



CERTAIN

**Certification for Ethical and Regulatory Transparency
in Artificial Intelligence**

D6.3: READINESS FOR TESTING



Co-funded by
the European Union

Project funded by



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra

Swiss Confederation

Federal Department of Economic Affairs,
Education and Research EAER
State Secretariat for Education,
Research and Innovation SERI

Work package	WP 6
Task	Task 6.3
Due date	30/11/2025
Submission date	30/11/2025 (DRAFT)
Deliverable lead	IDIAP
Version	1.0
Authors	Sushil BHATTACHARJEE (IDIAP), Eleftheria TSOURLIDAKI (NVCR), Ali KORDIA (UL), Sefik SALKUNIC (UKCM), Pierre GACON (IPS)
Reviewers	Natael COUTURIER (RAL), Ali KORDIA (UL), Fabian KOVAC (SPU)
Security reviewer	Pierre GACON (IPS)
Abstract	<p>When preparing a dossier for conformity assessment of an AI product, the AI technology provider may need to include an evaluation report prepared by an independent 3rd party test lab, referred to, in this document as an independent testing facility (ITF). When a technology provider requests an ITF to evaluate its AI product, the ITF must first determine whether the AI product in question, referred to as the <i>Target of Evaluation</i> (TOE), is ready for testing. In other words, the ITF must determine whether the TOE is configured to produce the results that would facilitate evaluation. For example, for each integral input, the TOE should output a <i>result-file</i> which contains all the intermediate results necessary for the evaluation. If the TOE is not configured to produce such result-files, it would be considered to not be ready for evaluation. To ascertain the readiness of the TOE for evaluation, the ITF will request the AI technology provider to complete a questionnaire. In this document, we propose a template to guide ITFs in creating questionnaires that would be appropriate for specific evaluation schemes.</p>
Keywords	Third-party independent evaluation, readiness criteria, test readiness review (TRR), pre-test validation

Document Revision History

Version	Date	Description of change	List of contributor(s)
V0.1	05/10/2025	1st draft	Sushil Bhattacharjee (IDIAP)
V0.2	05/11/2025	2nd draft: contributions by various authors	Eleftheria TSOURLIDAKI (NVCR), Ali KORDIA (UL) Sefik SALKUNIC (UKCM), Pierre GACON (IPS)
V0.3	17/11/2025	3rd draft	Sushil Bhattacharjee (IDIAP)
V0.4	29/11/2025	4 th draft for submission as a draft "on time"	Claude Bauzou (IPS)
V0.5		Updates to assimilate of reviewers' comments	Sushil Bhattacharjee (IDIAP)

V0.8	22/01/2026	Review of Energy questionnaire	Fabian Kovac (SPU)
V1.0	26/01/2026	Version ready to be delivered	

Grant Agreement No: 101189650 | **Topic:** HORIZON-CL4-2024-DATA-01-01
Call: HORIZON-CL4-2024-DATA-01. | **Type of action:** HORIZON-IA

REVIEWERS' COMMENTS

Reviewer's name, surname Dr. Ali KORDIA	Reviewers' entity: UL	Date of review:
Instead of text in this table, the reviewer provided feedback in the form of margin comments on different pages throughout the document. The reviewer's comments have been addressed in the final submitted version.		

Name of reviewer: Mr. Natael COUTURIER	Affiliation: RAL	Date of review:
Instead of text in this table, the reviewer provided feedback in the form of margin comments on different pages throughout the document. The reviewer's comments have been addressed in the final submitted version.		

Name of reviewer: Dr. Pierre GACON	Affiliation: IPS	Date of review:
Instead of text in this table, the reviewer provided feedback in the form of margin comments on different pages throughout the document. The reviewer's comments have been addressed in the final submitted version.		

Name of reviewer: Dipl.-Ing. Fabian KOVAC, BSc	Affiliation: SPU	Date of review:
Instead of text in this table, the reviewer provided feedback in the form of margin comments on different pages throughout the document. The reviewer's comments have been addressed in the final submitted version.		

DISCLAIMER

The CERTAIN project received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe Research and Innovation Programme under Grant Agreement No 101189650. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them. This work has received funding from the Swiss State Secretariat for Education, Research and Innovation (SERI).

Copyright notice

© 2025 – 2027 CERTAIN

Project funded by the European Commission in the Horizon Europe Programme		
Nature of the deliverable:	R (Document, report)	
Dissemination Level		
PU	Public, fully open, e.g., web (Deliverables flagged as public will be automatically published in CORDIS project's page)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
SEN	Sensitive, limited under the conditions of the Grant Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/>

Draft

TABLE OF CONTENT

Reviewers' comments.....	3
1 INTRODUCTION.....	10
2 READINESS CRITERIA	11
2.1 Observability and Transparency	11
2.2 Clear Interfaces and Documentation.....	11
2.3 Deployment and Reproducibility	12
2.4 Evaluation Support.....	12
3 READINESS QUESTIONNAIRE TEMPLATE.....	13
4 SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRES	14
4.1 Biometrics.....	14
4.2 Health	18
4.3 Finance.....	21
4.4 Information Technology.....	27
4.5 Energy	36
5 CONCLUSIONS.....	41

Draft

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In this document, we present the outcomes of the task T6.3. The goal of this task is to develop a 'readiness assessment template'. This template may be used by third-party testing labs, referred to as Independent Testing Facilities (ITF) in this document. When an AI technology provider contacts an ITF for an evaluation of its AI product (referred to as the Target of Evaluation (TOE) during evaluation), the ITF needs to first determine whether the technology provider has adequately prepared the TOE for evaluation. This determination is based on a questionnaire that the technology provider should complete. The ITF should develop the questionnaire depending on the evaluation process. In particular, based on the evaluation protocol designed for a given evaluation process, the ITF would be able to determine what functionalities the TOE should support, to enable a successful evaluation. The ITF would create a questionnaire to ascertain, from the technology provider, whether the TOE supports the required functionalities. The readiness assessment template produced in Task 6.3 is aimed at assisting ITFs in constructing appropriate questionnaires for evaluation schemes in different AI application domains.

