

**TEHNIČNE SPECIFIKACIJE – TEHNIČNI DEL / TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS - TECHNICAL PART
za javno naročilo / for public tender
»Presoja in nadgradnja sistema upravljanja tveganj skupine družb / Group – Wide Risk Management
Framework Assessment and Upgrade«**

Junij / June 2026

1. Subject of the public tender and contracting context

The Contracting Authority invites qualified advisory providers to tender for a group-wide risk management framework assessment and upgrade. The selected Tenderer shall assess the current framework, design pragmatic target-state upgrades, deliver implementation-ready working documents and dashboards, demonstrate them through agreed pilots and transfer know-how to HSE.

The HSE Group is a vertically and horizontally integrated energy group operating across the electricity value chain, from renewable power generation, proprietary hedging and trading, to retail electricity supply to end consumers. In line with its strategic goals, HSE is focused on reinforcing a centralised risk management framework that enables resilience, regulatory compliance and informed decision-making across business units and subsidiaries.

The engagement shall support the future-proofing and enhancement of HSE Group-wide risk management practices through pragmatic recommendations, practical artefacts and knowledge transfer enabling internal continuation after project closure.

Given the scope and breadth of this engagement, the Contracting Authority recognises that no single expert may cover all domains in equal depth. Team-based proposals and multi-party collaborations that address all areas outlined in this document are accepted. Proposals outlining coordination between specialist and generalist profiles are welcome.

The Tenderer must complete the entire scope of the public contract in question within 4 months of the effective date of the contract concluded between the parties.

2. Definitions and abbreviations

The following terms are used consistently throughout this document. At first substantive use, the full term and abbreviation are provided; thereafter, the abbreviation may be used.

Term	Meaning / usage in this document
Contracting Authority	Holding Slovenske elektrarne d.o.o. and, where the context requires, the HSE Group stakeholders participating in the engagement.
Tenderer	An economic operator submitting a tender for the services described in this document.
Offer / written tender	The binding written proposal submitted by the Tenderer, including required forms, schedules, evidence and referenced attachments.
HSE Group	The group-wide context for the engagement, including the Contracting Authority and group companies relevant to the assessment.
Enterprise Risk Management (ERM)	The group-wide framework of governance, processes, methodologies, reporting and decision-use for material risks.
ERM-level	The enterprise/group risk management layer. For quantitative work, this means the group-level aggregation, scenario/stress, RAF, dashboard and reporting layer, not full validation of individual process-level tools.
Risk Management Function	The second-line function responsible for risk methodology, challenge, monitoring and reporting, including evidence-based assurance to the Management Board.
Risk Appetite Framework (RAF)	The framework for defining risk capacity, risk appetite, tolerances, limits, thresholds, escalation triggers and management actions.
Risk appetite / capacity / tolerance	Respectively: the level of risk HSE is prepared to accept; the level of risk HSE can bear; and the permitted variation around risk appetite or target risk levels.

Key Risk Indicator / Key Performance Indicator (KRI/KPI)	Risk and performance metrics used for monitoring, escalation, dashboards and reporting.
RACI	A responsibility matrix describing who is Responsible, Accountable, Consulted and Informed.
3 Lines of Defence	The model distinguishing first-line risk owners/process owners, second-line oversight functions and third-line Internal Audit.
CSRD / ESRS / ESG	Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive; European Sustainability Reporting Standards; environmental, social and governance factors.
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation; used in relation to data protection, confidentiality and information security requirements.
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)	A standardised measure of expert availability and allocation by role and time period.
Methodology playbook	A practical, implementation-oriented how-to guide translating findings into roles, workflows, inputs, outputs, templates, reporting and implementation guidance.
Implementation-Ready Suite	The mandatory suite of editable templates, registers, dashboards, logs, reporting packs and working documents for practical use by HSE.
Pilot application / pilot use case	A demonstration of the agreed methodology and artefacts on at least two agreed use cases, including one group-level reporting/RAF use case and one process or business-area risk management use case.
Risk Data and Reporting Lineage Matrix	A matrix tracing reported fields, metrics and dashboard items to source systems, data owners, transformation/calculation logic, controls, limitations and remediation actions.
Deliverable acceptance evidence	Evidence that required outputs, artefacts, pilots, validation, open issues and handover status have been delivered and accepted for the relevant milestone or final handover.

3. Scope of assessment

3.1 Assessment boundaries and general approach

The Contracting Authority requires a group- and company-level review focused on how risk management practices are connected, aligned and embedded in decision-making. The engagement is not a detailed process audit and does not require detailed control testing.

Quantitative risk management includes ERM-level technical validation, recalibration and back-testing of group-level quantitative solutions used for aggregation, scenario/stress testing, RAF monitoring, KRI/KPI dashboards and management reporting. Full technical validation, recalibration, back-testing or re-performance of individual process-level models/tools is excluded; however, their interfaces, inputs, owners, validation status and limitations shall be documented where they feed ERM-level outputs.

Proposals shall be pragmatic and aligned with HSE Group capabilities, resources and implementation capacity.

3.2 Required assessment areas

3.2.1 Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) framework and governance

- Assessment of the current risk governance framework in line with **international standards** (e.g., ISO 31000, COSO ERM) and **sector-specific best practices**.

