expert contributions and interactive school activities with the development of a digital game-based educational platform that encourages children to think critically about sustainable food choices. A strong dissemination effort at European level will support policy alignment, long-term sustainability and wider awareness.

Three organizations from three different countries collaborate to establish PLAYFOOD as a reference point for educating younger generations on sustainable and responsible food consumption. PLAYFOOD is a European project funded under **SMP-CONS-2024-EDU**.

For more information about the PLAYFOOD project, you may visit: [www.playfood-eu.com/](https://www.playfood-eu.com/)

## 1.2 Role of this assignment

This assignment concerns the **first playable version (MVP)** of the student-facing, game-based part of the PLAYFOOD platform.

The digital platform that will be developed under this tender is a central output of the PLAYFOOD project and corresponds directly to **Task T3.1 – Content Creation & Platform Development** of Work Package 3 (WP3), as described in the Application Form. This work also contributes to the achievement of **Milestone MS4 – Final Version of the Digital Platform (Month 12)**, which serves as a key verification point for ensuring that the platform is fully operational and aligned with the required technical and pedagogical specifications. In this context, MS4 represents a significant checkpoint confirming that the subcontractor has delivered a complete and functional version of the platform, ready for testing, piloting, dissemination, and long-term maintenance as indicated in the Application Form.

We want to collaborate with a supplier who will:

- Help us **shape the concept** of the PLAYFOOD game experience, and
- **Design and build an MVP** that can be tested in pilot schools.

We are **deliberately open** about the exact game structure. It may become:

- One coherent game journey or story,

- A hub with several smaller games or episodes, or
- A combination of both.

We expect the supplier to **propose and motivate** a clear approach to co-create a concept and game structure that fits PLAYFOOD's objectives and constraints.

## 2. Instructions to Tenderers

### 2.1 Planning

The indicative start date of the contract is no later than 28 February 2026, subject to completion of the procurement procedure and contract signature.

The expected duration of the assignment is approximately 9 months, in line with the PLAYFOOD project work plan and milestones.

The Contracting Authority reserves the right to adjust the timing as necessary, in accordance with applicable procurement rules. Any changes will be communicated to all tenderers in due time.

### 2.2 Submission of offers

Offers must be submitted **electronically** by email to:

- **Submission address:** [info@eduquest.gr](mailto:info@eduquest.gr)
- **Subject line:** “Offer – PLAYFOOD Digital Platform – [Name of Tenderer]”

The offer must:

- Be written in **English**
- Be submitted as **one PDF file** (plus annexes if needed) in the RFP template (Playfood\_RFP Submission Template Annex)
- Be accompanied with a **Declaration on Honour** confirming that the participating organization *“accepts the Playfood\_RFP General Terms & Conditions and has no final convictions for offences such as corruption, fraud, bribery, money laundering, participation in criminal organizations, terrorism-related activities, or offences involving minors, in accordance with Directive 2014/24/EU and Article 73 of Greek Law 4412/2016. The participating organization is not in bankruptcy or liquidation, has no overdue tax or social security obligations, and has not engaged in grave professional misconduct”*.
- Follow the **structure of the award criteria** in Chapter 5

By submitting an offer, the tenderer accepts all conditions and requirements in this RFP and annexes.

### Clarifications

Any questions or requests for clarification regarding this Request for Proposals must be submitted in writing to the Contracting Authority.

All clarifications and answers will be provided simultaneously to all invited economic operators to ensure equal treatment.

## 2.3 Closing date

Offers must be **received** no later than:

**18/1/2026, 23:59:59 CET**

Offers received after this date and time will **not** be considered.

## 2.4 Questions and communication

All questions must be submitted **in writing** by email to:

- **Contact person:** Charalampos Vasileiadis
- **Function:** PLAYFOOD WP2 Lead
- **Email:** [info@eduquest.gr](mailto:info@eduquest.gr)
- **Subject line:** “PLAYFOOD Digital Platform – Question – [Name of Tenderer]”

Questions must be received **no later than 12/01/2026**.

A consolidated **Q&A / Clarifications document** will be published on **14/01/2026** and will form part of this RFP. Contact via other channels about this procedure is not permitted.

## 2.5 Complaints

If a tenderer considers parts of this RFP or the procedure unclear or unfair, they must first contact the **person in §2.4**, clearly marking the message as a **complaint**.