To assist in the process of creating useful questionnaires, we list the general readiness criteria that an ITF should consider. Based on these criteria, we recommend a process for creating new questionnaires. We also provide example questionnaires for five different AI application domains, namely, Biometrics, Health, Finance, IT, and Energy. The selected application domains correspond to Pilots planned in CERTAIN.

Draft

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: GLOSSARY	8
TABLE 2: ACRONYMS	9

Draft

GLOSSARY AND ACRONYMS

The list of terms, group of words, expression used in this document are explained in Table 1.

Term, expression	Definition
AI Domain	A specialized field of study, or application, where AI technology is being used. Such domains may be categorized by technology, such as Natural Language Processing, Computer Vision, and so on, or by application/usage, such as Biometrics, Industrial Inspection, etc. (all of which may rely on, say, the same basic technology — Computer Vision). The CERTAIN project includes pilots in seven AI application domains.
Readiness Criteria	Criteria applied to determine whether an AI product seeking independent evaluation is in fact ready for evaluation, that is, it supports all the functionalities necessary for a complete and successful evaluation.
Markets Financial Instruments Directive	in Abbreviated MiFID, this is a key piece of EU legislation aimed at regulating financial markets and enhancing transparency. (More details available on www.investopedia.com/terms/m/mifid.asp).
Target Evaluation	of The specific version of the AI product to be evaluated.
Technology Provider	The provider of an AI technology is in charge of fulfilling the obligations of the AI Act. For AI technologies classified as high risk, these obligations are detailed in Section 3 of the AI Act.
Test Harness	This is a collective term denoting all the hardware and software, external to the TOE, that is necessary to perform an evaluation of the TOE. A test harness may include the devices on which the TOE runs (if the TOE is a piece of software), other peripheral devices (such as wireless routers), cables, and so on.
Third-party testing lab	A laboratory or testing facility not affiliated in any way with the technology provider, that has the requisite accreditation and expertise for evaluating AI products. In this document we refer to such labs as Independent Testing Facilities (ITF).
Virtual Environment	A self-contained computing environment in which the TOE can be executed safely and correctly. In practice, a virtual environment may be implemented through a Virtual Machine or a Container.

Table 1: *Glossary*

The list of acronyms used in this document and their meaning is explained in Table 2.

Acronym	Meaning
CPU	Central Processing Unit
GPU	Graphics Processing Unit
IT	Information Technology

Acronym	Meaning
ITF	Independent Testing Facility
MiFID	Markets in Financial Instruments Directive
PII	Personal Identifiable Information
TOE	Target of Evaluation — the AI product considered for testing by an ITF.
TRR	Test Readiness Review
VM	Virtual Machine

Table 2: Acronyms

Draft

1 INTRODUCTION

When the provider of an AI product wishes to have the product tested at a third-party, Independent Testing Facility (ITF), the ITF needs to first determine whether the product in question has been adequately prepared for the testing process. In the context of testing, we refer to the product being tested as the *target of evaluation* (TOE). For the TOE to be tested appropriately, it should fulfil certain criteria. In task T6.3 we draw up the list of criteria the TOE should satisfy, before it is accepted for testing by the ITF. We refer to such criteria as the *readiness criteria*.

When an ITF considers a new evaluation scheme for a specific sector/domain of AI applications, it should also simultaneously produce a questionnaire for readiness assessment of TOEs in this domain. This *readiness questionnaire* should be published on the Evaluation Portal (to be developed in Task 6.4 of CERTAIN). When requesting a third-party evaluation, the technology provider will be required to first complete this questionnaire on the portal. The portal will also implement processes for submission of the completed questionnaire, as well as processes for the ITF to review the completed questionnaire and provide feedback to the technology provider.

In this report, we develop a set of readiness criteria for various AI application domains. These abstract criteria are then crystallized into a concise template that can be used by ITFs when composing a new readiness questionnaire.

We also provide example questionnaires for specific AI domains addressed by the pilots conducted in CERTAIN. Specifically, this report includes five readiness assessment questionnaires for AI products in the domains of Biometrics, Health, Finance, IT, and Energy. The questionnaires have been prepared by various members of the CERTAIN consortium that are involved in the different pilots in this project.

In Section 2, we list the criteria that should be addressed by any readiness assessment questionnaire, and in Section 3, we present the template to be followed when creating a questionnaire to assess the readiness of TOEs for a new evaluation process. Section 4 presents sample questionnaires constructed for five different AI application domains: Biometrics, Health, Finance, IT, and Energy. This report ends with a short summary, provided in Section 5.

2 READINESS CRITERIA

The ITF shall determine the readiness of a TOE based on a questionnaire. When developing the questionnaire for a given AI application domain, the ITF should consider the following criteria:

- Can the TOE be evaluated in a stand-alone manner, or is an external test-harness required for such testing? If a test-harness is deemed necessary, the architecture of the test-harness should be specified in as much detail as possible.
- Can the TOE be evaluated using the computing infrastructure, and specific computing environment available in the ITF? In particular, can the TOE be evaluated without access to the Internet?
- What APIs should the TOE support? The questionnaire should enable the ITF to ascertain whether the APIs supported by the TOE are adequate for testing purposes.
- What intermediate results should the TOE provide to facilitate the testing? The TOE should generate the necessary intermediate results, for every test-input.
- Does the TOE include the necessary data security and privacy features? When personal data is used in the testing process, does the TOE provide features to enable the testers to delete all data when the tests are complete.
- What additional documentation is required regarding the operation of the TOE, as well as other information necessary for testing?

Before an ITF accepts a TOE for evaluation, the technology provider should confirm that the TOE can actually be tested (operated) in the computing environment of the ITF, and can be observed and monitored in a secure and reproducible way. The following sections group the main requirements into four clear themes.

2.1 OBSERVABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY

Besides evaluating the overall performance of the TOE, in many cases the ITF may also need to evaluate the performance of the individual subsystems comprising the TOE. To this end, the TOE should provide functionalities to enable the following.

