

**OJ S 98/2026 22/05/2026**  
**Call for tender : MAA-010008 - Innovation and Digitalisation Advisory  
Programme**

**Clarifications to the Instructions to tenderers and Assignment Terms of  
reference / Set 2**

QUESTION 10:

We read in the **Evaluation grid** of the aforementioned tender (Strategy, 4th bullet point) that '*...If the tender is submitted by a single company or does not foresee any sub-contracting arrangements, the total of available points for this part in the evaluation grid will be allocated*'

This criterion is worth 5 points over 100.

We were considering replying in a consortium but due to this sentence, we are wondering if - de facto - a single-tenderer would not have a competitive advantage over our consortium? Does it mean that a single tenderer automatically starts the procedure with 5 points? Wouldn't that be artificially narrowing competition? This condition is currently deterring us from taking part to this tender.

Could you confirm that any tenderer, single entity or consortium, would be treated equally for this criterion: on their description of distribution and interaction of tasks and responsibilities between team members, and that this criterion is not specific for tenderers who formed a consortium in order to answer that bid?

CLARIFICATION 10

The purpose of this criterion is for tenderers willing to submit a tender in a consortium and tenderers intending to sub-contract one or more parts of the services to be undertaken to demonstrate clarity, coherence and appropriateness of the allocation of roles, tasks and responsibilities among entities involved in the implementation of the contract.

Such tenderers will not be disadvantaged as such. They will be assessed on how well they describe and organise the distribution and interaction of tasks and responsibilities.

QUESTION 11:

We would like to kindly ask you to confirm whether tenderers should include full technical development, hosting, maintenance, handover, and AI chatbot implementation costs in the financial offer, despite the possible carve-out? If carve-out occurs after award, how will the reallocation of resources and budget be instructed and contractually managed?

CLARIFICATION 11

Yes, according to the provisions of the ToR, for the tendering purposes, the tenderers should include full scope of activities. The concrete activities to be delivered will be described in the Task orders and the allocation of resources will be agreed for each Task order.

QUESTION 12:

The ToR allows reliance on external LLM APIs but requires compliance with EIBG AI

**OJ S 98/2026 22/05/2026**  
**Call for tender : MAA-010008 - Innovation and Digitalisation Advisory  
Programme**

**Clarifications to the Instructions to tenderers and Assignment Terms of  
reference / Set 2**

governance, data protection, explainability, retention, and third-party processing safeguards. Could you please clarify whether specific LLM providers, deployment models, data-retention rules, or EIBG AI governance requirements must be followed, and whether API/licensing costs can be claimed under the EUR 100,000 reimbursable budget?

**CLARIFICATION 12**

Tenders are free to propose appropriate solutions, no concrete third party LLM providers, deployment models, or licensing agreements are prescribed by the EIB. Nevertheless, compliance with requirements in line with the ToR will need to be met, including Regulation (EU) 2018/1725 and applicable EU data protection framework, ensuring data remains within the EEA and is not accessed from outside the EEA, ensuring appropriate safeguards regarding confidentiality, security, and explainability, ensuring that the Service Provider retains full responsibility for the behavior and outputs of the AI chatbot, irrespective of reliance on third-party providers. The tenderers shall assume EEA residency means full operational sovereignty (no access from outside EEA, including provider's support and operations personnel).

API/licensing costs are to be covered by the EUR 100,000 amount dedicated to expenses eligible for reimbursement.

**QUESTION 13:**

We would like to kindly ask to confirm whether costs related to external EU-based hosting of the ID webtool, including cloud infrastructure, maintenance, security monitoring, server scaling, and related third-party services, are considered eligible reimbursable under the EUR 100,000 reimbursable budget.

**CLARIFICATION 13**

This is confirmed.

**QUESTION 14:**

Given the overall complexity, breadth of scope, and level of coordination required to prepare a comprehensive and competitive tender, we would like to kindly ask to extend the tender submission deadline by 2–3 weeks.

**CLARIFICATION 14**

The EIB decided to postpone the deadline for **expression of interest and the deadline for receipt of tenders by the Contracting Authority.**

**The new deadline for receipt of tenders by the Contracting Authority is <23/07/2026> at <23:59>.**

Tenderers must express their interest by e-mail to the following address: [eib-cpcm-](mailto:eib-cpcm-)

**OJ S 98/2026 22/05/2026**  
**Call for tender : MAA-010008 - Innovation and Digitalisation Advisory  
Programme**

**Clarifications to the Instructions to tenderers and Assignment Terms of  
reference / Set 2**

[procurement@eib.org](mailto:procurement@eib.org) until the <17/07/2026> at <23:59> at the latest in order to receive the access to the SmartShare platform.

As a consequence, the Tenderers must now communicate by e-mail at the e-mail address: [eib-cpcm-procurement@eib.org](mailto:eib-cpcm-procurement@eib.org) the password for the Technical Offer file no later than the date for the tendering opening <24/07/2026> at <10:00 am>.

**QUESTION 15:**

**Help Desk Platform Service Contract**

The Terms of Reference indicate that the existing Green Gateway Helpdesk platform will be reconfigured under a separate service contract in order to expand its thematic scope from green finance to Innovation and Digitalisation finance.

Could you please clarify whether, under the present contract, the Service Provider's expert team will only be expected to use and interact with the Jira interface for handling ID-related helpdesk queries, or whether the expert team will also be expected to carry out any platform configuration activities?