- Evaluation of how ERM is integrated with **group/company strategy development, capital allocation, and decision-making processes.**
- Review of **risk ownership, roles, and responsibilities** across business units/processes.
- Review of interaction with **risk owners, internal/external audit, risk boards, executive/supervisory boards, and other key governance stakeholders.**
- Review of the **alignment** between risk management and corporate governance bodies:
 - Risk Committees.
 - Executive and Supervisory Boards.
 - Internal and External Audits.
- **Recommendations** to improve:
 - **Information flows**, escalation procedures, and reporting structures.
 - Internal **coordination, alignment** and **information flows** between risk, finance, strategy, and audit functions (risk assessment methodologies, audit report recommendations, risk registers, controls, planning, goals etc.).

The upgraded ERM governance, reporting and escalation model shall enable the Risk Management Function (2nd line) to provide sufficient and appropriate, evidence-based assurance to the Management Board that material risks across the HSE Group are identified, assessed, treated/mitigated, monitored and reported in a timely manner, with clear escalation triggers and documented management actions. This shall be without prejudice to the independent assurance role of Internal Audit (3rd line).

3.2.2 Risk appetite, capacity and tolerance

- Review of how **risk appetite, capacity, and tolerance** are currently defined, implemented, and monitored across different areas (e.g. trading, production, retail); at group-, company- and key risk-level.
- Recommendations, including practical guidance for deployment into the current risk management framework, for:
 - Cascading and quantifying of **risk appetite** (from strategic to operational level);
 - Embedding **risk thresholds** into operational and strategic processes.
 - **Monitoring, controls and measures in place** to track/review current risk appetite and risk thresholds levels (strategic and operational level).
 - Aligning risk appetite with performance and incentive systems, where relevant (e.g., alignment of trading risk appetite with KPIs and incentive systems).

3.2.3 Quantitative risk management from an ERM perspective

- **High-level** review of existing **quantitative tools and models** across key risk categories (market, hydrology, credit, production unit failure, regulatory, cyber, environmental, HR, other ESG categories, etc.), including third-party and supply chain risks where applicable.
- Assess whether the tools and models support ERM-level decision-making, including ERM-level technical validation, recalibration and back-testing of aggregation, scenario/stress-testing, RAF monitoring, KRI/KPI dashboarding and management-reporting solutions. Full validation, recalibration, back-testing or re-performance of individual process-level models/tools is excluded.
- Gap analysis of whether current quantitative frameworks (e.g., VaR, scenario analysis, stress testing) are **fit for purpose** at the group-level ERM layer. The proposed upgrade shall explicitly integrate scenario analysis and stress testing, including extreme-but-plausible (tail) events, into ERM-level governance and management reporting (committee packs/dashboards), including defined escalation triggers and linkage to RAF thresholds/tolerances and management actions.
- The Tenderer shall propose the related ERM-level testing approach, including data requirements, aggregation/calculation checks, sensitivity, threshold performance, back-testing evidence or limitations, recalibration triggers and governance responsibilities.
- Proposals for embedding **quantitative risk metrics** into **strategic decision-making**.

3.2.4 IT systems and digital infrastructure

- Review of current **IT support systems** and **digital tools** used for enterprise risk management at group-, company- and process-levels.
- Focus on:
 - Data integration and timely or near-real-time risk visibility, where relevant.
 - Reporting and dashboard capabilities.

- Gaps between current IT infrastructure and what is required for a **fully integrated and aligned ERM support**.
- Integration of **cybersecurity capabilities into ERM**-related systems.
- **Business resilience and supply chain digital monitoring tools**.
- Integration of **scenario/stress results** (including extreme-but-plausible events) into risk dashboards and management reporting, including traceability of inputs/assumptions and drill-down where relevant.

3.2.5 ESG and climate risk integration

- Review of ESG and climate risk integration into the risk management framework, especially in regard to risk identification, management and assessment and internal controls according to required standards (CSRD, ESRS) and their integration into the general risk management framework and methodologies.
- Recommendations for:
 - ESG (climate, resilience) scenario planning and stress testing.
 - Integration of ESG metrics into investment, trading, and operational decisions.

3.2.6 Internal controls management

- The focus is on the system for managing controls, rather than detailed control testing or the operating effectiveness assessment of individual controls.
- Review and evaluation of **existing risk procedures and internal control systems** in place with recommendations for upgrade, focusing on:
 - **Automation** potential.
 - Reducing **manual bottlenecks**.
 - Policies, procedures, responsibility matrices, control efficiency indicators, tracking/monitoring, reporting etc.
 - **Integration and alignment** from process to company and group level.
 - **Clarity in delineation of responsibilities** within the internal control system - between process owners, risk management function, compliance function, and internal audit function.
 - Integration of controls in **risk response planning, risk assessment and risk mitigation process**.

3.2.7 Risk culture and internal collaboration

- Evaluation of **risk culture** across the **company/group** and the **engagement** between **2nd, 3rd line and frontline personnel** (not just through documents, but also through interviews or surveys or similar if necessary).
- Recommendations for:
 - Integrating risk awareness into **performance systems**.
 - **Communication** upgrade.
 - **Training and development** needs.
 - Fostering a culture of **early risk reporting** (e.g., “no-blame” culture) etc.

4. Expected deliverables and mandatory outputs

Expected outputs are grouped as assessment and gap analysis, target-state recommendations and roadmap, methodology playbooks and knowledge transfer, and implementation-ready artefacts with pilots and handover evidence.