- Besides the final outputs (decisions, predicted values), the TOE should also provide intermediate results (such as scores, embeddings, or decision confidence).
- It should support deterministic test-runs, by using fixed random seeds, so tests can be repeated exactly.
- The TOE should be able to reset itself to a clean state between tests — such as by deleting cached data — to avoid bias from previous inputs.

2.2 CLEAR INTERFACES AND DOCUMENTATION

Before commencing the actual evaluation, testers at the ITF should be sufficiently familiar with the TOE. The technology provider should support this goal by (1) implementing clear user-interfaces, and (2) providing adequate documentation.

- Inputs and outputs must be clearly documented, with data types, formats, and acceptable ranges.
- Test Mode: In certain cases, the ITF may require the TOE to support a “test mode” or provide debug endpoints that let the ITF access additional diagnostic information.

- Version number: the TOE should explicitly display its version number and other relevant metadata, to enable the ITF to associate the test results to a specific version. (The ITF should mention the version number of the TOE in the final test reports.)
- Integration document: In many cases, the TOE may not be intended for use as a standalone product, but rather as one component of a larger system or product. In such cases, the technology provider should demonstrate that the process of integrating its AI product into a larger system will not invalidate the test results of the TOE. To this end, the technology provider should furnish a detailed *Integration document*, describing the process of integrating the TOE into the larger system. The technology provider should also explain, in the Integration document, why the proposed integration process will not affect the performance of the TOE. (During the testing process, the ITF will study and validate the Integration document furnished by the technology provider.)

2.3 DEPLOYMENT AND REPRODUCIBILITY

The technology provider should facilitate the evaluation of the TOE by providing an adequate *test harness*. All hardware and software components that do not form part of the TOE, but are necessary to operate the TOE, comprise the test harness. In particular, software TOEs need to be tested in an appropriate computing environment. For example, if the TOE is a software app designed for mobile devices, then the technology provider may be expected to provide a representative set of mobile devices as the test harness for the evaluation. Another example concerns the evaluation scenarios for AI products to be used in a cloud-environment. In such cases, for the purposes of evaluation, the technology provider should provide a computer running the cloud-based remote service locally, as part of the test harness. This test harness may also include a wi-fi router to enable the connection to the computer running the remote service.

The technology provider should be able to provide a complete virtual environment in which the TOE can be executed safely by the testers at the ITF. The technology provider and the ITF should reach an agreement on the following topics before commencement of the evaluation:

- Virtual environment: the technology provider should package the TOE in a virtual machine (VM) or container (e.g. Docker, Kubernetes) with clear instructions for installation and startup.
- Test harness description: the technology provider should declare the hardware and software requirements (CPU, GPU, memory, operating system). The ITF may require the technology provider to provide all or part of the necessary test harness for the testing process.
- Preliminary test results: the technology provider should include a health-check or smoke-test so that the ITF may confirm the TOE starts correctly.
- Documentation: Besides the instructions for setting up and operating the TOE in the test harness, the documentation should also record model versions and configurations, to facilitate repeatable testing.

2.4 EVALUATION SUPPORT

To support the evaluation process, documentation shared by the technology provider should include the following elements.

- Example code: besides the required hardware and computing environment required to operate the TOE, this may also include example code-snippets illustrating how to call the TOE programmatically.
- Self-test results: the ITF may require the technology provider to provide results of their own unit tests, integration tests, as well as large-scale tests, ideally with coverage statistics.

3 READINESS QUESTIONNAIRE TEMPLATE

In this section, we outline a template for use by ITFs when constructing a Readiness Questionnaire. The questionnaire should be constructed with two purposes in mind: (1) to enable the ITF to determine if the AI product is ready for evaluation, and (2) to provide the technology provider with sufficient information to prepare said TOE for evaluation. To prepare the questionnaire, the ITF should first collect the following information:

- From the test-protocol designed to test products of the specified type, determine the observability and transparency criteria (as discussed in Section 2.1).
- Determine the functionality expected from the user-interface of the TOE (as discussed in Section 2.2).
- Determine the deployment and reproducibility requirements (discussed in Section 2.3).
- Determine what support materials and documentation are required from the technology provider to complete the testing (see Section 2.4).

The bulk of the Readiness Questionnaire will be based on the information collected in the previous step. Questions in the questionnaire should be organized in the following sections:

- *Introduction*: this section should describe the purpose of the questionnaire and should include clear instructions for filling in the responses to the questions. This section should include a table explaining the technical terms and abbreviations used in the questionnaire.
- *Details about Technology Provider*: in this section the technology provider should provide details about itself, such as the company-name, contact address, individual contact-persons and their contact details.
- *Details about TOE*: in this section the technology provider should furnish high-level information about the TOE. Information requested in this section should include the name and AI application domain of the TOE, a general description of the functionality of the TOE, as well as the specific version number of the TOE. Based on the information provided in this section, the ITF should be able to determine whether it has the capability to evaluate the TOE.
- *Observability and Transparency*: questions in this section should clearly mention the specific outputs expected from the TOE. Every output required from the TOE for the evaluation should be explicitly addressed in a separate question, and the technology provider should confirm that the TOE is able to record the necessary output. If any of the required outputs is not provided by the TOE, then the ITF should conclude that the TOE is not ready for evaluation.
- *User-interfaces and Documentation*: the technology provider is not required to provide, as part of this questionnaire, complete documentation about how to operate the TOE. However, the technology provider should explicitly confirm that such documentation shall be provided to the ITF before the commencement of the evaluation. Questions in this section will guide the technology provider as to the necessary elements of the user interface, especially in terms of providing inputs and recording outputs.
- *Deployment and Reproducibility*: this section should include questions regarding the execution of the TOE, for example, if the TOE is provided within a virtual environment for safe execution. The technology provider is expected to provide, in this section, sufficient information about the minimum computational resources required to execute the TOE. Note that, in many cases, the ITF may request the technology provider to include a separate software development kit (SDK) in the TOE, for the purpose of facilitating speedy evaluation. In such cases, the questionnaire should ask the technology provider to confirm that a suitable SDK can be supplied.
- *Evaluation Support*: in this section, the ITF should mention specific support items that it would expect from the technology provider. Depending on the evaluation context, the ITF may decide whether these elements are absolutely necessary for the evaluation to proceed, or if they may be considered optional.