If the Service Provider is expected to carry out configuration-related tasks, could you please clarify whether the associated costs should be covered under the reimbursable budget or included in the experts' fee rates?

*Reference: TOR Section 4.2.1 B, pg. 9*

**CLARIFICATION 15**

We confirm that under the present contract the team of experts will be expected to use and interact with Jira interface for handling queries. No platform configuration activities are foreseen under this contract.

**QUESTION 16:**

**Deadline Extension**

We would like to request an extension of the tender submission deadline by one week. This would help accommodate reduced availability during the summer holiday period and allow tenderers to finalise a complete and high-quality offer.

**CLARIFICATION 16**

See clarification n°14

**QUESTION 17:**

**Technical capacity criterion A**

Could you please clarify the eligible activities under criterion A:

**OJ S 98/2026 22/05/2026**  
**Call for tender : MAA-010008 - Innovation and Digitalisation Advisory  
Programme**

**Clarifications to the Instructions to tenderers and Assignment Terms of  
reference / Set 2**

“The tenderer (individual company or consortium altogether) has implemented, during the last 5 years (starting 01/01/2021 up to the deadline for the receipt of tenders indicated under item 11 below), at least 3 project(s) of a minimum value of EUR 200,000 equivalent each, with activities related to **development of IT / software solutions**, and should demonstrate that it had a participation of minimum 50% in each of the project(s) brought as reference.” Our understanding is that support for the implementation and use of IT/software solutions is eligible. Could you please confirm whether this understanding is correct?

**CLARIFICATION 17**

Development of IT / software solutions may include also work related to implementation, use, configuration and other similar related activities but development activities must comprise the largest share of such projects. Activities limited only to implementation and use of existing IT / software solutions are not considered sufficient to fulfil this criterion.

**QUESTION 18:**

**Extension**

Section 8.2 Budget:

“Out of the maximum budget for the performance of Services to be provided under the Contract, up to 100,000 EUR will be dedicated to the reimbursement of expenses eligible for reimbursement. Pursuant to Art. 5.2 above (Start date and period of implementation), the amount that can be paid to the Service Provider can be increased up to EUR 1,000,000 for each renewal. The maximum total expenditure by the Bank under the Contract (including the potential extensions/increases) shall be EUR 3,250,000, excluding VAT and including expenses eligible for reimbursement.”

As Article 5.2 (Start date and period of implementation) mentions two years of extension, we understand that no corresponding increase of the budget is foreseen for the reimbursement of expenses eligible for reimbursement. Is this understanding correct?

**CLARIFICATION 18**

The two renewals foreseen in the ToR, section 8.2 indicate the total amount without breaking it down to the specific amount for fees and for the expenses eligible for reimbursement. This will be defined based on the needs at the moment of the increase. Thus, the budget for the expenses eligible for reimbursement can be increased.

**QUESTION 19:**

**Activities**

Remuneration of infrastructure / hosting / licence / LLM costs

Under the time and materials model, how are recurring infrastructure costs (external EU hosting, third party software licences, LLM API consumption) remunerated?

Do they fall under the “other ancillary expenses related to the development, hosting and maintenance of the advisory web based products” approved per Task Order (ToR

**OJ S 98/2026 22/05/2026**  
**Call for tender : MAA-010008 - Innovation and Digitalisation Advisory  
Programme**

**Clarifications to the Instructions to tenderers and Assignment Terms of  
reference / Set 2**

8.3.1.II), and is any cap foreseen?  
Are these separate from the EUR 100,000 reimbursable allocation referenced for events and workshops?

**CLARIFICATION 19**

The costs such as hosting, licenses, LLM are to be covered by the EUR 100,000 budget for expenses eligible for reimbursement.

**QUESTION 20:**

**Activities**

3.1 Component A – ID webtool

Data residency in the EEA vs external LLM services

Section A.3 of the ToR requires that (personal) data remain within the EEA throughout their lifecycle and not be accessed from outside the EEA, while Section A.2 allows the generative AI chatbot to rely on external LLM APIs.

- (i) Does the EEA data-residency requirement apply to user inputs processed by the chatbot?
- (ii) Does “EEA residency” mean data residency (data at rest and inference within an EU/EEA region), or full operational sovereignty (no access from outside the EEA, including the provider’s support and operations personnel)?

**CLARIFICATION 20**

- (i) Yes, EEA data requirements apply also to user inputs processed by the chatbot.
- (ii) For the tendering purposes, the tenderers shall assume EEA residency means full operational sovereignty (no access from outside EEA, including provider’s support and operations personnel).

**QUESTION 21:**

**Activities**

3.1 Component A – ID webtool

Green Checker / “Checker” platform – documentation and integration model

The ID webtool is to mirror the user-journey logic and software architecture of the existing EIBG Green Checker and to integrate with the shared “Checker” platform via an integration route to be determined by EIB at the outset.

- (i) Is any architecture, technology-stack or API documentation for the Green Checker / Checker platform available to tenderers (now or under NDA) to support effort estimation and solution design?
- (ii) Can the EIB indicate the expected integration model, for example the ID webtool embedded as a module within the Checker front end, or exposing an API consumed by the Checker platform?