- Current-state assessment and gap analysis across the seven scope areas, including pragmatic upgrade recommendations, a current-state process/control and governance map, target-state design with RACI and clear integration into decision-making.
- Quantitative RM maturity and ERM-level validation/recalibration/back-testing assessment by risk type and ERM reporting/decision use case, including process-model interfaces, validation evidence, recalibration recommendations and back-testing results or limitations.
- Recommendations for an upgraded RAF, including risk capacity, risk tolerances, thresholds and a monitoring approach.
- Recommendations for an upgraded internal controls management system and governance, including operating model, roles across the 3 Lines of Defence and monitoring/reporting, excluding detailed control testing.
- IT systems and data upgrade guidance supporting risk monitoring and decision support, including high-level gap assessment and roadmap, reporting/dashboarding and KRI/KPI enablement, and consideration of cybersecurity and resilience.
- Prioritised implementation roadmap with sequencing, dependencies, realistic timeline, resources, capabilities and knowledge/competence needs for implementation.

- Executive-ready report and presentation of findings and proposed next steps, including interim milestone updates as agreed.
- Methodology and knowledge transfer package enabling internal continuation, including documented best-practice methodologies/playbooks per assessment area, practical how-to guidance, reusable templates/examples and knowledge-transfer workshops/training for internal teams.
- Implementation-Ready Artefact Suite and Pilot Application, including mandatory editable HSE working documents/templates, worked examples, at least two agreed pilot use cases, validation evidence and handover/reuse instructions.

The detailed minimum content, pilot-use expectations and acceptance evidence for the Implementation-Ready Artefact Suite and Pilot Application are set out in Section 5.6 of this document. The Tenderer shall treat those requirements as mandatory and shall describe in the written tender how the suite will be produced, validated and handed over, including a concise draft artefact inventory and pilot application approach. A separate tender-stage requirement-to-artefact checklist is not required; the completed checklist shall be prepared and maintained during contract delivery as deliverable acceptance evidence under Section 5.6.

Methodology playbooks shall be practical how-to guides as defined in Section 5. They may be separate or integrated and must enable HSE to continue applying the upgraded approach.

5. Methodology playbooks and implementation-ready artefacts

5.1 Purpose and role of methodology playbooks

The Tenderer shall deliver methodology playbooks as mandatory outputs within the Methodology and Knowledge Transfer Package. This section also specifies the mandatory Implementation-Ready Artefact Suite and Pilot Application. Both must convert findings and recommendations into practical, reusable guidance and editable working documents for HSE after project closure. Additional committed content beyond this minimum may be considered under Q1.

For clarity: a playbook explains the operating method; an artefact is the editable document, template, dashboard, register, log or report pack used in practice; a pilot output demonstrates use; and the traceability/acceptance checklist evidences delivery, validation and handover.

5.2 Definition

A methodology playbook means a practical, implementation-oriented guide for a given work area that translates the final assessment findings and recommendations into a usable operating approach for HSE, including roles/responsibilities, workflow steps, required inputs/data, outputs/reporting, templates/examples and implementation guidance.

A playbook shall be sufficiently concrete to support internal continuation by HSE corporate functions and, where relevant, by group companies. It may be delivered either as separate playbooks by work area or as one integrated manual with clearly separated chapters for each work area. A playbook is not intended to be only a narrative report, generic best-practice memo or slide summary without practical operating guidance.

5.3 Tender submission requirements related to playbooks

The written tender shall demonstrate, for each assessment area, how the corresponding methodology playbook will be developed and what practical content it will contain. The description shall be concise but specific enough for HSE to verify the method, inputs/data, outputs, editable templates, validation steps and handover evidence.

- Draft table(s) of contents/structures for the methodology playbooks for each assessment area, or for one integrated manual with clearly separated chapters for each assessment area.
- A concise description of the proposed approach for developing the playbooks, including sources and inputs, workshops/interviews, validation with key stakeholders and tailoring to the HSE Group context.
- An indicative list of reusable templates/examples to be delivered with the playbooks, appropriate to each work area.
- A draft inventory of the mandatory Implementation-Ready Artefact Suite and Pilot Application, indicating which editable working documents/templates will be delivered, how they link to the playbooks, which pilot use cases are proposed, and how outputs will be validated and handed over to HSE.
- A separate tender-stage requirement-to-artefact checklist is not required. The completed requirement-to-artefact traceability and acceptance checklist shall be prepared and maintained during contract delivery as mandatory deliverable acceptance evidence under Section 5.6.

- A description of the proposed knowledge transfer approach for playbooks, including workshop/training formats, target audiences and handover materials.