To the extent possible, questions in the Readiness Questionnaire should be formulated as multiple-choice questions. This helps to clarify the scope of the responses and makes it easy for the technology provider to complete the questionnaire. For questions with binary responses ('yes' or 'no'), the question should be worded in such a way that the response favoured by the ITF is 'yes'. For some questions, the correct responses will be free-text inputs (e.g., names and contact data of people, description of the TOE, and so on).

In the next section we provide examples of Readiness Questionnaires for the testing of products from a number of AI domains.

4 SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRES

In this section we list sample questionnaires for specific AI application domains. The domains referenced in this section correspond to Pilots planned in CERTAIN project. Specifically, readiness questionnaires for AI products in the domains of Biometrics, Health, Finance, IT and Energy.

AI products in the first four pilots (Biometrics, Health, Finance, and IT) produce *decisions*. The evaluation processes for these TOEs typically require knowledge of certain intermediate results, on which the final decisions are based. (The commercially deployed versions of these AI products need not output the intermediate results that are used during evaluation.)

The AI product used in the Energy pilot generates *regression-based predictions* (for energy production and consumption for the next day). This TOE can be evaluated simply based on the scalar outputs it generates, for different input data. Access to additional intermediate results is not necessary.

The following subsections present sample questionnaires for the various AI products considered in CERTAIN. It is important to note that questionnaires have been constructed with specific AI products in mind, for the different application domains. For evaluations of other AI products in these domains, it may be necessary to adapt the questionnaires to the specific requirements of the relevant evaluation process.

4.1 BIOMETRICS

In this section we present a sample questionnaire that could be used to determine the readiness of a TOE in the biometrics domain for an independent evaluation.

4.1.1 Instructions for completing the questionnaire

In response to your request for a quote for evaluating one of your products, we request you to complete the following questionnaire. Your answers will help us plan the evaluation, and to prepare an accurate quote for the requested evaluation.

For each question, please select the applicable options among those listed. Where, relevant, please provide complementary information that you consider relevant. If a question is unclear to you, please answer the question to the best of your knowledge.

At this point you are not required to share confidential information with us. In case we agree to proceed with the evaluation, we will sign appropriate confidentiality and non-disclosure agreements, based on which you may share confidential information with us.

4.1.2 General information about the technology provider and TOE.

	Item	Description
1	TOE Name, Version	
2	Technology Provider Name	
3	Technology Provider Address	

4	Name of Contact Person	
5	Contact Info. (email)	

4.1.3 Terms and abbreviations:

	Abbreviation	Full Term	Description
1	SDK	Software Development Kit	Software library for implementing offline tests during the evaluation
2	TOE	Target of Evaluation	The product to be evaluated

4.1.4 Questionnaire

Questionnaire version number: 1.0

Section 1: Description of TOE

1 Which biometric modality is used in the TOE?

Face

Iris

Voice

Fingerprint. If selected, please specify what kind of sensor is used in the TOE?

Single finger

Does the TOE distinguish among different fingers?

No Yes

If Yes, please include other details you consider relevant:

	<input type="checkbox"/> Slap / Multiple fingers captured simultaneously
2.	Does the TOE function in 1:1 comparison mode (for identity verification), or 1:N comparison mode (identification)? <input type="checkbox"/> 1:1 mode only <input type="checkbox"/> 1:N mode only <input type="checkbox"/> Both modes
3	Is the TOE a purely software based product, or does it include hardware, for example, a biometric capture device. <input type="checkbox"/> Software only <input type="checkbox"/> Hardware with capture device If the TOE includes a biometric sensor (hardware), provide a brief description of the biometric sensor (including any specific characteristics it may have): _____
Section 2: Observability and Transparency	
4	Does the TOE include functionality to download raw biometric-samples to an external computer? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
5	Does the TOE include functionality for exporting biometric-references and biometric probes to an external computer? <input type="checkbox"/> No. <input type="checkbox"/> Only biometric probes can be exported from the TOE. <input type="checkbox"/> Only biometric reference can be exported from the TOE. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, both biometric references and biometric probes can be exported from the TOE.
6	Does the TOE include functionality for deleting all biometric data (captured biometric-samples, as well as derivative data such as software generated templates, biometric references, biometric probes, etc.)? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (All data on the TOE can be deleted.)
7	Can the TOE support multiple simultaneous enrolments? (That is, can several identities be enrolled on the TOE, or can the TOE have only a single enrolled identity at any given time?) <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. If Yes, please specify the maximum number of simultaneous enrolments possible on the TOE: _____
Section 3: User interface	

8	Does the TOE support one-to-many transactions (one probe is compared against several biometric references) <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes.
9	Does the TOE output a single score (a floating-point or integer scalar) as the result of comparing the biometric probe to a biometric reference? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes.
10	Does the TOE provide functionality to download comparison scores to an external computer? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes.
Section 4: Deployment and Reproducibility	
11	Can you (the technology provider) provide a SDK that includes the same signal processing subsystem and comparison subsystem as the TOE? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes.
12	Can the SDK be used to compare biometric references and biometric probes downloaded from the TOE and generate comparison scores for various probes? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes.
13	If the TOE uses a score-threshold to make a decision (e.g., <i>accept</i> or <i>reject</i>) based on the comparison-score, is it possible to use the same score-threshold with the SDK? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes.
14	Can you provide the SDK in a virtualization environment (e.g., Docker or VirtualBox)? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. If yes, which one (please provide details): _____
15	Specify the computational environment required for using the SDK: <input type="checkbox"/> Linux. Specify Linux version(s): _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Windows. Specify version(s): _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Please specify OS and version: _____
16	If the SDK is not implemented in Python, then do you provide Python bindings for the SDK? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes.

Section 5: Evaluation Support

17 Additional documentation:

- Is adequate documentation available on how to operate the TOE and the SDK correctly?
- Can you provide a separate document describing the differences between the TOE provided for testing, and the deployed/commercial version of the product?

No

Yes.

4.2 HEALTH

In this section we present an example questionnaire that may be used to determine the readiness for evaluation of an AI product in the health domain. Specifically, here we consider the example of evaluating AI-based Assistive/Medical-Interaction Robots.