**CLARIFICATION 21**

**OJ S 98/2026 22/05/2026**  
**Call for tender : MAA-010008 - Innovation and Digitalisation Advisory  
Programme**

**Clarifications to the Instructions to tenderers and Assignment Terms of  
reference / Set 2**

- i) Technical documentation including architecture, technology stack and API specifications of the Green Checker will be provided to the winning tenderer at the outset of the assignment, in the context of the scoping and requirements definition phase.
- ii) As indicated in the ToR, the ID webtool shall be designed as an API-enabled system, allowing integration with external front-end applications, including the EIBG Checker platform. At this stage, the precise integration model has not yet been finalised. The EIB is currently considering integration approaches that would ensure a consistent user experience within the Checker platform, including the possibility of front-end level integration of the ID webtool within the shared interface. The final integration model may involve, for example, API-based interaction, front-end embedding, or a combination of both (e.g. exposing back-end services while integrating within a shared front-end environment), and will be defined by the EIB during the implementation phase, taking into account technical, operational, and security considerations. Tenderers are therefore expected to propose flexible and modular solution designs that can accommodate different integration approaches.

**QUESTION 22:**

**Activities**

3.1 Component A – ID webtool

Number and complexity of the ID eligibility criteria

The ID eligibility criteria applicable in EIBG's intermediated finance operations will be communicated at the outset of the assignment.

Could the EIB provide an indicative indication of their number and complexity (for example, comparable to the number of criteria in the Green Checker) to enable tenderers to size the deterministic assessment engine?

**CLARIFICATION 22**

Please see attached the EIB eligibility criteria applied for Innovation and Digitalisation. The EIF eligibility criteria are to be found [here](#) (pages 2 – 5).

**QUESTION 23:**

**Activities**

3.1 Component A – ID webtool

Remuneration of infrastructure / hosting / licence / LLM costs

Under the time-and-materials model, how are recurring infrastructure costs (external EU hosting, third-party software licences, LLM API consumption) remunerated?

Do they fall under the “other ancillary expenses related to the development, hosting and maintenance of the advisory web-based products” approved per Task Order (ToR 8.3.1.II), and is any cap foreseen?

**OJ S 98/2026 22/05/2026**  
**Call for tender : MAA-010008 - Innovation and Digitalisation Advisory  
Programme**

**Clarifications to the Instructions to tenderers and Assignment Terms of  
reference / Set 2**

Are these separate from the EUR 100,000 reimbursable allocation referenced for events and workshops?

**CLARIFICATION 23**

Yes, they fall under the “other ancillary expenses related to the development, hosting and maintenance of the advisory web based products” mentioned in the ToRs at section 8.3.1. II and they are to be covered by the EUR 100,000 budget foreseen for the expenses eligible for reimbursement.

**QUESTION 24:**

**Activities**

3.2 Component C – Market development activities

We have several questions regarding the organisation of webinars and in-person events:

- (i) How many events are foreseen?
- (ii) How many participants / speakers / moderators are expected?
- (iii) Are all of the events expected to take place in Luxembourg? If not, will travel and accommodation for experts mobilised outside their country of residence be eligible for reimbursement?

**CLARIFICATION 24**

The specific webinars and events will be agreed during the implementation of the contract based on the identified needs and as instructed in the corresponding Task order.

The events may be organised outside Luxembourg. According to the provisions of the ToR, section 6.2., travel and associated costs are to be covered by the fees.

**QUESTION 25:**

**Activities**

We would greatly appreciate your clarifications to the following:

- Could you please confirm whether the O&M has a page limit?
- Could you please clarify how many financial intermediaries are currently engaged or expected to participate, and what query volume should we assume for the helpdesk (queries per month)?

**CLARIFICATION 25**

- There is no page limit indicated for the O&M.
- Currently, approximately 50-100 financial intermediaries of the EIB Group are implementing relevant intermediated finance products with innovation & digitalisation targets. Of these, an estimated 25-50 intermediaries could be expected to take advantage of the products and services developed under this contract. The EIB indicatively estimates approximately 10-25 helpdesk queries per month during the initial phase of the helpdesk operation under this contract,

**OJ S 98/2026 22/05/2026**  
**Call for tender : MAA-010008 - Innovation and Digitalisation Advisory  
Programme**

**Clarifications to the Instructions to tenderers and Assignment Terms of  
reference / Set 2**

increasing to 20-40 helpdesk queries per month during the later phase.

**QUESTION 26:**

**Contractual, financial and procedural points**

**Use of external (non-EU) LLM APIs for the AI assistant.** The ToR (Section 4.2, component A – ID webtool) allows the generative AI assistant to rely on external LLM APIs, while Section 4.2/A.3 requires that data remain within the EEA throughout its lifecycle and not be accessed from outside the EEA (Regulation (EU) 2018/1725). Could the Bank confirm whether LLM APIs provided by non-EU (e.g. US-based) providers are acceptable where the provider contractually guarantees EEA data residency, no use of data for model training, and compliance with Regulation (EU) 2018/1725 — or whether the Service Provider must use models processed entirely within the EEA? Could the Bank also share the “EIBG AI governance” requirements referenced in Section 4.2 so tenderers can confirm tool selection at tendering stage?

**CLARIFICATION 26**

Tenders are free to propose appropriate solutions, no concrete third party LLM providers are prescribed by EIB. Nevertheless, compliance with requirements in line with ToR will need to be met, including Regulation (EU) 2018/1725 and applicable EU data protection framework, ensuring data remains within the EEA and is not accessed from outside the EEA. For the tendering purposes, the tenderers shall assume EEA residency means full operational sovereignty (no access from outside EEA, including provider’s support and operations personnel).