A formal **Complaints Procedure** is included as **Annex**.

## 2.6 Costs of participation

All costs for preparing and submitting offers are at the tenderer's own expense and **will not be reimbursed**.

## 2.7 Conditions and legal framework

- The Contracting Authority's **General Terms and Conditions for Services** apply (Annex 1).
- The tenderer's own general terms and conditions **do not apply**.
- The assignment must comply with:
  - Applicable public procurement rules,
  - The SMP Grant Agreement provisions relevant to subcontracting, and
  - Applicable data protection legislation (GDPR), with special attention to **minors**.

## 2.8 Validity of the offer

Offers must remain valid for at least **90 calendar days** after the closing date (§2.3).

## 2.9 Right to cancel or modify

The Contracting Authority may modify or cancel this procedure at any time before award, without any

obligation to compensate tenderers.

## 2.10 Award decision and standstill

All tenderers will receive a written notification of the **award decision**. A **standstill period** of one week will apply, during which tenderers can request clarifications or submit a complaint.

# 3. Evaluation Procedure

## 3.1 Principle

The contract will be awarded to the economically most advantageous tender based on the best price–quality ratio.

The evaluation is based on:

- **Technical quality criteria** (maximum **90 points**), and
- **Price criterion** (maximum **10 points**).

The total score is calculated as the sum of:

- the technical score (criteria 1–3), and
- the price score (criterion 4),

resulting in a maximum total score of **100 points**.

Only offers meeting the minimum technical requirements will be considered for price evaluation.

## 3.2 Steps

### 1. Formal check

- On-time submission, correct format, completeness of requested documents.

### 2. Minimum requirements check

- Compliance with key requirements in Chapter 4 (scope, basic functional and non-functional requirements, legal conditions).
- Offers that do not meet minimum requirements may be rejected.

### 3. Qualitative and financial evaluation

- Evaluation against the four award criteria in §5.
- Calculation of total score (max. 100 points).

## 3.3 Tie-breaking

If two or more offers have the same total score:

1. The offer with the **highest overall quality score** (considering all three sub criteria) will be ranked higher.

2. If still tied, the offer with the **lowest evaluated price** will be ranked higher.
3. If needed, the Contracting Authority may invite tied tenderers for a short clarification before taking a final decision.

## 4. Programme of Requirements

We intentionally keep this section **focused and non-prescriptive**. We describe the **outcomes we need**. We expect tenderers to propose **how** to get there.

### 4.1 Assignment summary

Design and develop the **first playable version (MVP)** of the **student-facing PLAYFOOD game platform** that:

- Helps children (approx. **9–14 years**) explore and practice **sustainable food choices**
- Aligns with the minimum of the mentioned **four PLAYFOOD content domains**
- Can be used in **classrooms** and, to a limited extent, at **home**
- Respects **privacy and data minimization** for children
- Is technically suitable for **common school notebook/laptop devices**
- Can be **operated and extended** by the PLAYFOOD consortium after the project

We are **open** to different game structures (single story, episodic/mini-games, hub model...). The supplier should **make a clear, motivated proposal** on how to guide this design & decision-making process.

The PLAYFOOD consortium will provide the supplier with:

- A draft set of learning goals across the four PLAYFOOD content domains,
- Any existing visual assets or branding guidelines (if available).

The supplier is expected to:

- Transform this content into child-friendly, age-appropriate in-game materials (e.g., simplified texts, missions, choices, challenges),
- Propose any additional narrative elements or light assets needed for the MVP.

### 4.2 Scope of work

We foresee three main work streams. Tenderers may propose their own detailed phasing, as long as these elements are covered.

#### A. Concept & Co-Design

Outcomes:

- Shared understanding of PLAYFOOD goals, target groups and constraints
- Clear **game concept** and **game structure** (e.g. journey, episodes, mini-games or combination)
- Agreement on **MVP scope** (what is in the first release, what comes later)

Key elements:

- 1–2 co-design sessions (online or hybrid) with consortium representatives
- Short **Product Vision** (1–2 pages)
- Lightweight overview of the **player experience and game loop** (e.g. key steps from entry to completion)
- High-level mapping of PLAYFOOD content domains to **game situations/missions** We expect **clarity and focus**, not heavy documentation.