5.4 Minimum required content for each playbook

Section	Minimum content
1. Purpose and scope	Objective of the playbook, covered entities/processes, interfaces, boundaries and intended users.
2. Governance and roles	Governance bodies, owners, contributors, approval/escalation lines and RACI or equivalent accountability mapping, aligned with HSE Group organisational structure.
3. Process / workflow	Step-by-step process description, key activities, sequence, triggers, interaction points and timing/cadence.
4. Inputs and data	Required documents, data sources, minimum data quality expectations, assumptions and system/tool dependencies.
5. Method / decision rules	Applicable methods, calculation/assessment logic, decision criteria, thresholds/tolerances or qualitative judgement rules.
6. Outputs and reporting	Expected outputs, reporting packs, dashboards or registers, KRIs/KPIs where relevant, and escalation/reporting routes.
7. Templates and examples	Reusable templates, sample outputs, meeting pack examples, registers, log sheets or other practical tools.
8. Implementation notes	How to apply the playbook in HSE, dependencies, minimum capabilities and resources (including the knowledge and competencies required of all relevant stakeholders, in alignment with the HSE Group organisational structure, to ensure the successful implementation of the proposed framework), sequencing, common pitfalls and transitional steps.
9. Knowledge transfer	Workshop/training content, handover notes and explanation of how internal teams should continue using the approach.
10. Version control	Document owner, review/update cycle, version status and assumptions/limitations.
11. Artefact linkage and acceptance evidence	Mapping to related artefacts, pilot outputs, acceptance criteria, validation evidence, open issues and handover status.

5.5 Work-area-specific minimum content

Templates and examples referenced in playbooks shall be delivered as editable working documents/templates with field definitions, owners, inputs, outputs, review cadence and usage instructions. Screenshots, generic appendices or non-editable examples alone shall not be sufficient where an artefact is required for practical use by HSE. The lists below are indicative and non-exhaustive; the Tenderer may supplement them where beneficial.

5.5.1 ERM framework and governance playbook

- Purpose, scope and alignment with the HSE Group governance model.
- ERM governance architecture, committees, interfaces and 3 Lines of Defence roles.
- RACI for risk ownership, challenge, oversight and reporting aligned with HSE Group organisational structure.
- End-to-end ERM cycle: identification, assessment, response, reporting and escalation.
- Risk taxonomy, materiality logic and linkage to strategy/business planning.
- Required inputs, risk register standards and reporting outputs/committee packs.
- Integration into decision-making and management forums.
- Templates/examples: risk register, governance map, RACI, committee agenda/reporting pack.

- Assurance and oversight: minimum content of periodic management assurance reporting, evidence sources, escalation triggers and how the second line forms and documents its view.

5.5.2 Risk Appetite Framework (RAF) playbook

- Purpose of RAF and linkage to strategy, capacity and key business decisions.
- RAF architecture: appetite statement hierarchy, metrics, tolerances and thresholds.
- Method for calibration and periodic review of appetite/thresholds.
- Rules for cascading RAF into business areas, processes and entities where relevant.
- Monitoring approach, breach triggers, escalation routes and management actions.
- Interface with KRIs/KPIs, performance management and reporting.
- Required data, assumptions and decision documentation.
- Templates/examples: RAF statement, threshold sheet, monitoring dashboard, breach log.
- Implementation notes and governance for maintenance of RAF.

5.5.3 Quantitative risk management playbook from an ERM perspective

- Scope of quantitative risk measures from an ERM perspective and covered risk types.
- Inventory of key methodologies/tools used for aggregation, scenario analysis and quantification, including extreme-but-plausible events, linkage to RAF thresholds/tolerances and escalation/management action logic.
- ERM-level technical validation, recalibration and back-testing of quantitative ERM solutions, covering aggregation logic, scenario/stress methodology, RAF threshold calibration, KRI/KPI/dashboard/reporting calculations, assumptions, sensitivity, threshold performance, back-testing evidence or limitations, recalibration triggers and recommendations.
- Clear distinction between included ERM-level validation/recalibration/back-testing and excluded full validation/recalibration/back-testing or re-performance of individual process-level models/tools.
- Templates/examples: ERM-level validation/back-testing log, recalibration decision sheet, model/input interface inventory, threshold-performance review, testing evidence summary, quantitative assessment sheet, scenario template and management summary.
- Required inputs/data, assumptions, data quality expectations and methodological boundaries.
- Step-by-step process for quantitative assessment, consolidation and interpretation.
- Use of scenario/stress views and interaction with qualitative ERM assessment.
- Reporting outputs, dashboards/metrics and decision-use cases.
- Governance responsibilities, review cycle and interfaces with model owners and subject-matter specialists.
- Implementation notes, limitations and maturity-improvement actions.

5.5.4 IT systems and data playbook

- Purpose, scope and architecture view for systems/data supporting risk management.
- Source systems, data owners, data flows and interfaces relevant to risk processes.
- Data quality controls, ownership/accountability and issue-management process.
- Workflow for collection, consolidation, validation and reporting of risk data.
- Approach to dashboards, KRIs/KPIs and management reporting outputs.
- Cybersecurity/resilience and access-control considerations relevant to risk tooling/data.
- Change backlog, prioritisation logic and high-level roadmap for improvement.
- Templates/examples: data inventory, data issue log, dashboard outline, reporting matrix.
- Implementation notes and minimum operating practices.

5.5.5 ESG and climate risk integration playbook

- Purpose, scope and linkage between ESG/climate topics and ERM.
- ESG/climate risk taxonomy and mapping to business activities, assets and decisions.
- Method for identification, assessment and prioritisation of ESG/climate risks.
- Approach to scenarios/stress considerations and use of external/internal inputs, including acute physical risk and extreme weather events where relevant, and how such scenarios feed into ERM reporting and decision routines.
- Integration points with ERM, internal controls, planning, investment and operational decisions.
- Reporting expectations, governance and escalation routes.
- Templates/examples: ESG/climate risk register, scenario sheet, decision checklist.
- Implementation notes, capability needs and review/update cycle.