EIBG AI governance will be presented to the winning tenderer at the onset of the assignment.

**QUESTION 27:**

**Contractual, financial and procedural points**

**Budget structure and renewal envelope.** Section 8.2 sets the maximum budget at EUR 1,250,000 for the initial 24-month period (including up to EUR 100,000 for reimbursable expenses), increasable by up to EUR 1,000,000 for each of the two renewal periods of up to one year (Art. 5.2), for a maximum total of EUR 3,250,000. Could the Bank clarify the rationale for the higher annual envelope foreseen for the renewal periods compared with the initial period — in particular whether it reflects an anticipated increase in the volume of activities (e.g. number of Task Orders, supported financial intermediaries, or helpdesk volumes) — so tenderers can size their mobilisation and pricing accordingly?

**CLARIFICATION 27**

The renewals indicated in the ToR are based on the availability of additional budget and

**OJ S 98/2026 22/05/2026**  
**Call for tender : MAA-010008 - Innovation and Digitalisation Advisory  
Programme**

**Clarifications to the Instructions to tenderers and Assignment Terms of  
reference / Set 2**

needs.
<p><a href="#">QUESTION 28:</a></p> <p><b>A. Contractual, financial and procedural points</b></p> <p><b>Scope during the renewal periods.</b> Section 5.2 states that renewal shall not imply any modification of existing obligations, while also reserving the Bank’s right to amend or extend the scope and/or duration. Could the Bank confirm whether the scope of services in the two renewal periods is expected to remain the same as the initial period, or whether changes (e.g. additional functionalities, expanded helpdesk coverage, or additional bilateral advisory) are anticipated, given the increased budget envelope for those periods?</p>
<p>CLARIFICATION 28</p> <p>The scope of services is expected to remain the same but as indicated in the ToRs at section 5.2 in case additional services would become necessary to the completion of the Assignment, the EIB reserves the right to amend the contract to extend the scope and/or duration accordingly.</p>
<p><a href="#">QUESTION 29:</a></p> <p><b>Contractual, financial and procedural points</b></p> <p><b>Status of the staff days offered.</b> Section 6.1.3 presents the staff-day figures as minima, the financial offer (Section 15.3 of the Instructions) is built on the number of staff days offered in the Organisation &amp; Methodology, and the contract is on a time-and-material basis (Section 2 of the Instructions) delivered through Task Orders. Could the Bank confirm whether the number of staff days offered in the tender constitutes a firm minimum the Service Provider commits to mobilise, or an indicative volume used for financial evaluation only, and how any under- or over-utilisation against the offered days would be handled within the maximum budget?</p>
<p>CLARIFICATION 29</p> <p>The number of staff days offered in the tender constitutes a firm minimum the Service Provider commits to mobilise. Any under- or over-utilisation against the days offered will be the object of an addendum to the contract.</p>
<p><a href="#">QUESTION 30:</a></p> <p><b>Contractual, financial and procedural points</b></p> <p><b>EUR 200,000 minimum value for training / capacity-building references.</b> Selection criterion 3(b) (Section 5 of the Instructions) requires at least three projects of a minimum value of EUR 200,000 each relating to training, awareness-raising and/or capacity building. Could the Bank confirm whether this EUR 200,000 minimum must be met by a</p>

**OJ S 98/2026 22/05/2026**  
**Call for tender : MAA-010008 - Innovation and Digitalisation Advisory  
Programme**

**Clarifications to the Instructions to tenderers and Assignment Terms of  
reference / Set 2**

single project, or whether it may be met by aggregating several related training/capacity-building engagements delivered to the same client or under the same framework/programme?

**CLARIFICATION 30**

The minimum value of EUR 200,000 refers to the value of the service contract under which the training activities and/or awareness raising events and/or capacity building were delivered to financial institutions.

A tenderer may not aggregate several contracts delivered to the same client or under the same framework/programme to meet this requirement.

In the case of framework agreements (without contractual value), only specific contracts corresponding to assignments implemented under such framework agreements shall be considered, and only one such specific contract shall be included as one reference.

**QUESTION 31:**

**Contractual, financial and procedural points**

**Definition of “financial institutions” vs “financial intermediaries”.** Selection criterion 3(b) refers to capacity building “to financial institutions”, whereas the ToR (e.g. Sections 1.1 and 4.1.3) describes the beneficiaries as “financial intermediaries” (and potentially investors/mandators). Could the Bank confirm whether, for the reference criteria, “financial institutions” is to be understood broadly to include financial intermediaries — such as national promotional banks/institutions and other (semi-)public bodies channelling financing — or whether it is restricted to regulated financial institutions (e.g. banks and insurers)?

**CLARIFICATION 31**

We confirm that “financial institutions” can be understood broadly to include financial intermediaries such as national promotional banks and other (semi)public bodies channeling financing.

