

Change log: ID-01 Core Solution - 17 April 2026

Name	Date identified	Changes/Questions	Answers to suppliers
Video consultation integration (Viðtalur)	2026-04-10	Video consultation integration (Viðtalur) In order to provide a qualified and de-risked price for the integration between the new Solution and Viðtalur, we kindly request the following: Interface description – Please provide available technical documentation for the Viðtalur/Pexip integration interface. Specifically: Does Viðtalur expose an embeddable video component (e.g. iframe widget, JavaScript SDK) for rendering within the Solution, or is the expected model a link-based launch to the Vangin video application? What authentication mechanism is used — OAuth 2.0/OIDC, SSL/TLS certificates, or a proprietary scheme?	<p>Viðtalur (VUM in Vangin) currently does not expose dedicated integration interfaces for external systems. Video consultations are delivered using the Pexip solution.</p> <p>The current approach is link-based, where a video meeting is accessed via a generated Pexip URL. This link can be opened directly or embedded within an iframe if required.</p> <p>As an alternative, suppliers may choose to integrate directly with Pexip using available APIs and SDKs (e.g. PexRTC JavaScript client API) to implement a more fully embedded video experience within their own solution. Relevant documentation is available at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •https://docs.pexip.com/ •https://docs.pexip.com/api_manage/api_configuration.htm <p>At present, participant access to video consultations is based on secure meeting links. The Pexip platform supports integration with identity providers (https://docs.pexip.com/searchresults.htm?q=sso) suppliers may propose authentication approaches as part of their solution where appropriate.</p>
Patient demographics and family relations (Fólk)	2026-04-10	Patient demographics and family relations (Fólk) In order to provide a qualified and de-risked price for the integration between the new Solution and Fólk, we kindly request the following: Purpose and scope – The Solution must support workflows where a parent or guardian acts on behalf of a child. Does Fólk expose family relation data (e.g. parent–child relationships, guardianship) as part of its person lookup service, enabling the Solution to resolve a citizen's children or dependants programmatically? If not, how is this relationship currently established? Interface description – Please provide available technical documentation describing the Fólk lookup interface, including the supported query methods (e.g. REST/SOAP, batch/real-time), available data attributes in the response (P-tal, CPR, name, address, family relations, civil status), and any authentication or authorisation requirements for consuming the service.	<p>Family relations are exposed via the Fólk service, including relationships such as parent–child links and guardianship.</p> <p>Authentication is token-based. A token is obtained via a login method requiring username and password, and this token must be included in all subsequent webservice requests. Further details of the authentication flow and service usage are described in the accompanying documentation (“FÓLK – External Services v3.5”) and the WSDL definition.</p> <p>Please note that the document “FÓLK – External Services v3.5” reflects an earlier documentation version of the Heldin integration layer. General documentation for Heldin is available via Talgildu Føroyar and should be used as supporting reference material. Relevant links are provided in Appendix 6.</p> <p>Pdf and wdsd documents will be distributed directly to pre-qualified vendors.</p>

Citizen authentication (Samleikin)	2026-04-10	Citizen authentication (Samleikin) In order to provide a qualified and de-risked price for the integration between the new Solution and Samleikin, we kindly request the following: Interface description – We note that Samleikin must be supported as an external IdP via OIDC/OAuth2. Please confirm whether the Samleikin integration is based on a recognised international standard (e.g. OpenID Connect, SAML 2.0 / OIOSAML) or on a proprietary protocol. Please also provide available technical documentation describing the token exchange flow, supported scopes/claims, and any test environment available for integration development.	<p>Samleikin is primarily based on the SAML 2.0 standard for identity federation. While other protocols (e.g. OpenID Connect / OAuth2) may be supported in certain cases via intermediary solutions (e.g. identity brokers such as Keycloak), these must be described by the Supplier and are subject to approval on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>Technical documentation describing the integration approach, including authentication flows, attributes/claims, and configuration examples, is available via the following repository: https://bitbucket.org/klintra-ft/sp-demo/src/master/</p> <p>An open sandbox environment is not currently available. Suppliers may set up a local client environment to familiarise themselves with the integration approach, as described in the documentation. Integration testing can subsequently be performed against a staging environment.</p> <p>The final integration approach, including any use of alternative protocols or intermediary components, will be agreed during the clarification phase.</p>