Readiness for Testing Questionnaire

Domain: AI-based Assistive / Medical Interaction Robots

Purpose: To determine whether the Target of Evaluation (TOE) is properly configured to support testing and validation activities.

General Information

1	<p>Company Name: _____</p> <p>Contact Person (Name, Email, Phone): _____</p> <p>Product Name / Model: _____</p> <p>Product Version / Firmware Version: _____</p> <p>Brief description of the system’s intended medical use case: _____</p> <p>Target user group (patients (mention if patients may be in vulnerable groups), caregivers, clinicians, etc.): _____</p> <p>Clinical context where the system is intended to operate (hospital, home care, clinic, etc.): _____</p>
2	<p>System Overview</p> <p>What type of robot is the product?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Conversational companion robot</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Therapy / rehabilitation support robot</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Monitoring & alerting assistant</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (describe): _____</p> <p>Describe the main interaction modalities supported:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Speech recognition</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Text-based interaction</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Gesture recognition</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Emotion detection</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Medical dialogue / protocols</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p>
3	<p>Data Access for Testing</p> <p>Can interaction logs (input, system decisions, output) be exported?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No.</p> <p>Can audio/voice recordings used by the system be downloaded for external analysis?</p>

	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No.</p> <p>Can sensor/vision data (e.g., camera frames, depth sensors) be accessed or logged?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No.</p> <p>Can timestamps for every action / response be exported?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No.</p> <p>Is there an API or debug interface for retrieving internal model outputs (confidence scores, detected intent, etc.)?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No.</p>
4	<p>Evaluation Scenario Configuration</p> <p>Can the system be reset to a clean state (e.g., remove past patient data)?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No.</p> <p>Can patient profiles be simulated without using real patient data?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No.</p> <p>Can scripted / repeatable interaction scenarios be executed?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No.</p> <p>Can autonomy level be adjusted (manual vs. automatic response selection)?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No.</p>
5	<p>Safety and Privacy Settings</p> <p>Does the system provide a full data deletion / secure wipe function?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No.</p> <p>Is patient data stored locally (device) or remotely (cloud)?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No.</p> <p>Can data storage location be customized for testing?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No.</p> <p>Does the product comply with GDPR / HIPAA requirements?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No.</p>
6	<p>Technical Environment Requirements</p> <p>Supported Operating Systems (Linux / Windows / macOS / Other):</p> <hr/>

	Virtualization / Container support (Docker, VM, etc.) _____ Required hardware (minimum): _____ Network requirements (internet access, firewall ports): _____ Need for cloud-based services? If yes, please specify: _____
7	Additional Notes from the technology provider: _____ _____ _____ _____
8	Declaration Name & Position: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

4.3 FINANCE

This section includes a sample questionnaire that may be used to determine the readiness for evaluation of an AI product (specifically, an investment recommendation product) in the finance domain.

4.3.1 Terms and Abbreviations

Term/Abbreviation	Definition
MiFID	MiFID, or the Markets in Financial Instruments Directive, is a piece of EU legislation that regulates, and enhances transparency in financial markets.
ML	Machine Learning

4.3.2 Questionnaire

Readiness for Testing Questionnaire (UKCM)	
	Domain: Finance / Banking Purpose: To determine whether the Target of Evaluation (TOE) is properly configured to support testing and validation activities.
Section 1: General Information	
1	Company Name: _____
2	Technology Provider (Name, Address): _____
3	Contact Person (Name): _____
4	Contact Person Details (Address, Email, Phone): _____
5	TOE Name: _____
6	TOE Version: _____
7	TOE Last Update (Month/Year): _____
8	Brief description of the system's intended use case: _____ _____
Section 2: System Overview	
9	Provide a brief description of the investment recommendation engine, including its core functionality and intended use. _____ _____
10	What types of financial products does the TOE recommend? <input type="checkbox"/> Mutual Funds <input type="checkbox"/> Bonds <input type="checkbox"/> Stocks <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
11	What customer data types are inputs across the models? <input type="checkbox"/> Demographics <input type="checkbox"/> Income <input type="checkbox"/> Current risk profile

	<input type="checkbox"/> Historical transactions <input type="checkbox"/> Historical investments <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
12	Does the system produce recommendations using rules, ML or hybrid? <input type="checkbox"/> Rule-based <input type="checkbox"/> ML-based <input type="checkbox"/> Hybrid
13	Intended deployment environment: <input type="checkbox"/> Cloud <input type="checkbox"/> On-premises <input type="checkbox"/> Hybrid
Section 3: Model Specific Questions	
14	Can you share the training dataset used in the development phase? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
15	Is the frequency of outcomes generation consistent across the models? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
16	Is the perimeter of the customers used in the development phase the same across the models? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
17	Which model-category best suits this TOE? <input type="checkbox"/> Model A — Risk Profile Estimation <input type="checkbox"/> Model B — Investment Capability Estimation <input type="checkbox"/> Model C — Product Recommendation
If the TOE falls in Model A, please answer questions 18 - 21	
18	What data types have been used to infer risk profile for customers without MiFID questionnaire responses?
19	Is the result of risk profile estimation expressed in terms of the following expected labels — ‘conservative’, ‘income’, ‘balanced’, ‘aggressive’? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

20	<p>Is the model trained on real historical MiFID questionnaire data?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
21	<p>Can the model output confidence scores or uncertainty estimates?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
If the TOE falls in Model B, please answer questions 22 - 24	
22	<p>What types of transactional data are used?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Spending</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Income</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Asset Under Management</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Historical transactions</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p>
23	<p>How is investment capacity calculated?</p> <p><i>Describe the logic or formula.</i></p>
24	<p>Does the model account for seasonal or recurring spending patterns?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
If the TOE falls in Model C, please answer questions 24 - 29	
25	<p>What algorithm(s) are used for product recommendation?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Random forest</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Decision trees</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Logistic regression</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p>
26	<p>What data types are used to match products to customers?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Demographics</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Risk Profile</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Investment History</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p>
27	<p>How are product suitability and appeal calculated?</p> <p><i>Describe scoring or ranking logic</i></p>
28	<p>Can the model explain why a product was recommended?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p>