5.5.6 Internal controls management playbook (excluding control testing)

- Purpose and scope of the internal control management system, excluding detailed control testing.
- Control framework structure, control ownership and 3 Lines of Defence responsibilities.
- Method for control mapping, linkage to risks and identification of key controls.
- Guidance for control design documentation, evidence standards and action tracking.
- Monitoring, deficiency escalation and management reporting routines.
- Automation opportunities and system/process integration points.
- Templates/examples: control inventory, control map, deficiency/action log, reporting pack.
- Implementation notes and governance for maintenance of the control framework.

5.5.7 Risk culture and collaboration playbook

- Purpose and scope of the risk culture/collaboration improvement approach.
- Diagnostic method for risk culture, behaviours and cross-functional collaboration.
- Leadership responsibilities, desired behaviours and escalation/speak-up expectations.
- Communication and training approach for strengthening risk awareness and consistency.
- Cross-functional governance/interaction model and practical routines for coordination.
- Metrics or indicators for monitoring culture progress where relevant.
- Templates/examples: workshop guide, survey/interview guide, communication toolkit, action tracker.
- Implementation notes, ownership and refresh cycle.

5.6 Implementation-Ready Artefact Suite and Pilot Application

The following artefacts are mandatory minimum deliverables. They may be embedded in playbooks or delivered as one consolidated toolkit, but must be editable, mutually consistent and aligned with common HSE terminology, taxonomy, ownership, RAF thresholds, escalation logic, status categories and reporting cadence.

Required artefact	Minimum content and pilot-use expectation
HSE Group risk register and taxonomy template	Editable template covering group, company and process views; risk taxonomy; materiality and aggregation logic; fields for risk owner, action owner and control owner; inherent, residual and target risk; causes, consequences, controls, actions, KRIs/KPIs, RAF linkage, reporting status and escalation status. Pilot output shall include sample populated entries for the agreed use cases.
RAF definition and monitoring pack	Editable structure covering risk capacity, appetite, tolerance, limits, early-warning thresholds, breach triggers, escalation triggers, management actions, calibration/review method, threshold ownership, decision-use cases and linkage to strategy, planning, KPIs/incentives and reporting.
KRI/KPI metric library and dashboard pack	Metric definitions, calculation logic, thresholds, owners, data sources, reporting frequency, trend/traffic-light logic and dashboard templates for group, company and process/business-area views, including pilot-populated dashboard examples.
3 Lines of Defence governance, RACI and escalation matrix	RACI covering risk owners, process owners, group companies, the Risk Management Function, compliance/internal controls, Internal Audit, Management Board, Supervisory Board/Risk Committee and other relevant committees/forums; includes hand-offs, challenge points, escalation paths and decision rights.
Management reporting and committee pack templates	Executive-ready templates for the Management Board, Supervisory Board/Risk Committee and Risk Management Function, including top/material risks, RAF status, KRI/KPI dashboard, scenario/stress results, risk response/action status, control issues, decisions required, decision log and risk oversight/assurance statement.
Internal controls management toolkit	Control inventory mapped to risks and risk responses; key-control identification logic; control owner and evidence standards; deficiency/action log; remediation

	tracker; monitoring dashboard and reporting route to relevant management/governance bodies.
Scenario/stress and quantitative assessment toolkit	Editable scenario/stress templates covering extreme-but-plausible assumptions, input/data requirements, ERM-level aggregation/calculation logic, quantitative summary, sensitivity/limitations, RAF linkage, escalation/management actions and ERM-level validation/recalibration/back-testing approach. Pilot output shall include validation evidence, recalibration recommendations and back-testing results or limitations.
ERM-level quantitative validation, recalibration and back-testing toolkit/log	Editable toolkit/log for ERM-level validation, recalibration and back-testing of aggregation logic, scenario/stress design, RAF threshold calibration, KRI/KPI/dashboard calculations and management-reporting outputs, including test objectives, evidence, findings, recalibration actions, limitations, owner and handover status. Individual process-level model validation is excluded.
Issue, action and decision tracking toolkit	Integrated log for risk responses, control deficiencies, RAF breaches, decisions, owners, deadlines, dependencies, status, escalation level and closure evidence, aligned with reporting packs and dashboard status categories.
Process/business-area dashboard template	Dashboard structure for selected processes or domains, showing material risks, KRIs/KPIs, controls, actions, breaches, trends, accountable owners and escalation status. Pilot output shall demonstrate how the dashboard can be used by risk owners and the Risk Management Function.
Risk data and reporting lineage matrix	Map of key data fields used in the risk register, KRIs/KPIs, RAF monitoring, dashboards and reporting packs to data owners, source systems, refresh frequency, data quality controls, limitations and remediation actions. Pilot output shall document the lineage assumptions for pilot dashboards/reports.
Implementation roadmap, capability and transition plan	Prioritised implementation backlog, quick wins, sequencing, dependencies, owner/resource/capability matrix, target-state operating rhythm, transition plan and governance for maintaining the artefacts after project closure.
Requirement-to-artefact traceability and acceptance checklist	Cross-reference matrix linking each requirement in this document to the relevant deliverable, playbook and artefact, including pilot use case, editable output file, owner, validation evidence, acceptance status, open issues and handover status.
Pilot application and handover package	At least two agreed pilot use cases: one group-level reporting/RAF use case and one process or business-area risk management use case. The package shall include populated or representative examples, assumptions, limitations, validation feedback, training/handover notes and instructions for reuse by HSE.