Appendix 3 Requirements (ID 75)	2026-04-10	Appendix 3 Requirements (ID 75) In requirement no 75 you asks for us to describe how a transparent and logic case handling process can look like with minimal registration or transfer from one system to another. Are you using Service Desk Plus in ManageEngine - and is it possible to build an integration to your ManageEngine from our IT Service Management System? If so - can you provide a description of the interface? Alternatively - is ManageEngine able to enter a mail integration between the two systems?	<p>Yes, we are currently using ManageEngine ServiceDesk Plus as our ITSM platform. The solution provides a comprehensive REST API, which enables integration and communication with external systems. Therefore, such integration should be fully feasible. We understand that the relevant API documentation is available via ManageEngine's ServiceDesk Plus REST API resources. As an alternative, integration via email-based communication is also possible. However, an API-based integration would be the preferred and recommended approach. (https://www.manageengine.com/products/service-desk/on-premises/faq/api-management.html)</p>
Appendix Tender Terms - Section 9.2	2026-04-10	Appendix Tender Terms - Section 9.2 You write: The supplier will mark requirements in column E (Negotiation) in appendix 3 if a requirement is subject to negotiation from the supplier's side. We're not sure what you mean here - could you clarify?	<p>In august all suppliers within the procurement are invited to an individual two-day dialogue meeting. The purpose of this is to listen to the suppliers on where the tender material can be improved and remove misunderstandings. Furthermore, the suppliers can provide feedback on the tender material, and the responses can be elaborated and discussed. It is important to get the best possible tender material and proposals by the end of the procurement, and the dialogue meetings are an important way to achieve that. Within appendix 3 a series of requirements are marked in column D (Negotiation) as "yes", which means the client intends to have them on the agenda for the dialogue meetings. The supplier can also put important areas on the agenda, which must follow the structure of Appendix XX_Suggestions and improvements.</p>

The Contract, clause 26.2.1, section 2.	2026-04-10	The Contract, clause 26.2.1, section 2. Pursuant to clause 26.2.1, upon termination of maintenance and support, the Supplier is obligated to release an updated version of the source code for both Client-Specific Software and Standard Software to the Client. The source code for Standard Software is owned by the third-party manufacturers, and the Supplier will neither have the right nor the ability to disclose such source code. Can the Contracting Authority accept that the obligation, under the Contract, to release source code are limited to Client-Specific Software only, and that any requirements regarding deposit or release of source code for Standard Software can be prohibited by the Supplier?	The Contract stipulates that, upon termination of maintenance and support, the Supplier shall release an updated version of the source code for both Client-Specific Software and Standard Software. The Contracting Authority acknowledges that the Supplier may not hold the rights to disclose source code for Standard Software owned by third-party licensors. However, this does not in itself limit the Supplier's obligations under the Contract. Accordingly, the Contracting Authority can accept that: the obligation to release source code applies only to Client-Specific Software where the Supplier holds the relevant rights, and any release or escrow of source code for Standard Software is subject to the rights granted by the relevant third-party licensors. However, the Supplier remains responsible for ensuring that the Client's rights and the exit situation are adequately safeguarded. This includes ensuring that the Client, upon termination, can maintain, operate, and further develop the Solution in accordance with the Contract, including through appropriate licensing rights, documentation, and other necessary materials. The Contract will not be amended to include a general prohibition on requirements regarding deposit or release of source code for Standard Software, but such requirements shall be interpreted in accordance with applicable third-party rights.