**QUESTION 32:**

**Contractual, financial and procedural points**

**Number of key experts, CVs and Statements of Exclusivity and Availability required.** The Tender Submission Form refers to “a list of key experts and their CVs” (plural), whereas Section A (Instructions to Tenderers), point III refers to “the CV of the key expert” (singular) together with a single signed Statement of Exclusivity and Availability, and the Financial offer (Section 7.2) provides for a single key expert (“Key expert 1: Team Leader / Project Manager”). Could the Bank confirm whether tenderers are required to propose a single key expert (the Team Leader / Project Manager) —

**OJ S 98/2026 22/05/2026**  
**Call for tender : MAA-010008 - Innovation and Digitalisation Advisory  
Programme**

**Clarifications to the Instructions to tenderers and Assignment Terms of  
reference / Set 2**

submitting one CV and one signed Statement of Exclusivity and Availability — or several key experts? If several are required, could the Bank confirm how many, and that a CV and a signed Statement of Exclusivity and Availability are to be provided for each of them?

**CLARIFICATION 32**

We confirm that there is only one key expert defined in the tender documents: Key expert 1: Team Leader / Project Manager and for which a CV and a Statement of exclusivity and availability shall be provided in the offer.

**QUESTION 33:**

**Technical and scoping points**

*Front-end integration & API contract*

The ToR states that the integration route with the separate front-end vendor (“EIBG Checker platform”) is decided “by EIB Advisory at the onset.” Could the Bank confirm now which integration pattern is intended — (a) our tool exposes a REST/JSON API the vendor consumes, (b) we embed via iframe/web component, or (c) the vendor calls our deterministic engine and chatbot as discrete services — so we can fix the API contract and effort estimate in the technical offer?

**CLARIFICATION 33**

As indicated in the ToR, the ID webtool shall be designed as an API-enabled system, allowing integration with external front-end applications, including the EIBG Checker platform. At this stage, the precise integration model has not yet been finalised. The EIB is currently considering integration approaches that would ensure a consistent user experience within the Checker platform, including the possibility of front-end level integration of the ID webtool within the shared interface. The final integration model may involve, for example, API-based interaction, front-end embedding, or a combination of both (e.g. exposing back-end services while integrating within a shared front-end environment), and will be defined by the EIB during the implementation phase, taking into account technical, operational, and security considerations. Tenderers are therefore expected to propose flexible and modular solution designs that can accommodate different integration approaches.

**QUESTION 34:**

**Technical and scoping points**

*Front-end integration & API contract*

Will the Bank provide, before contract start, the front-end vendor’s name, technology stack, and a point of contact for joint interface design, or is the front-end vendor not yet selected? (This determines whether we design to a known counterpart or to a generic,

**OJ S 98/2026 22/05/2026**  
**Call for tender : MAA-010008 - Innovation and Digitalisation Advisory  
Programme**

**Clarifications to the Instructions to tenderers and Assignment Terms of  
reference / Set 2**

<p>versioned API specification.)</p>
<p><b>CLARIFICATION 34</b></p> <p>Technical documentation including architecture, technology stack and API specifications of the Green Checker will be provided to the winning tenderer at the outset of the assignment, in the context of the scoping and requirements definition phase.</p> <p>At this stage, the joint front-end interface design of the EIBG Checker platform, into which the ID webtool would be integrated, is still under development and has not yet been fully defined.</p> <p>The integration will require coordination with relevant parties designated by the EIB during implementation. Tenderers are therefore expected to design solutions based on standard, well-documented and versioned interfaces that can accommodate evolving integration requirements.</p>
<p><b><u>QUESTION 35:</u></b></p> <p><b>Technical and scoping points</b></p> <p><i>Front-end integration &amp; API contract</i></p> <p>Is there an existing or preferred API specification standard the front-end expects us to publish (OpenAPI 3.x / JSON Schema), and who owns the contract-of-record if the interface changes mid-contract?</p>
<p><b>CLARIFICATION 35</b></p> <p>The ToR does not prescribe a specific API specification or documentation standard. Tenderers are expected to propose widely adopted and well-documented interface standards. Detailed interface requirements will be defined during the scoping and requirements definition phase at the outset of the assignment. Any evolution of integration requirements during implementation will be managed by the EIB in the context of the Task Order mechanism. Tenderers are therefore expected to design flexible, versioned interfaces that can accommodate such changes.</p>
<p><b><u>QUESTION 36:</u></b></p> <p><b>Technical and scoping points</b></p> <p><i>ID eligibility criteria: source, format, Green Checker logic</i></p> <p>In what form will the EIBG ID eligibility criteria be supplied — narrative document, decision tree, or a structured/machine-readable set (the ToR mentions an XLS for the decision-tree/rules-engine methodology)? Is a machine-readable criteria set available at or before</p>