The risk data/reporting lineage matrix shall show end-to-end traceability from reported risk fields, metrics and dashboard items to sources, owners, calculation/transformation logic, validation controls, outputs, thresholds, limitations and remediation actions.

5.7 Acceptance criteria

The final playbooks and the Implementation-Ready Artefact Suite are accepted when they cover the relevant work areas and mandatory artefacts, are consistent with final findings/recommendations, are tailored to HSE, contain the agreed minimum content and are practical enough for internal continuation and use. Minor editorial comments alone are not grounds for rejection.

- Includes, for the relevant work area, the minimum sections listed in Section 5.4 or an equivalent structure accepted by the Contracting Authority.
- Includes practical templates/examples and knowledge-transfer material enabling internal continuation, such as workshop/training materials and handover notes.

- Includes the mandatory Implementation-Ready Artefact Suite and Pilot Application specified in Section 5.6, delivered as editable, mutually consistent working documents/templates and populated or representative pilot outputs sufficient for practical use by HSE.
- Includes ERM-level validation/recalibration/back-testing evidence for the quantitative ERM solution, including test objectives, assumptions, calculation/aggregation checks, sensitivity and threshold-performance analysis, back-testing results or limitations, recalibration recommendations and clear exclusion of individual process-level model validation.
- Includes a completed requirement-to-artefact traceability and acceptance checklist as deliverable acceptance evidence prepared and maintained during contract delivery, including validation evidence and handover status for the mandatory artefacts and pilot outputs.
- Shows no material inconsistencies with the final assessment findings and recommendations.
- Is written in a clear, implementation-oriented manner with step-by-step guidance, roles and responsibilities and decision/escalation logic where relevant.
- Is tailored to the HSE Group context, including terminology, governance interfaces and practical applicability.

6. Tender submission requirements and minimum technical compliance with the scope of this documentation

6.1 Instructions for preparing an offer

In addition to the forms, supporting evidence and documents required in the general section of the public procurement documentation, the Tenderer must submit the content and documents specified below (also defined as Minimum Content Overview). Tenderer will verify that delivered offers are in line with requirements defined in Section 6 and all the proposed activities, outputs, timing, validation and editable handover evidence using Excel workbook Minimum Content Overview, deliverables list, draft artefact inventory, pilot application approach and written tender references.

Tenders must be easy to verify. The Minimum Content Overview Excel workbook (Scope-mapping and Submission Checklist) and written tender shall provide exact section/page references sufficient to verify the mandatory scope, methodology, deliverables, artefact/pilot approach, validation and handover. The Excel workbook is a concise evidence and completeness aid; it does not replace the written tender, required forms, price submission or this Technical Specifications document.

The written tender constitutes the binding offer and shall include, at a minimum, the following Minimum Content Overview information and evidence:

- A scope-mapping table demonstrating full coverage of the scope in Section 3 and each assessment area.
- For each assessment area, a concise description of the proposed assessment methodology/approach, key activities, expected inputs/data requirements, intended outputs and proposed form/structure of the corresponding methodology playbook, including knowledge transfer to HSE.
- A diagnostic and evidence plan describing the proposed data/document review, interviews/workshops, validation approach and confidentiality/data-handling arrangements.
- A deliverables list with a draft structure/table of contents for each key deliverable, including draft playbook tables of contents/structures for each assessment area or one integrated playbook/manual with clearly separated chapters, and an indicative milestone plan aligned with Section 4.
- A concise description of how the Implementation-Ready Artefact Suite and pilots will be produced, validated and handed over, including a draft artefact inventory, editable formats, HSE inputs and stakeholder validation steps.
- A detailed project plan and timeline with phases, milestones and due dates, including delivery governance, communication and reporting cadence, check-ins/steering and escalation points.
- Information on the proposed delivery team: names, roles and responsibilities, CVs/profiles of proposed experts and availability/FTE allocation. Professional credentials or certifications, if provided, shall be internationally recognised/acknowledged within the relevant professional community and verifiable.
- Organisational references relevant to the scope, including energy/utilities where applicable, with client contact details and evidence of implemented recommendations/outcomes.
- Key assumptions, dependencies and exclusions, if any.
- A tenderer presentation deck submitted with the tender summarising the proposed scope, methodologies and deliverables. The Contracting Authority may invite tenderers to a presentation/clarification meeting prior to award. The presentation shall not introduce new or amended commitments beyond the submitted tender.

For the avoidance of doubt, the written tender shall contain all mandatory evidence and binding commitments. The presentation deck/presentation is used to summarise and clarify the written tender. In case of any inconsistency, the written tender prevails.