The Contract, clause 17.8	2026-04-10	The Contract, clause 17.8 Contracting Authority is requested to confirm that the Requirements Specification set out in Appendix 3 has been prepared so as to reflect and incorporate all applicable legal and regulatory requirements relevant to the Solution, including Faroese and Danish legislation, and that a Supplier's compliance with Appendix 3 will, as a consequence, constitute compliance with the applicable rules referred to in clause 17.8?	The Contracting Authority confirms that Appendix 3 (Requirements Specification) has been prepared with the intention of reflecting relevant legal and regulatory requirements applicable to the Solution, including Faroese and Danish legislation. It is further noted that Appendix 8 (Relevant legislation) is expressly of an indicative and non-exhaustive nature and does not in itself impose independent contractual obligations on the Supplier. However, as stated in clause 17.8, the Supplier bears the full and independent responsibility for ensuring that the Solution and all services delivered under the Contract comply with all applicable laws and regulations, irrespective of whether such requirements are explicitly reflected in Appendix 3 or Appendix 8. Accordingly: compliance with Appendix 3 constitutes an important part of fulfilling the Contract, but it does not in itself constitute full compliance with all applicable legal and regulatory requirements. The Contracting Authority therefore cannot confirm that compliance with Appendix 3 alone will be deemed sufficient to satisfy the obligations set out in clause 17.8.
Preliminary Proposals submit to tender@ls.fo	2026-04-13	How would you like to receive our offer? Should we send it to you via this email?	Preliminary Proposals should be submitted to tender@ls.fo. and should refer to Tender Terms 7.5.

<p>MedRuc integration n material inconsistent with latest Q&A from Client</p>	<p>2026-04-13</p>	<p>According to the current tender material the MedRuc integration is considered minimum scope and the supplier must reintegrate into the new solution according to Appendix 17. In the latest QA response from the Client, it was stated that "The Client does not require suppliers to assume or cost a specific integration approach for MedRuc as part of the current tender scope." Can the Client confirm that the MedRuc integration mentioned in both Appendix 17 and Sub-Appendix 11A should be disregarded accordingly?</p>	<p>The Client acknowledges that previous responses may have created some ambiguity regarding the scope of the MedRuc integration. Following further clarification, the Client confirms that the MedRuc integration remains within the minimum scope and should therefore be included in the pricing outlined in Appendix 11A.</p> <p>However, as outlined in the previous response to CL-32, the Client does not currently have sufficiently defined requirements to prescribe a specific integration approach or what, if any, detailed billing functionality will look like in the future.</p> <p>Suppliers are therefore requested to include pricing for the MedRuc integration based on reasonable assumptions, taking into account the expected level of complexity associated with integrating to MedRuc and relevant standards.</p> <p>The Client anticipates that the scope, requirements, assumptions and preferred integration approach will be further clarified during the dialogue phase scheduled for August, and also as part of the future GP billing system project which will run in parallel with the procurement of this new digital healthcare solution.</p>
<p>Clause 14.1 states that prices are fixed and binding unless expressly stated otherwise in Appendix 11.</p>	<p>2026-04-14</p>	<p>Clause 14.1 states that prices are fixed and binding unless expressly stated otherwise in Appendix 11. Tenderer have not been able to identify a price regulation mechanism in Appendix 11 and would encourage the Client to consider including one – for instance linked to a recognised cost index – in order to ensure a sustainable commercial framework for both parties over the duration of the Contract. In the absence of such a mechanism, tenderers will need to factor the full risk of cost increases over the contract period into their pricing from the outset. Could the Client confirm whether such a mechanism is intended to be included, and if so, which index or adjustment model applies?</p>	<p>See attached PDF-document, named "Response to legal questions 17 APRIL 2026", ref. Response 1</p>

<p>Contract Clause 23.1 states provisions in Appendix 13 concerning maintenance</p>	<p>2026-04-14</p>	<p>Contract Clause 23.1 states that provisions in Appendix 13 concerning maintenance shall be disregarded: 'If Appendix 13 includes additional provisions, e.g. concerning duration, installation, breach, maintenance, warranty, liability, etc., the Parties agree that any such provisions will be disregarded as between the Supplier and the Client.' Clause 23.2 states that the Client's right of use in respect of Standard Software includes a right to maintain the Standard Software by a third party and use the Standard Software indefinite, 'unless otherwise stated in Appendix 13.' Could the Client confirm whether clause 23.2 constitutes an exception to clause 23.1 – i.e., that restrictions on third-party maintenance rights and time-limitation for use of Standard Software set out in Appendix 13 and/or Supplier's Licence Terms shall be effective and enforceable notwithstanding the general provision in clause 23.1? We note that we understand the criticality of the solution, but it seems commercially unusual for standard software to be subject to third-party maintenance rights, and we would appreciate confirmation that the Supplier may restrict such rights through its licence terms attached to Appendix 13.</p>	<p>See attached PDF-document, named "Response to legal questions 17 APRIL 2026", ref. Response 2</p>