	<input type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes, describe the explanation method. _____</i>
29	<p>Can the model provide a numeric estimate of the investment amount range for a specific product?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Section 4: Evaluation and Testing Requirements	
30	<p>Can your system be tested on its own, without needing to connect to other systems?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
31	<p>If NO, what other systems or tools are needed to test it properly? (e.g., banking software, data platforms, etc.)</p>
32	<p>What kind of computer setup is needed to test the system?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Linux <input type="checkbox"/> Windows <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
33	<p>Can your system be used with Python?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
34	<p>Does your system need internet access during testing?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes – always <input type="checkbox"/> Yes – sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Can work both online and offline
Section 5: Results: Intermediate Outcomes and Monitoring	
35	<p>What intermediate outputs are generated by each model?</p> <p>Model A: ____</p> <p>Model B: ____</p> <p>Model C: ____</p>
36	<p>Can these intermediate results be exported for additional analysis?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

37	Are explanations for recommendations available to the customer or evaluator? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
38	Does the TOE include monitoring mechanism for results evaluation? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Section 6: Privacy, Security, and Documentation	
39	What privacy-preserving techniques are used? <input type="checkbox"/> Data anonymization <input type="checkbox"/> Encryption <input type="checkbox"/> Role-based access <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
40	Is documentation available for the TOE's operation and architecture? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
41	Does the documentation include details on tests' outcomes during the development phase? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
42	Can you provide a document comparing the outcomes of the version under test and the previous version? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Section 7: Regulatory Compliance and Risk Classification	
43	Under the EU AI Act, how is the TOE classified? <input type="checkbox"/> High-risk <input type="checkbox"/> Limited risk <input type="checkbox"/> Minimal risk <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment pending
44	Does the TOE perform automated decision-making that affects the financial outcomes for individuals? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
45	Is the TOE subject to MiFID suitability and appropriateness requirements? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes

	<input type="checkbox"/> No
46	Does the TOE support auditability and traceability of decisions? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
47	Are mechanisms in place to detect and mitigate bias in model outputs? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
48	Is there a documented risk management process for the TOE? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
49	Are human oversight mechanisms integrated into the operation of the TOE? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
50	Does the TOE comply with other relevant regulations? <input type="checkbox"/> GDPR <input type="checkbox"/> DGA <input type="checkbox"/> CE Marking <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
51	<p>Declaration</p> <p>Name & Position: _____</p> <p>Signature: _____</p> <p>Date: _____</p>

4.4 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

In this section we present an example questionnaire for determining the readiness for evaluation of AI applications in the Information Technology (IT) domain.

4.4.1 Instructions for Completing the Questionnaire

Purpose

This questionnaire is designed to assess whether your AI system (Target of Evaluation - TOE) is ready for conformity assessment testing in accordance with the EU AI Act and related regulatory frameworks. The

questionnaire specifically addresses automated compliance systems integrated within Machine Learning Operations (MLOps) pipelines.

How to Complete the Questionnaire

Please review all sections before submission. Incomplete questionnaires will be returned for completion, causing delays in the evaluation process.

1. **Answer all questions completely and accurately.** Incomplete submissions may delay the evaluation process.
2. **Provide detailed technical specifications** where requested.
3. **Use clear, unambiguous language.** If a question is not applicable, write "N/A" and provide a brief explanation.
4. **Review your responses** before submission to ensure consistency and accuracy.

Confidentiality

All information provided will be treated as confidential and used solely for the purpose of the TOE readiness assessment and subsequent conformity evaluation.

4.4.2 Terms and Abbreviations

Term/Abbreviation	Definition
API	Application Programming Interface
CE Marking	Conformité Européenne - European conformity marking
CI/CD	Continuous Integration/Continuous Deployment
DGA	Data Governance Act
EU AI Act	European Union Artificial Intelligence Act
FAR	False Accept Rate
FRR	False Reject Rate
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation
IOPS	Input/Output Per Second
JSON	JavaScript Object Notation
MLOps	Machine Learning Operations - practices for deployment and maintenance of ML models in production
PII	Personally Identifiable Information
RBAC	Role-Based Access Control
REST	Representational State Transfer
SLA	Service Level Agreement
SME	Small and Medium-sized Enterprise
TOE	Target of Evaluation - the AI system being submitted for testing
XML	Extensible Markup Language

4.4.3 Questionnaire

Section 1: General Information

1.1 Technology provider Information

1.	Legal name of organization: _____
2.	Primary contact person: Name: _____ Title: _____ Email: _____
3.	Technical contact person (if different): Name: _____ Title: _____ Email: _____
4.	Country of establishment: _____
1.2 TOE Information	
5.	TOE product name: _____
6.	TOE version number: _____
7.	TOE brief description (max 500 words): [Open text]
8.	Provide a high-level description of the TOE's functionality, and the compliance checks it performs. _____
9.	Intended deployment environment: <input type="checkbox"/> Cloud-based <input type="checkbox"/> On-premises <input type="checkbox"/> Hybrid <input type="checkbox"/> Edge computing <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): _____
10.	AI risk classification under EU AI Act: <input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable risk <input type="checkbox"/> High-risk <input type="checkbox"/> Limited risk <input type="checkbox"/> Minimal risk <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment pending

Section 2: Testing Environment and Infrastructure Requirements

2.1 Stand-alone Evaluation Capability

11. Can the TOE be evaluated in a stand-alone manner without integration into a production environment?

Yes

If YES, describe the stand-alone evaluation mode:

How exactly, can the TOE be tested independently? What functionality is available in stand-alone mode? _____

No

If NO, describe the external test-harness requirements: Specify in detail the systems, environments, or platforms required for testing.