**OJ S 98/2026 22/05/2026**  
**Call for tender : MAA-010008 - Innovation and Digitalisation Advisory**  
**Programme**

**Clarifications to the Instructions to tenderers and Assignment Terms of  
reference / Set 2**

contract start?
<p>CLARIFICATION 36</p> <p>The EIBG ID criteria are available as a narrative document. Please see attached the EIB eligibility criteria. The EIF eligibility criteria can be found <a href="#">here</a> (pages 2 – 5).</p>
<p><b><u>QUESTION 37:</u></b></p> <p><b>Technical and scoping points</b></p> <p><i>ID eligibility criteria: source, format, Green Checker logic</i></p> <p>Could the Bank grant access to the existing “Green Checker” — source code, rules logic, decision-tree definitions, and/or a working instance — so we can mirror its deterministic logic, or are we to reimplement from the criteria specification only?</p>
<p>CLARIFICATION 37</p> <p>Detailed technical documentation of the Green Checker, as relevant for the performance of the assignment, will be provided to the successful Service Provider at the outset of the assignment, in the context of the scoping and requirements definition phase.</p> <p>Tenderers are not expected to replicate the existing Green Checker solution, but to develop the ID webtool based on the applicable eligibility criteria and requirements, while aligning, to the extent relevant, with the user journey logic and architecture principles of the existing tool.</p>
<p><b><u>QUESTION 38:</u></b></p> <p><b>Technical and scoping points</b></p> <p><i>ID eligibility criteria: source, format, Green Checker logic</i></p> <p>How closely must the ID webtool mirror the Green Checker: identical UX and rule structure, or functional parity with freedom to re-engineer the rules engine? (This affects whether component A.2 is an adaptation or a greenfield build.)</p>
<p>CLARIFICATION 38</p> <p>The ID webtool is expected to align, to the extent relevant, with the user journey logic and overall architecture principles of the existing Green Checker.</p> <p>Tenderers are not expected to replicate the existing solution, but to develop the ID webtool based on the applicable eligibility criteria and requirements. This includes flexibility in the design and implementation of the underlying assessment logic, while ensuring interoperability and alignment, as required, with the interfaces and integration</p>

**OJ S 98/2026 22/05/2026**  
**Call for tender : MAA-010008 - Innovation and Digitalisation Advisory  
Programme**

**Clarifications to the Instructions to tenderers and Assignment Terms of  
reference / Set 2**

<p>approach of the EIBG Checker platform.</p> <p><b>QUESTION 39:</b></p> <p><b>Technical and scoping points</b></p> <p><i>ID eligibility criteria: source, format, Green Checker logic</i></p> <p>Who is the authoritative owner of the ID criteria content, and what is the expected update cadence during the 24 months (so we can size the criteria-maintenance workflow and the “further development” effort under A.3)?</p>
<p>CLARIFICATION 39</p> <p>EIBG is the owner of the ID eligibility criteria. The criteria are expected to remain relatively stable; however, some updates may occur during contract implementation.</p>
<p><b>QUESTION 40:</b></p> <p><b>Technical and scoping points</b></p> <p><i>SLA targets</i></p> <p>The ToR cites an “industry-standard” SLA “pending final SLA definition.” Could the Bank state target figures now — uptime (e.g. 99.5% vs 99.9%), incident response/resolution times by severity, and support-response times — so we can size hosting redundancy and on-call staffing accurately? If undefined, what assumed baseline will the Bank accept as compliant?</p>
<p>CLARIFICATION 40</p> <p>As indicated in the ToR, specific SLA parameters have not been defined at this stage and will be agreed during the requirements definition phase at the outset of the assignment.</p> <p>Tenderers are expected to propose solutions in line with industry-standard practices for comparable EU-hosted public web tools, taking into account the nature and expected use of the ID webtool</p>
<p><b>QUESTION 41:</b></p> <p><b>Technical and scoping points</b></p> <p><i>EU region &amp; LLM provider compliance (Regulation (EU) 2018/1725)</i></p> <p>Which EU region(s)/Member State(s) are required or preferred for hosting and data residency, and do we read correctly that all data must remain in the EEA with no access from outside the EEA throughout the lifecycle under Regulation (EU) 2018/1725?</p>

**OJ S 98/2026 22/05/2026**  
**Call for tender : MAA-010008 - Innovation and Digitalisation Advisory**  
**Programme**

**Clarifications to the Instructions to tenderers and Assignment Terms of  
reference / Set 2**

CLARIFICATION 41

We do not have a preferred EU region(s) or Member State(s).

Yes, all data must remain in the EEA with no access from outside the EEA throughout the lifecycle.

[QUESTION 42:](#)

**Technical and scoping points**

Does the Bank maintain an approved/whitelisted set of LLM providers, or will any provider with an EU-region endpoint, zero-data-retention and no-training-on-data guarantees be acceptable? If so, is a Data Processing Agreement / Standard Contractual Clauses arrangement required, and must the LLM inference endpoint itself sit inside the EEA?

CLARIFICATION 42

There is no predefined list of approved LLM providers. Any provider complying with the requirements set out in the ToR may be proposed.

Tenderers must ensure that the use of third-party LLM providers complies with applicable data protection, security and AI governance requirements, including restrictions on data processing, retention and use by third parties, and the requirement that data remains within the EEA.

The EIB does not prescribe specific contractual arrangements between the Service Provider and third-party providers. The Service Provider remains responsible for ensuring full compliance with the applicable requirements.

[QUESTION 43:](#)

**Technical and scoping points**

May we use AI tools for our own design, development, testing and similar internal processes?

CLARIFICATION 43

It is up to the tenderer to decide.