<p>Contract 20.2 - termination with immediate effect,</p>	<p>2026-04-14</p>	<p>Contract Clause 20.2 of the Contract states that upon termination with immediate effect, the rights in respect of the Supplier's services will revert to the Supplier following repayment. Appendix 13, clause 2.1 states that the right of use is irrevocable and non-terminable by the Supplier. Could the Client clarify how these provisions interact – including, in the event of termination for convenience by the Client the Client's material breach?</p>	<p>See attached PDF-document, named "Response to legal questions 17 APRIL 2026", ref. Response 3</p>
<p>Appendix 13, clause 2.1.1 the Client can engage third parties for all activities relating to the Software, including maintenance and development.</p>	<p>2026-04-14</p>	<p>Appendix 13, clause 2.1.1 entitles the Client without restriction to engage third parties for all activities relating to the Software, including maintenance and development. We assume the intention is to allow the Client to engage consultants and operational partners acting on its behalf. Could the Client confirm this, and clarify whether the clause also covers activities that are the Supplier's contractual obligations under the Contract – such as installation, maintenance and development? If our assumption is correct, we would propose that clause 2.1.1 is amended to require that: (i) third parties act solely on behalf of and under the instructions of the Customer; (ii) third parties are subject to equivalent confidentiality obligations in respect of the Software and source code; and (iii) the Customer may not engage direct competitors of the Supplier.</p>	<p>See attached PDF-document, named "Response to legal questions 17 APRIL 2026", ref. Response 4</p>

Contract refers to terms that carry legal effect, but are not defined in App 0	2026-04-14	The Contract refers to terms that carry legal effect, but which do not appear to be defined in Appendix 0. We would ask the Client to clarify the following: (i) 'Public Institution': The term is used in clause 23.3.2 (rights of other Public Institutions to Client-Specific Software) and clause 25 (assignment). Could the Client provide a definition of this term, specifying which entities are covered? (ii) 'Takeover Date': The term is used as the reference point for termination of maintenance and support under clause 26.2, including the minimum notice periods applicable to both parties. Could the Client confirm the definition of Takeover Date and clarify when this date occurs in relation to the approval of a Partial Delivery test, the Deployment Date, and the Acceptance Date?	See attached PDF-document, named " Response to legal questions 17 APRIL 2026 ", ref. Response 5
When will the full fixed maintenance and support fee become payable from	2026-04-14	Appendix 11 provides that the fixed annual maintenance and support fee is payable from the Acceptance Date, which is defined in Appendix 0 as the date on which a partial delivery test has been passed. Please confirm whether the full fixed maintenance and support fee becomes payable from the approval of the first partial delivery test, or whether a proportional payment mechanism applies until approval of the final acceptance test.	See attached PDF-document, named " Response to legal questions 17 APRIL 2026 ", ref. Response 6
Exit Fee - clarification	2026-04-14	Contract & appendix 11 Clause 26.2.2 of the Contract provides that the Client shall pay an exit fee as specified in Appendix 11 in the event that maintenance and support is terminated between four and eight years after the Takeover Date for the first Partial Delivery. However, no exit fee amount or calculation methodology is specified anywhere in Appendix 11 or Sub-appendix 11A. Please confirm whether the exit fee will be specified prior to contract execution, and if so, in which document and according to which principles.	See attached PDF-document, named " Response to legal questions 17 APRIL 2026 ", ref. Response 7
Contract - compensations and penalties	2026-04-14	Contract Clause 21 limits the combined amount of compensation and penalties to the delivery payment for the entire contract term. As the delivery payment may not reflect the actual values at stake during the operational phase, we kindly request that the contract be amended to include a separate liability cap for the operational phase, based on 12 months' maintenance and support fees. This approach is standard in comparable contracts and would ensure a more proportionate allocation of risk across both phases of the contract.	See attached PDF-document, named " Response to legal questions 17 APRIL 2026 ", ref. Response 8