Required Components: _____

- MLOps platform/framework (specify): _____
- CI/CD tools (specify): _____
- ML model registry (specify): _____
- Container orchestration (specify): _____
- Monitoring/logging systems (specify): _____
- Other (specify): _____

Integration Requirements: _____

12. Can you provide a containerized version of the TOE (e.g., Docker, Kubernetes)?

Yes - specify format: _____

No - explain why: _____

2.2 Computing Infrastructure Requirements

13. Operating system requirements:

Linux (specify distribution and version): _____

Windows (specify version): _____

macOS (specify version): _____

Container-based (OS-agnostic)

Other (please specify): _____

Minimum hardware specifications:

CPU:

Architecture: _____

Cores: _____

	<p>Clock speed: _____</p> <p>Memory (RAM):</p> <p>Minimum: _____ GB</p> <p>Recommended: _____ GB</p> <p>Storage:</p> <p>Minimum: _____ GB</p> <p>Type (SSD/HDD): _____</p> <p>IOPS requirements: _____</p> <p>GPU Requirements:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not required</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Required - specify model/specifications: _____</p> <p>Network:</p> <p>Bandwidth requirements: _____</p> <p>Latency requirements: _____</p> <p>Special network configurations: _____</p>
14.	<p>Does the TOE have any special computing-infrastructure requirement? (e.g., dedicated networks, air-gapped environments, specific security zones)</p> <p>_____</p>

Section 3: API and Interface Specifications

3.1 Primary APIs

15.	<p>What APIs does the TOE expose for testing and evaluation?</p> <p>For each API, provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • API name/purpose • Protocol (REST, gRPC, GraphQL, etc.) • Data formats (JSON, XML, etc.) • Authentication method • API version <p>API 1:</p> <p>Name: _____</p> <p>Protocol: _____</p> <p>Format: _____</p> <p>Authentication: _____</p> <p>Version: _____</p> <p>Documentation URL: _____</p>
-----	---

	<i>Add additional APIs as needed</i>
16.	Does the TOE provide an audit logging API? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (describe below) <input type="checkbox"/> No If YES, describe the audit logging API functionality: _____
3.2 Integration APIs	
17.	What MLOps platform APIs does the TOE integrate with? List the external APIs/platforms the TOE connects to: 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____
18.	Does the TOE support standard MLOps interfaces? <input type="checkbox"/> MLflow <input type="checkbox"/> Kubeflow <input type="checkbox"/> TensorFlow Extended (TFX) <input type="checkbox"/> Apache Airflow <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please list): _____
3.3 Data Exchange Formats	
19.	What data formats does the TOE support for input/output? <input type="checkbox"/> JSON <input type="checkbox"/> XML <input type="checkbox"/> CSV <input type="checkbox"/> Parquet <input type="checkbox"/> Protocol Buffers <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please list): _____
20.	Are schema definitions available for all data exchanges? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - provide documentation reference: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Partial - specify what's available: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No
Section 4: Intermediate Results and Testing Facilitation	

4.1 Audit Trail and Logging	
21.	<p>Does the TOE maintain auditable records of all compliance activities?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, and a complete audit trail can be extracted (showing the timestamp for each event and the identity of the entity that triggered it)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, but a complete audit trail cannot be extracted.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
22.	<p>What information is captured in audit logs?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> User actions</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> System decisions</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Data access events</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Configuration changes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Compliance check results</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Timestamp information</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Source IP/user identification</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (please list): _____</p>
23.	<p>What is the format of audit logs?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Structured (JSON/XML)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Plain text</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Database records</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (please list): _____</p>
24.	<p>Can audit logs be exported for analysis during testing?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes - format: _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
4.2 Diagnostic and Debug Capabilities	
25.	<p>Can the TOE output intermediate processing steps?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes - specify which steps: _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
26.	<p>Does the TOE provide performance metrics during operation?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Response time</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Throughput</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Resource utilization (CPU, memory)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Error rates</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (please list): _____</p>

4.3 Compliance Validation Outputs

27.	<p>What specific compliance validations can the TOE perform?</p> <p>List each validation type and its output:</p> <p>1. GDPR compliance check - Output: _____</p> <p>2. Data Governance Act compliance - Output: _____</p> <p>3. AI Act requirements - Output: _____</p> <p>4. Other: _____ - Output: _____</p>
28.	<p>Does the TOE provide pass/fail determinations for compliance checks?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes - with confidence scores</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes - binary pass/fail only</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No - provides metrics only</p>
29.	<p>Can the TOE identify specific non-compliance issues?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes - with detailed explanations</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes - with error codes only</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>

Section 5: Data Security and Privacy Features

5.1 Authentication and Authorization

30.	<p>What authentication mechanisms does the TOE support?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Username/password</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> API keys</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> OAuth 2.0</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> SAML</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Multi-factor authentication (MFA)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Certificate-based authentication</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p>
31.	<p>What authorization model does the TOE implement?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Role-Based Access Control (RBAC)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Attribute-Based Access Control (ABAC)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Access Control Lists (ACL)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p>
32.	<p>Can test user accounts with specific privileges be created for evaluation purposes?</p>

	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
33.	Does the TOE support single sign-on (SSO)? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (specify protocol): _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No
5.2 Data Protection	
34.	Does the TOE process or store Personally Identifiable Information (PII)? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (proceed to 35) <input type="checkbox"/> No (proceed to 38)
35.	If YES, what types of PII are processed? <input type="checkbox"/> Names <input type="checkbox"/> Email addresses <input type="checkbox"/> IP addresses <input type="checkbox"/> Biometric data <input type="checkbox"/> Financial information <input type="checkbox"/> Health data <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): _____
36.	How is PII protected? <input type="checkbox"/> Encryption at rest (specify algorithm): _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Encryption in transit (specify protocol/version): _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Pseudonymization <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymization <input type="checkbox"/> Data masking <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): _____
37.	Is the TOE GDPR-compliant in its data handling? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - certified/validated <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - self-attested <input type="checkbox"/> Under assessment <input type="checkbox"/> No
38.	Does the TOE implement data minimization principles? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (describe): _____ <input type="checkbox"/> No

5.3 Data Isolation and Segregation	
39.	Does the TOE support multi-tenancy? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
40.	If multi-tenant, how is data isolation ensured? <input type="checkbox"/> Separate databases per tenant <input type="checkbox"/> Schema-level separation <input type="checkbox"/> Row-level security <input type="checkbox"/> Encryption with tenant-specific keys <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
Section 6: Declaration and Attestation (For ITF use only)	
Received by: _____	
Date received: _____	
Completeness check: <input type="checkbox"/> Complete <input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete (details: _____)	
Initial assessment: <input type="checkbox"/> Ready for testing <input type="checkbox"/> Additional information required <input type="checkbox"/> Not ready	
Assigned evaluator: _____	
Notes: _____	

4.5 ENERGY

This section includes a sample questionnaire to determine the readiness for evaluation of an AI product in the domain of electric-power generation and consumption. Such AI products are used by *energy communities* to predict the generation and consumption of electrical power in the respective communities.