## B. Design & Build of the MVP

Outcomes:

- A **playable MVP** of the PLAYFOOD game platform, ready for internal testing and pilot preparation
- Basic structure that can later be extended with more content or features
- Where feasible, content should be made available in a minimum of three languages: English, Dutch, and Greek.

Key elements:

- Interactive experience in the browser (see §4.3 and §4.4)
- Simple, child-friendly UI and feedback
- Inclusion of **a first set of content** across at least the main PLAYFOOD domains
- Mechanism(s) to connect **real-world actions** (e.g. small tasks at home or in class) with **in-game effects**

The exact number of missions, levels or episodes is **up to the tenderer**, but must be **realistic** for the available budget and timeline and sufficient for meaningful pilots.

## C. Pilot Readiness & Handover

Outcomes:

- MVP is ready to be piloted in **partner schools** in at least all Playfood partner countries (BE, GR, PT)
- PLAYFOOD partners can operate and further develop the platform

Key elements:

- Short **quick-start guide** for teachers and pupils
- Basic **monitoring possibility** for a few KPIs (see §4.4)
- Delivery of source code and documentation, using an appropriate **open license** (to be agreed, e.g. MIT/Apache)
- Clear explanation of **hosting options**, including optional post-project maintenance We expect a **practical and lean** approach focused on pilots.

## 4.3 Timeline and coordination

The assignment must fit within the PLAYFOOD work plan. The indicative timeframe is:

- Contract start **no later than 28/02/2026**
- Concept & co-design: early 2026
- **Pilot-Ready MVP: Available by August 2026 (MS3 – M12)**
- Pilot Testing & Finalization: School pilot in September 2026; final MVP delivery based on feedback by October 2026
- Handover: Aligned with PLAYFOOD pilot planning; formalized at contract stage, no later than November 2026

Tenderers should propose a **concise timeline** with:

- Main phases or sprints
- Key decision moments (e.g. concept approval, MVP test)
- A simple visual timeline is sufficient, e.g., a Gantt chart illustrating the phases and milestones

## 4.4 Key requirements

We only specify the **minimum requirements**; details can be refined with the selected supplier.

### 4.4.1 Functional

- **Phygital element**
  - Playfood's user research indicates students & teachers' interest in **connecting real-life actions/play** (home/school, board game) with digital gameplay (e.g. code entry, choice screen, basic logging). The feasibility and options for creating a phygital game will be a key focus in co-design phase A.
- **Platform & devices**
  - Browser-based application
  - Usable on common school **laptops/PCs**; tablet support is a plus
- **Access & accounts**
  - Full playability in **guest mode** (no registration required)
  - If accounts are used: only **pseudonymous** (e.g. nickname/avatar), no direct personal identifiers
- **Game experience**
  - Designed for **short, engaging play sessions** (suitable for classroom time slots)
  - Integrates **PLAYFOOD content areas** in a meaningful way
  - Includes at least a **first set of playable content** that teachers can use in pilots
- **Basic monitoring**
  - Ability to track a **small set of usage indicators**, e.g.:
    - Number of unique active player sessions
    - Number of completed game sessions/missions
  - Data must be exportable in a simple format (e.g. CSV) or accessible through a database.

### 4.4.2 Non-functional

- **Privacy & data protection**
  - No collection of direct PII from children (no names, emails, photos) in the MVP
  - Use of anonymous or pseudonymous identifiers
  - Data stored and processed within the **EU/EEA** and compliant with EU **GDPR**.

- Clear, short documentation of what data is collected and why
- **Accessibility**
  - Where feasible, content should be made available in a minimum of three languages: English, Dutch, and Greek.
  - Language, visuals and controls appropriate for 9–14-year-olds
- **Performance & reliability**
  - Smooth operation on typical school internet connections and hardware
  - Reasonable loading times
- **Maintainability**
  - Use of **well-known technologies** that can be maintained by others
  - Basic documentation of architecture and deployment

## 4.5 Acceptance Criteria

The MVP will be accepted when, at minimum:

- It can be played end-to-end in guest mode without blocking errors
- Teachers and pupils can understand **what to do** without extensive explanation
- The agreed first set of playable content is available and functioning
- Basic monitoring works and data can be viewed and/or exported
- Code and documentation have been handed over and can be installed on a test environment

Details on acceptance tests will be agreed with the selected supplier.

## 4.6 Commercial framework

A maximum contract value is set in line with the PLAYFOOD budget (details will be provided separately).