[QUESTION 44:](#)

**Technical and scoping points**

**OJ S 98/2026 22/05/2026**  
**Call for tender : MAA-010008 - Innovation and Digitalisation Advisory  
Programme**

**Clarifications to the Instructions to tenderers and Assignment Terms of  
reference / Set 2**

<p><i>Concurrency &amp; data retention</i></p> <p>What is the expected peak concurrency (simultaneous users / requests per second), beyond the monthly-visit figures already given in Clarification 2c, that the hosting and API must sustain?</p>
<p>CLARIFICATION 44</p> <p>Specific performance requirements, including peak concurrency and request volumes, have not been defined at this stage and will be further specified during the scoping and requirements definition phase of the assignment.</p> <p>Tenderers are expected to propose solutions that are scalable and aligned with the indicative usage figures provided in Clarification 2c, and consistent with industry-standard practices for comparable public web tools.</p>
<p><a href="#">QUESTION 45:</a></p> <p><b>Technical and scoping points</b></p> <p><i>Concurrency &amp; data retention</i></p> <p>What data-retention period applies to (a) chatbot conversation logs and (b) generated binding eligibility-assessment reports — and are binding reports to be persisted server-side at all, or generated and handed to the user only?</p>
<p>CLARIFICATION 45</p> <p>For the AI chatbot component, conversation logs may be retained in order to support monitoring, quality control and improvement of the service, in compliance with applicable data protection and AI governance requirements.</p> <p>For the deterministic eligibility assessment functionality, outputs are generally expected to be generated and provided to the user without systematic server-side persistence.</p> <p>Specific retention periods and detailed data management rules will be defined during the scoping and requirements definition phase at the outset of the assignment.</p>
<p><a href="#">QUESTION 46:</a></p> <p><b>Technical and scoping points</b></p> <p><i>On-call / out-of-hours support</i></p> <p>Is out-of-hours / on-call support expected for the hosted webtool, or is business-hours support sufficient given the low-scale, niche nature of the tool?</p>

**OJ S 98/2026 22/05/2026**  
**Call for tender : MAA-010008 - Innovation and Digitalisation Advisory  
Programme**

**Clarifications to the Instructions to tenderers and Assignment Terms of  
reference / Set 2**

CLARIFICATION 46

It is confirmed that business-hours support is sufficient for the webtool.

[QUESTION 47:](#)

**Technical and scoping points**

*Penetration testing & security validation*

For the required penetration testing under A.2: what scope is expected (web app + API + LLM/prompt-injection surface), what frequency (one-off pre-launch vs recurring annually), and who validates/accepts the results — the Bank's own security function, or a Bank-nominated third party?

CLARIFICATION 47

Service Provider is expected to propose and perform appropriate security measures for the ID webtool, including penetration testing, taking into account the final functional and technical scope of the solution. The detailed scope (e.g. application, APIs and other relevant components), frequency, and validation approach for such testing will be defined during the scoping and requirements definition phase at the outset of the assignment.

[QUESTION 48:](#)

**Technical and scoping points**

*Penetration testing & security validation*

Must penetration testing be performed by an independent/accredited third party, and if so, is its cost reimbursable, or expected to be absorbed in expert fees?

CLARIFICATION 48

It is not required for penetration testing to be performed by an independent third party.

If the Service Provider proposes to use a third-party provider, the related costs can be eligible for reimbursement, subject to prior approval by the EIB and in accordance with the provisions of the ToR.

[QUESTION 49:](#)

**Technical and scoping points**

*Identity / authentication model*

**OJ S 98/2026 22/05/2026**  
**Call for tender : MAA-010008 - Innovation and Digitalisation Advisory  
Programme**

**Clarifications to the Instructions to tenderers and Assignment Terms of  
reference / Set 2**

What authentication model does the front-end / EIBG environment expect for our API — OAuth2 client-credentials, mutual TLS, signed API keys, or integration with an EIB identity provider (SSO/OIDC)? Is there an EIB API gateway or standard we must conform to?

**CLARIFICATION 49**

The ToR does not prescribe a specific authentication model or API security standard.

The detailed integration and authentication approach, including alignment with any EIB systems or platforms (e.g. identity providers or API management solutions), will be defined during the scoping and requirements definition phase of the assignment.

Tenderers are expected to propose secure, industry-standard authentication mechanisms appropriate for system-to-system integration and adaptable to the final integration environment.

**QUESTION 50:**

**Technical and scoping points**

*Accessibility, branding, EIBG design guidelines*

Will the Bank provide EIBG brand/design guidelines, a component library or design system, and logos for the webtool's UI/UX, mock-ups and clickable prototypes — and what accessibility standard must we meet?

**CLARIFICATION 50**

The EIBG visibility guidelines can be found [here](#).

**QUESTION 51:**

**Technical and scoping points**

*Accessibility, branding, EIBG design guidelines*

Since the front-end is built by a separate vendor, does our deliverable include user-facing UI at all, or only API-served data plus the chatbot — i.e. where does the branding/accessibility obligation sit between us and the front-end vendor?

**CLARIFICATION 51**

As indicated in the ToR, the scope of the assignment includes the design of the user journey and UI/UX elements of the ID webtool (e.g. mock-ups, prototypes), in alignment with EIBG design guidelines.

**OJ S 98/2026 22/05/2026**  
**Call for tender : MAA-010008 - Innovation and Digitalisation Advisory  
Programme**

**Clarifications to the Instructions to tenderers and Assignment Terms of  
reference / Set 2**

At the same time, the ID webtool is expected to be developed as an API-enabled system and integrated into a shared front-end environment (EIBG Checker platform), which may involve coordination with a separate service provider.

The detailed allocation of responsibilities, including the extent of user-facing interface implementation and aspects such as branding and accessibility, will be defined during the scoping and requirements definition phase at the outset of the assignment.