4.5.1 Instructions for completing the questionnaire

In connection with your request to evaluate your AI product, please complete the following questionnaire, to help us determine if the TOE is ready for evaluation.

For the multiple-choice questions, please select all applicable options, and for the open-text questions, please provide complete but concise answers. Please fill in the questionnaire to the best of your ability. This questionnaire will form the basis for further discussions between you and the ITF.

4.5.2 Terms and Abbreviations

Term/Abbreviation	Definition
API	Application Programming Interface
CPU	Central Processing Unit

GPU	Graphics Processing Unit
gRPC	Remote Procedure Call framework proposed by Google
HDD	Hard disk drive
JSON	Javascript Object Notation
REST	Representational State Transfer
SDK	Software Development Kit
SSD	Solid State Drive
TOE	Target of Evaluation (The AI product to be evaluated)
URL	Universal Resource Locator
XML	eXtensible Markup Language

4.5.3 Questionnaire

Section 1: General Information	
1.1 Technology provider Information	
1.	Legal name of organization: _____
2.	Primary contact person: Name: _____ Title: _____ Email: _____
3.	Technical contact person (if different): Name: _____ Title: _____ Email: _____
4.	Country of establishment: _____
1.2 TOE Information	
5.	TOE product name: _____

6.	TOE version number: _____
7.	TOE brief description (max 500 words): [Open text]
8.	Provide a high-level description of the TOE's functionality, and the compliance checks it performs. _____

Section 2: Observability and Transparency

9. In the following table, provide the complete list of input variables required by the TOE. (Add as many rows to the table as necessary.)

Variable name	Data type	Range

10. In the following table, provide the complete list of outputs produced by the TOE for each input. (Add as many rows to the table as necessary.)

Output name	Data type	Range

Can you provide the TOE in the form of an SDK that the testers could use to implement their own test-bench?

Yes

No

Section 3: User-interfaces and Documentation

11. What APIs does the TOE expose for testing and evaluation?

For each API, provide:

- API name/purpose
- Protocol (REST, gRPC, GraphQL, etc.)
- Data formats (JSON, XML, etc.)
- Authentication method
- API version

API 1:
Name: _____

	<p>Protocol: _____</p> <p>Format: _____</p> <p>Authentication: _____</p> <p>Version: _____</p> <p>Documentation URL: _____</p> <p><i>Add additional APIs as necessary</i></p>
Section 4: Deployment and Reproducibility	
12	<p>Can you provide the TOE in the form of a SDK that the testers could use to implement their own test-bench?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
13.	<p>Specify the computational environment required for using the SDK:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Linux. Specify Linux version(s): _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Windows. Specify version(s): _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other. Please specify OS and version: _____</p>
14.	<p>Can you provide the TOE in a virtualization environment (e.g., Docker or VirtualBox)?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If Yes, which one? (please provide details) : _____</p>
15.	<p>Minimum hardware specifications:</p> <p>CPU:</p> <p>Architecture: _____</p> <p>Cores: _____</p> <p>Clock speed: _____</p> <p>Memory (RAM):</p> <p>Minimum: _____ GB</p> <p>Recommended: _____ GB</p> <p>Storage:</p> <p>Minimum: _____ GB</p> <p>Type (SSD/HDD): _____</p> <p>GPU Requirements:</p>

	<input type="checkbox"/> Not required <input type="checkbox"/> Required - specify model/specifications: _____
Section 5: Evaluation Support	
16.	Can the TOE be operated on a standalone computer without Internet access? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
17.	Does the TOE save any file with intermediate results during the evaluation? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, then does the TOE include functionality to delete all intermediate files? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
18.	Is adequate documentation available on how to operate the TOE and SDK correctly? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, please add the URL to the documentation or attach the documentation to the questionnaire, if the resource is only available offline: Documentation resource: _____
Section 6: Declaration and Attestation (For ITF use only)	
Questionnaire Version: 1.0	
Received by: _____	
Date received: _____	
Completeness check: <input type="checkbox"/> Complete <input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete (details: _____)	
Initial assessment: <input type="checkbox"/> Ready for testing <input type="checkbox"/> Additional information required <input type="checkbox"/> Not ready	
Assigned evaluator: _____	
Notes: _____ _____	

5 CONCLUSIONS

For AI products designated as high risk under the EU AI Act, assessment of conformance to the AI Act may require an evaluation report prepared by an independent testing facility (ITF). In such cases, when the technology provider of the AI product contacts an ITF to perform the necessary evaluation, the first step taken by the ITF will be to determine whether the AI product in question is ready for evaluation. Readiness for evaluation implies that the AI product to be tested, formally referred to as the Target of Evaluation (TOE) should be configured to return all the intermediate results that would be analysed during the evaluation process. To determine the readiness for evaluation of a TOE, the ITF would require the technology provider to complete a questionnaire.

The purpose of this document is to provide a template that ITFs may use to construct a readiness assessment questionnaire for a new evaluation scheme in a given AI application domain. In this report we list the main components that such a questionnaire should include, namely:

1. Introduction, covering how the questionnaire should be completed
2. Details about the technology provider
3. Details about the TOE
4. Questions related to observability and transparency
5. Questions about user-interfaces and documentation
6. Questions about deployment and reproducibility
7. Questions about testing support

The document concludes with a section containing sample questionnaires pertaining to different AI application domains, namely, Biometrics, Health, IT, Finance, and Energy. These application domains correspond to some of the Pilots to be conducted in the CERTAIN project.