Tenderers must provide a clear price breakdown using the attached **Financial Tender Form**, at least per main work stream:

- Concept & co-design
- Design & build
- Pilot readiness & handover
- Optional hosting and maintenance packages

Prices must indicate:

- Total price excluding and including VAT per work stream/phase
- Prices must use the same unit for all tenderers (e.g., €/phase)

Payments will be linked to milestones (to be agreed at contract stage). For this low-value procedure, the payment schedule is simplified to:

1. **Intermediate payment 1:** after concept & co-design approval
2. **Intermediate payment 2:** after pilot-ready MVP delivery
3. **Final payment:** upon final handover and approval

## 5. Award Criteria

### 5.1 Overview

Offers that meet all minimum requirements will be evaluated on the following criteria:

Nr	Criterion	Weight (points)
1	Plan of Approach	50
2	Co-design quality and gameplay–learning fit	20
3	Expertise team	20
4	Value for money (price in relation to quality)	10
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>

### 5.2 Criterion 1 – Plan of Approach (50 pts)

We look for a **concise but concrete** plan that explains:

- How you will collaborate with the PLAYFOOD consortium overall (co-design, decision-making, feedback loops)
- How you will structure the work into **phases or sprints**, including key milestones
- How you will deliver the **MVP** within the given timeframe
- How you will handle **risks and dependencies** (e.g. content availability, school IT constraints, privacy)
- How you will ensure **quality** (testing, validation with users, etc.)

High scores are given to offers that:

- Are **clear and practical**,
- Show a **realistic timeline**,
- Provide a **logical step-by-step approach** from concept to pilot-ready MVP, without unnecessary complexity.

### 5.3 Criterion 2 – Co-design quality and gameplay–learning fit (20 pts)

We look for:

- A **clear understanding** of PLAYFOOD's goals, context and target group
- A **convincing approach to co-develop a game concept** (structure, type of experience) that:
  - Fits primary school pupils (approx. 9–14 years)
  - Naturally integrates sustainable food themes
  - Is realistic for the available budget and timeframe

High scores are given to offers with:

- A **clear, strong co-design process to shape the game concept** and understand how gameplay connects with learning

#### 5.4 Criterion 3 – Expertise team (20 pts)

We look for:

- Relevant **experience** with:
  - Game-based learning for children or young people
  - Design and development of web experiences
  - Working with schools or educational settings
  - Optional: educational or behavior-change games
  - Optional: phygital learning & game design
- A well-composed **team**, with clear roles and sufficient availability
- 2–3 **short references** to similar projects (links/screenshots where possible)

High scores are given to offers that:

- Demonstrate **strong, relevant experience**,
- Show that the proposed team can **guide** a non-game consortium through concept decisions and MVP development.

#### 5.5 Criterion 4 – Value for money (10 pts)

The price will be evaluated solely on the basis of the formula described below. No qualitative assessment of the price will be carried out.

**Price band for this procedure:**

- Minimum price: **€8,000** (exclusive of VAT)
- Maximum price: **€10,000** (exclusive of VAT)

**Rules for price evaluation:**

- Tenderers must ensure that their total offered price falls within the above price band.
- If the offered price exceeds **€10,000 (exclusive of VAT)**, the offer will be rejected.
- If the offered price is **equal to or below €8,000 (exclusive of VAT)**, the tenderer will receive the maximum score of **10 points**.

For prices within the band (**€8,001–€10,000**), the price score will be calculated proportionally using the following formula:

**Price Score = 10 × (Lowest Price ÷ Evaluated Price)**

Where:

- **Lowest Price** = the lowest price among all offers that meet the minimum technical requirements
- **Evaluated Price** = the price of the tender being evaluated

Only offers meeting all minimum technical requirements will be considered for price evaluation.

The price criterion contributes a maximum of **10 points** to the total score. The technical criteria contribute a maximum of **90 points**.

## 5.6 Scoring scale for criteria 1–3

For criteria 1–3 we use the following scale:

Label	Description	% of max points
Excellent	Clearly above expectations	100%
Good	Above expectations	80%
Satisfactory	Meets expectations	60%
Weak	Partly meets expectations	40%
Poor	Does not meet expectations	20%
No answer / n.a.	Missing or not assessable	0%

The percentage is multiplied by the maximum points per criterion.