Service level adjustments - clarification	2026-04-14	Appendix 7, clause 7 allows the Client to adjust Service Levels and measured transactions unilaterally with three months' notice, at no additional cost to the Client (unless new tooling is required). This seems unusual compared to market standard and creates significant uncertainty for the Supplier, as service obligations may be changed without consent or compensation. We would suggest that the contract be amended to require mutual agreement for any adjustments to Service Levels, or alternatively that a change request process applies, entitling the Supplier to additional remuneration where adjustments result in increased cost or effort. We note that the current approach may in practice result in higher pricing, as Suppliers will need to factor in the uncertainty of future adjustments when calculating their offer. A mutual change request process — where adjustments are agreed and costed on a case-by-case basis — would likely produce a more cost-efficient outcome for the Client, as pricing would reflect actual obligations rather than a risk premium for potential future changes.	See attached PDF-document, named " Response to legal questions 17 APRIL 2026 ", ref. Response 9
Payment Schedule - clarification	2026-04-14	Appendix 11 Reference is made to Appendix 11 section 8 - Payment Schedule. Is it correct understood that as part of our proposal we are to suggest a payment schedule covering any one-time payments, in Sub-Appendix 11A, based on milestones in our time schedule Appendix 1? Please clarify where in our proposal (Appendix, section) this payment schedule must be described. Please clarify if there are any mandatory payment triggers to be incorporated, and if so, what their specifics are.	See attached PDF-document, named " Response to legal questions 17 APRIL 2026 ", ref. Response 10
Clarify non-mandatory rules	2026-04-15	Clause 17.8 contains a warranty of compliance with mandatory and non-mandatory rules as at the date of the Contract. Could the Client clarify what is meant by "non-mandatory rules" (as non-mandatory rules is a broad concept and difficult to scope, making it unclear what obligations Supplier is expected to comply with under the contract)?	See attached PDF-document, named " Response to legal questions 17 APRIL 2026 ", ref. Response 11

Citizen health data available via Vangin	2026-04-16	It says "Make relevant citizen health data available via Vangin as described in the table in section 1.4" We can understand this to be that we should develop UI for Vangin for this. Is this correct understood? Or can we assume it is enough to expose the required data through APIs? There is an integration in the list called "BDBlod (Blodbank System)". It says a webservice is expected. But our understanding is that this would be a jump out. Is this correct? Or can you specify what this webservice is?	<p>Requirement #125 "Make relevant citizen health data available via Vangin as described in section 1.4" does not imply that the Supplier should develop UI components directly within Vangin. The Supplier is expected to make relevant health data and services available through secure, standards-based interfaces (e.g. APIs), enabling Vangin to present this information to citizens and/or to support secure redirection to supplier-hosted interfaces where appropriate.</p> <p>The current interaction with BDBlod is primarily handled via a 'jump-out', where clinicians are directed to a webpage when making requisitions. Answers are automatically sent back to COSMIC. This represents the minimum required functionality at go-live to preserve existing clinical workflows. The reference to 'webservice' for BDBlod in the table in section 3 (Appendix 17) reflects the target architectural direction for integration. Therefore, Suppliers are expected to assess and propose the most appropriate integration approach (e.g. API/webservice, messaging, or other standards such as HL7/FHIR) in line with the target architecture and interoperability principles.</p> <p>The existing jump-out functionality must be supported at go-live but Suppliers may propose enhanced integration approaches where these provide clear clinical or technical benefit.</p>
Clarification Sub-appendix 18a1 "The secretary/secretarial function"	2026-04-16	The Supplier requests clarification regarding Sub-appendix 18a1 under the persona "The secretary/secretarial function". The last 6 listed tasks/requirements appear to describe clinical responsibilities that are typically related to the anesthesiologist role, including: obtaining an overview of anesthesia-relevant information, documenting medication prescriptions, prescribing and documenting epidural block, viewing medication together with the partogram, ordering blood/urine tests and receiving results, and referring to a pediatrician. Can the Client confirm whether these 6 tasks/requirements are intended to belong to the anesthesiologist persona rather than the secretary/secretarial function?	The Client confirms that the Supplier's assumption is correct. The last statements listed under Sub-appendix 18a1 for the persona "The secretary/secretarial function" were included due to a formatting error. These tasks are not intended to belong to the secretary/secretarial function. The requirements in question are all intended to belong to the anesthesiologist (anesthesiology persona). The tender material should therefore be interpreted accordingly.