**QUESTION 52:**

**Technical and scoping points**

*Languages*

Which languages must the chatbot, the displayed ID criteria, and the binding report support — English only, or multiple EU official languages? If multilingual, which set, and is the deterministic criteria content to be supplied translated by the Bank or translated by us?

**CLARIFICATION 52**

The ToR does not specify multilingual requirements for the ID webtool.

At this stage, the functionalities (including chatbot, eligibility criteria display and generated reports) are expected to be available in English.

Any additional language requirements, if applicable, as well as the approach to translation of content, would be defined during the scoping and requirements definition phase of the assignment.

**QUESTION 53:**

**Technical and scoping points**

*Criteria seeding / migration, backup*

How will the initial ID criteria corpus be seeded? Does the Bank supply the full criteria set (and the chatbot knowledge base) at start, in what format, and is there a migration from any existing Green Checker data store?

**CLARIFICATION 53**

Please see the EIB's ID eligibility criteria attached to the clarifications. The EIF eligibility criteria can be found [here](#) (pages 2 – 5).

**QUESTION 54:**

**OJ S 98/2026 22/05/2026**  
**Call for tender : MAA-010008 - Innovation and Digitalisation Advisory  
Programme**

**Clarifications to the Instructions to tenderers and Assignment Terms of  
reference / Set 2**

**Technical and scoping points**

*Criteria seeding / migration, backup*

What backup, disaster-recovery, and RPO/RTO expectations apply to the hosted tool (acceptable data-loss window and recovery time), bearing in mind that handover requires non-proprietary formats and no data retained after contract end?

**CLARIFICATION 54**

Specific requirements regarding backup, disaster recovery and RPO/RTO have not been defined at this stage and will be determined during the scoping and requirements definition phase at the outset of the assignment.

Tenderers are expected to propose proportionate and industry-standard approaches to system resilience and data protection, taking into account the nature of the solution.

**QUESTION 55:**

**Technical and scoping points**

*Front-end scope (production front-end: ours, or the separate vendor's?)*

Is the production, user-facing front-end in scope for this contract, or delivered solely by the separate "EIBG Checker platform" vendor? The ToR implies the latter (we are API-enabled for it) — please confirm.

**CLARIFICATION 55**

As indicated in the ToR, the ID webtool is expected to be developed as an API-enabled system and integrated into a shared front-end environment (EIBG Checker platform), which may involve coordination with a separate service provider.

At the same time, the scope of the assignment includes the design of the user journey and UI/UX elements (e.g. mock-ups and prototypes), in alignment with EIBG design guidelines.

The detailed allocation of responsibilities for the production user-facing interface, including aspects such as branding and accessibility, will be defined during the scoping and requirements definition phase at the outset of the assignment.

**QUESTION 56:**

**Technical and scoping points**

*Front-end scope (production front-end: ours, or the separate vendor's?)*

**OJ S 98/2026 22/05/2026**  
**Call for tender : MAA-010008 - Innovation and Digitalisation Advisory  
Programme**

**Clarifications to the Instructions to tenderers and Assignment Terms of  
reference / Set 2**

If any production UI is ours, is it (a) only an embeddable chatbot widget, (b) the ID-thematic screens embedded in the vendor's shell, or (c) a full standalone web app including the multi-thematic switching shell?

**CLARIFICATION 56**

The precise form of user-facing implementation (e.g. embedded components, interface modules or other approaches) will be defined during the scoping and requirements definition phase at the outset of the assignment.

**QUESTION 57:**

**Technical and scoping points**

*Front-end scope (production front-end: ours, or the separate vendor's?)*

Who owns and builds the shared "thematic switch" shell (Green Checker / ID / other) — the front-end vendor or us?

**CLARIFICATION 57**

The thematic switch interface under the EIBG Checker platform is expected to be developed under a separate assignment.

The Service Provider under the present contract will be required to ensure that the ID webtool can integrate and operate within this shared environment, which may involve coordination with the relevant service provider(s).

**QUESTION 58:**

**Technical and scoping points**

*Front-end scope (production front-end: ours, or the separate vendor's?)*

If the production front-end is in scope, does the 1,190-day minimum envelope cover it, or may we offer above the minima (and corresponding budget) without prejudicing the financial evaluation?

**CLARIFICATION 58**

As indicated in the ToR at section 6.1.3., the working days specified represent minimum requirements. The tenderers are allowed to offer more days than the minima set in the ToRs.

**QUESTION 59:**

**OJ S 98/2026 22/05/2026**  
**Call for tender : MAA-010008 - Innovation and Digitalisation Advisory  
Programme**

**Clarifications to the Instructions to tenderers and Assignment Terms of  
reference / Set 2**

**Technical and scoping points**

*Front-end scope (production front-end: ours, or the separate vendor's?)*

Will the Bank / the front-end vendor provide the design system / component library / EIBG brand assets, or must we build them?

**CLARIFICATION 59**

The EIBG visibility guidelines can be found [here](#).

To ensure consistent user experience across the EIBG Checker platform, certain visual design elements and components used in the existing Green Checker may be made available to the winning tenderer, as appropriate. Full component library / front-end design system is not prescribed by EIB. The detailed design approach, including the extent of reuse of shared components will be defined during the scoping and requirements definition phase of the assignment. Tenderers are expected to propose appropriate UI/UX solutions aligned with EIBG design guidelines and capable of ensuring consistency with the overall Checker platform.