6.2 Presentation content

The presentation shall concisely summarise the written tender and, at minimum, cover:

- Understanding of the assignment and full scope coverage, including scope mapping, boundaries and interfaces.
- Assessment methodology per work area, including key activities, inputs/data, intended outputs and integration across work areas.
- Diagnostic and evidence plan, including documents/data, interviews/workshops, validation approach, confidentiality/data handling and key assumptions.
- Approach to recommendations and target-state design, including pragmatic implementation, governance/RACI and embedding into decision-making and processes.
- Approach to the prioritised implementation roadmap, including prioritisation logic, sequencing, dependencies, timeline realism and resource/capability implications.
- Deliverables structure and executive-ready outputs, including deliverables list, draft tables of contents/sample structures and reporting format.
- Implementation-Ready Artefact Suite, pilots, validation feedback/open issues and handover.
- Project management, delivery governance and communication cadence, including milestones, steering/check-ins and escalation.
- Methodology playbooks and knowledge transfer, including proposed playbook structure per work area, practical how-to guidance, templates/examples and workshops/training enabling internal continuation.
- High-level overview of the proposed delivery team and how the team covers each work area.
- Summary of organisational references and outcomes relevant to the scope.
- Key assumptions, dependencies and exclusions, if any.

6.3 D1 - Full scope coverage and minimum technical approach

The Tenderer shall demonstrate full scope coverage through a scope-mapping table (see also Section 6.1 – Excel workbook) and concise, specific methodology descriptions for each work area, covering activities, inputs/data, outputs, playbook structure and knowledge-transfer approach. Methodology descriptions must be coherent, credible and non-generic. Any material omission, conditionality or insufficient evidence under D1 or D2 does not meet criteria/requirements and cannot be compensated under Q1 evaluation procedure.

The Offer shall describe how the mandatory Implementation-Ready Artefact Suite and Pilot Application detailed in Section 5.6 will be developed, validated and handed over, including artefact inventory, pilot selection, HSE inputs/data, editable formats and alignment with HSE governance and resources.

Minimum requirements per work area to be explicitly included in the Offer:

- **ERM framework and governance:** alignment with ISO 31000 and/or COSO ERM or equivalent; review of governance and 3 Lines of Defence; operating model (RACI), escalation and reporting; integration of ERM into strategy and decision-making.
- **Risk appetite, capacity and tolerances:** assessment of the current RAF; cascading/quantification where applicable and definition of thresholds; embedding into key processes/decisions; monitoring approach, including linkage to KPIs/incentives where relevant.
- **Quantitative risk management from an ERM perspective:** coverage of material risk types; ERM-layer maturity/gap assessment and technical validation, recalibration and back-testing of group-level quantitative solutions used for aggregation, scenario/stress testing, RAF monitoring, KRI/KPI dashboards and ERM reporting; integration into ERM governance, reporting and decision-making; exclusion of full individual process-level model/tool validation, with interfaces, inputs, owners, validation status and limitations documented where they feed ERM-level outputs.
- **IT systems and data:** review of IT tools and data flows supporting risk management; reporting/dashboards and KRI/KPI support; cybersecurity/resilience considerations; high-level IT gap assessment and upgrade roadmap method.
- **ESG and climate risk integration:** integration of ESG/climate risks into ERM and internal controls; CSRD/ESRS expectations where applicable; scenario/stress testing approach; integration into investment, trading and operational decision-making.

- **Internal controls management:** focus on the internal control management system and not control testing; end-to-end control mapping and monitoring/reporting; automation opportunities; role clarity across 3 Lines of Defence; linkage to risk response and mitigation planning.
- **Risk culture and internal collaboration:** method for assessing risk culture, such as interviews, surveys or workshops; actionable recommendations to strengthen culture, training, communication and escalation.
- **Cross-cutting implementation-ready artefacts:** approach for producing the mandatory editable artefacts, worked examples and pilots detailed in Section 5.6, including the ERM-level quantitative validation/recalibration/back-testing toolkit/log, risk data/reporting lineage, pilot validation and handover/open-issue evidence.

6.4 D2 - Commitment to required deliverables and tenderer presentation

The Tenderer shall commit to all mandatory outputs in Section 4, submit a presentation deck with the tender and provide an assurance for delivering the full scope and deliverables as defined in Excel Minimum Content Overview. The written tender is binding; the presentation may only summarise or clarify it.

7. Evaluation rules and award criteria

7.1 Two-step evaluation

Evaluation step	Rule
Step 1 - Selection and minimum compliance	The Contracting Authority first verifies eligibility, capacity and minimum compliance requirements set out in the general procurement documentation, separate response forms and Section 6 of this document. Any Requirement Not Met leads to exclusion and the tender will not proceed to quality/price scoring.
Step 2 - Award criteria (Quality + Price)	Only tenders that meet the requirements in Step 1 are scored under Quality (Q1, Q2 and Q3) and Price (P). Award evaluation is based on Quality (maximum 40 points) and Price (maximum 60 points).

7.2 Evidence-based assessment

All evaluations are performed only on the basis of the content submitted in the tender, including explicit references to sections/pages. Unsupported claims will not be scored as included. Where a claim is not linked to a specific written tender section/page, the committee could treat it as not evidenced for evaluation purposes. The presentation deck may summarise and clarify the written tender but is not a substitute for written tender evidence.

If the Contracting Authority organises a tenderer presentation/clarification meeting prior to award, it is used solely to clarify the content of the submitted tender. The presentation shall not introduce new or amended commitments or materially modify the offer. In case of inconsistency, the written tender prevails.

7.3 Quality scoring scale (maximum 40 points)

Q1 is scored from 0 to 30 points by the HSE Procurement Committee. Q2 and Q3 are scored at 2.5 points per qualifying item, capped at 5 points for each criterion. There are no minimum quality thresholds. Only tenders that meet all Minimum Content Overview requirements defined in Section 6 proceed to award scoring and are admissible for ranking.