Index prices	2026-04-16	Having reviewed the Contract including appendices, we have noticed that neither the Contract nor Appendix 11 describes the right for the Supplier to index the prices. The omission of such indexation clause places the entire risk of price and wage increases for the entire duration of the Contract (10 years). In order to cater for more competitive pricing, the Contract Authority is recommended to include a right for the Supplier to index the fees for maintenance & support, hourly prices, options and periodical software payments by adding the following wording: "All fees, except for the Delivery Payment, may be adjusted once a year, on January 1, by the percentage change in the "Standardised Index of Average Earnings for Companies and Organizations", Industry: "Information and Communications" published by Statistics Denmark (Danmarks Statistik) from October to October; the first adjustment may take effect on January 1, 2027."	See attached PDF-document, named " Response to legal questions 17 APRIL 2026 ", ref. Response 12

Updated answer to previously answered question 18/3 - Text in regular and bold - significance	2026-03-18	In Sub-appendices 18 both regular and bold text is used in the table. There is no reference to this in the text. Is the text in either regular or bold significant?	<p>The Client intends to reduce the complexity and scope of the supplier demonstration sessions to increase their overall value and ensure a clear focus on the most relevant functional and clinical aspects. This adjustment concerns only the demonstration scheduled for August and does not affect the suppliers' tender submissions due on 23 April.</p> <p>The demonstration sessions are intended to be a transparent, current-state presentation of system functionality, as available at the time of the session. They are not scripted showcases or scenario-driven demonstrations and are not designed to illustrate optimized or outcome-oriented workflows. The purpose is to provide an honest and factual basis for evaluation of how the solution operates in practice.</p> <p>Because of this clarification, Appendix 23 will be updated to provide a more precise and detailed description of the walkthrough scope, format, and content. Appendix 18 will remain unchanged in substance and will continue to define the functional and clinical requirements. Any modifications to Appendix 18 will be of a strictly clarifying or editorial nature and limited to its references within Appendix 23.</p> <p>Revised versions of Appendix 18 and Appendix 23 will be issued within the next three weeks.</p> <p>Following the publication of the revised appendices, a two-week Q&A period will be opened. During this period, only questions directly related to the walkthrough scope and content as described in Appendix 23 will be accepted. Questions outside this scope, including general solution capabilities not shown, alternative workflows, future functionality, or other unrelated tender elements will be disregarded and will not be answered.</p> <p>Suppliers are further requested to disregard the response to the question titled "Text in regular and bold – significance" from the changelog uploaded on 18 March 2026 (dated 13.03.26), as this information is no longer applicable.</p>
Names of persons needing access to downloaded tenders	2026-04-17	According to section 7.5 of the Tender Terms, tenders must be made available to the Client by a download link or similar. Could you please provide the full name and email address of the person(s) who should be granted access to the download link?	Annfinn Thomsen, annfinn@ls.fo - Louisa A. Fjalsbak, louad@ls.fo