Criterion / class	Scoring description
Q1: 0-10 points	The tender is fully compliant with Minimum Content Overview requirements; however, proposed value-add beyond the minimum technical requirements is limited. Additional outputs or accelerators are few, generic or not sufficiently evidenced/committed.
Q1: 11-20 points	The tender is fully compliant and provides clear, tangible and well-evidenced value-add beyond the minimum. Additional outputs are specific, measurable and integrated into the deliverables plan, such as enhanced playbooks, additional

	practical artefacts, additional workshops/training, stronger benchmarking or more detailed implementation-roadmap support.
Q1: 21-30 points	The tender is fully compliant and provides outstanding, clearly evidenced value-add beyond the minimum. Additional outputs are substantial, highly practical and tailored to HSE, materially increasing usability and implementation readiness, without reducing scope or making delivery conditional.
Q2 and Q3	Awarded points = 2.5 x number of qualifying additional items, capped at 5 points for each of Q2 and Q3.

7.4 Q1 - Quality of methodology, deliverables and project execution (0-30 points)

Baseline compliance with the minimum technical requirements is assessed under Minimum Content Overview. Under Q1, the committee awards points solely for the overall quality, completeness and credibility of the Tenderer's proposed value-add beyond the mandatory minimum under Minimum Content Overview requirements defined in Section 6, as evidenced in the written tender and consistently summarised in the presentation.

- Understanding of the assignment and full scope coverage, including HSE Group context, end-to-end scope, boundaries, interfaces and governance bodies.
- Assessment methodology per work area, including concrete activities, inputs/data and outputs, evidence-based approach, integration across areas and appropriate tools/techniques.
- Diagnostic and evidence plan, including document/data request plan, interviews/workshops, validation approach, assumptions, confidentiality and data limitation handling, and benchmarking where relevant.
- Quality of recommendations and target-state design, including pragmatic implementation aligned with HSE resources, target-state governance/operating model, RACI and link between gaps/root causes and proposed upgrades.
- Implementation roadmap quality, including prioritisation logic, sequencing, dependencies, realistic timelines, resource/capability implications and implementation-ready actions/owners/governance.
- Deliverables structure and executive-ready outputs, including complete deliverables list, draft structures and concise decision-oriented executive reporting.
- Project management, delivery governance and communication cadence, including realistic plan and milestones, team roles, steering/check-ins, risk/issue management and escalation.
- Methodology playbooks and knowledge transfer, including documented best-practice how-to guidance, clear playbook structures, reusable templates/examples and concrete workshops/training enabling internal continuation.
- Implementation-ready artefact suite and pilot usability beyond the mandatory minimum, such as additional pilots, more complete sample-populated templates, dashboard/report-pack prototypes, practical accelerators and stronger handover material.

Under Q1, points shall not be awarded for merely restating mandatory artefacts. Value-add may be recognised only for clearly committed enhancements beyond the minimum, such as additional pilots, deeper ERM-level testing/back-testing, more detailed sample-populated artefacts, advanced dashboard/report-pack prototypes, deeper data-lineage support or additional training/handover accelerators.

7.5 Q2 - Additional organisational references beyond minimum requirements (maximum 5 points)

Q2 awards 2.5 points for each additional qualifying reference beyond the minimum admissibility references, up to 5 points. A qualifying reference must be compliant with the conditions specified in the general documentation, completed within the last 5 years, relevant to ERM/RAF and/or group risk governance diagnosis/upgrade and/or include evidence of implemented recommendations and/or measurable outcomes. References used to satisfy minimum admissibility cannot be counted again in Q2.

7.6 Q3 - Relevant professional certifications of nominated key experts (maximum 5 points)

Q3 awards 2.5 points for each distinct relevant professional certification evidenced for nominated key experts, up to 5 points. Certifications must be relevant to the analysis domains in this document, such as risk management, quantitative risk, internal controls/audit, IT security or ESG/climate, and must be internationally recognised/acknowledged within the relevant professional community and verifiable by issuer, credential ID, validity and public verification where available.

7.7 P1 - Price criterion (maximum 60 points)

P1 evaluates cost competitiveness among tenders that meet all requirements in Step 1 Evaluation Step in Section 7.1. The evaluated price is the total fixed price for delivery of the full scope and all required deliverables, inclusive of all costs required for performance, including travel, workshops, reporting and direct costs.

Price points = 60 x (Lowest admissible total price / Tenderer's total price).

9. Final notes for tender preparation

- Tenderers shall ensure that the written tender, Minimum Content Overview workbook (Scope Mapping and Submission Checklist), presentation deck, price submission and all supporting evidence are mutually consistent.
- Exact references to tender sections/pages are required wherever evidence is requested. Generic confirmations are insufficient.
- The written tender prevails over the presentation deck if inconsistent.
- Any assumptions, dependencies or exclusions shall be clearly stated and must not reduce the mandatory scope or deliverables defined in this document.
- The Contracting Authority expects outputs to be practical, editable, implementation-ready and tailored to the HSE Group context.

Appendix: Minimum Content Overview workbook (Scope Mapping and Submission Checklist) in Excel form

Holding Slovenske elektrarne d.o.o.