United Nations Development Programme
Programul Națiunilor Unite pentru Dezvoltare

Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

RfP25/03147: IMPLEMENTATION OF HEAD END SYSTEM (HES) AND METER DATA MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (MDMS) PLATFORM IN 1+1 CONFIGURATION (2 LOTS)

Amendment no. 2 – Clarifications to bidder's inquiries

Date: **24/12/2025**

Subject: Implementation of Head End System (HES) and Meter Data Management System (MDMS) platform in 1+1 configuration (2 lots)

Dear Sir/Madam,

UNDP is hereby amending the following:

1. **Clarifications** to Suppliers' inquiries are published, as per the below:

No.	SECTION/TYPE OF CLARIFICATION	QUESTION	CLARIFICATION
1	COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES, PROTOCOLS & DEVICE COMPATIBILITY	Could PED provide complete details of meter brand, model, firmware version, communication protocol (G3-PLC, PRIME, OSGP, RF) and quantities for each listed meter type?	Detailed meter inventory (brand and model/series) is clearly listed in the p.7.7, all other details will be provided to the awarded bidder during inception phase. For proposal purposes, assume mixed deployment of all listed brands with PRIME/G3-PLC predominant. Bidders should demonstrate firm compatibility capability of the proposed HES+MDMS platforms for all listed meter types regardless of quantities.
2	COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES, PROTOCOLS & DEVICE COMPATIBILITY	Regarding the DLMS/COSEM and OSGP security suites implementation (authentication, encryption). Considering that OSGP uses DLMS /COSEM, only DLMS/ COSEN documentation will be required?	DLMS/COSEM documentation is sufficient as OSGP utilizes DLMS/COSEM at the application layer. Focus on DLMS/COSEM implementation with OSGP transport considerations.
3	COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES, PROTOCOLS & DEVICE COMPATIBILITY	Regarding the meter brand combability, it is possible to share and inform the installed base with: Quantity of Meter brand and models with communication type installed in the field, Quantity of DCU or/and Gateways brand with models and communication type installed in the field.	Actual deployment details (upon contract signature) will be shared with selected contractor. Proposal should demonstrate scalability and multi-vendor capability independent of specific quantities.
4	COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES, PROTOCOLS & DEVICE COMPATIBILITY	There are several documentations required at Offer evaluation stage and documentation to be provided to Evidence the compatibility meter brand. These documents should be provided by the manufactured of the software HES? If not, please clarify.	Bidder provides HES platform documentation. Meter manufacturer documentation (if required) will be facilitated by Beneficiary during implementation.

5	COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES, PROTOCOLS & DEVICE COMPATIBILITY	There are several documentations required at Offer evaluation stage and documentation to be provided to Evidence the compatibility meter brand. These documents should be provided and complemented by meter and HW manufacturer?	Meter-specific compatibility technical documentation must be justified by Bidder as the party that propose its technological platform as solution for HES+MDMS that meets requirements.
6	COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES, PROTOCOLS & DEVICE COMPATIBILITY	Will DCUs expose standard APIs, DLMS/COSEM interfaces, or proprietary manufacturer-specific protocols for communication with the HES?	DCUs expose various interfaces including standard DLMS/COSEM and manufacturer-specific APIs. HES must accommodate multiple interface types as discovered during inception phase and adjusted/integrated accordingly by the selected contractor during implementation.
7	COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES, PROTOCOLS & DEVICE COMPATIBILITY	Should the HES implement the full PRIME/G3/OSGP communication stacks, or only adapters to DCU-provided interfaces?	HES should implement protocol adapters for DCU-provided interfaces rather than full communication stacks. DCUs handle PLC layer communications.
8	COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES, PROTOCOLS & DEVICE COMPATIBILITY	Could UNDP clarify whether the HES–DCU communication using the G3-PLC protocol will depend on the specific implementation made by each DCU manufacturer (stack version, APIs, firmware, exposed services)? If so, can UNDP confirm that interoperability will be aligned with the capabilities and interfaces provided by each DCU vendor?	HES must adapt to each manufacturer's implementation. Detailed protocol specifications will be identified by selected contractor directly during inception phase, and coordinated with DCU vendors during implementation phase. Beneficiary will facilitate vendor cooperation.
9	COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES, PROTOCOLS & DEVICE COMPATIBILITY	Could UNDP confirm whether OSGP interoperability depends on each manufacturer's implementation (DCU model, NIC, object model, proprietary services, firmware)? Additionally, should the bidder assume that the HES will integrate based on the APIs and OSGP interfaces that each DCU vendor provides?	HES must adapt to each manufacturer's implementation. Detailed protocol specifications will be identified by selected contractor directly during inception phase, and coordinated with DCU vendors during implementation phase. Beneficiary will facilitate vendor cooperation.
10	COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES, PROTOCOLS & DEVICE COMPATIBILITY	If DCU manufacturers use proprietary extensions of PRIME, G3-PLC, or OSGP, will vendors provide full protocol documentation, SDKs, test tools or decoding guides to ensure interoperability with the HES?	HES must adapt to each manufacturer's implementation. Detailed protocol specifications will be identified by selected contractor directly during inception phase, and coordinated with DCU vendors during implementation phase. Beneficiary will facilitate vendor cooperation.
11	COMMUNICATION MODES (PULL/PUSH)	Could UNDP clarify whether DCU communication with the HES will support a "pull" model, where the HES actively requests meter data, status, events or actions from DCUs? If so, will detailed command lists and request/response structures be provided by each DCU manufacturer?	HES must support both pull and push modes. Assume hybrid architecture with scheduled data collection (push) and on-demand queries (pull). Specific DCU capabilities will be mapped by selected contractor during inception phase and duly assured during implementation phase. Design for flexibility.
12	COMMUNICATION MODES (PULL/PUSH)	Could UNDP clarify whether DCUs will also support a "push" communication mode, sending scheduled readings, mass-collected data and real-time events (e.g. alarms, outages, fraud) autonomously to the HES? If so, could UNDP specify the expected volume, frequency and format of such push notifications?	HES must support both pull and push modes. Assume hybrid architecture with scheduled data collection (push) and on-demand queries (pull). Specific DCU capabilities will be mapped by selected contractor during inception phase and duly assured during implementation phase. Design for flexibility.
13	COMMUNICATION MODES (PULL/PUSH)	Should the bidder assume a hybrid PUSH/PULL architecture for G3-PLC/PRIME/OSGP communication, similar to other AMI frameworks (e.g., STG-DC), or must the bidder strictly support the model defined by each DCU manufacturer? This clarification is essential to accurately size communication load, storage, concurrency and system performance.	HES must support both pull and push modes. Assume hybrid architecture with scheduled data collection (push) and on-demand queries (pull). Specific DCU capabilities will be mapped by selected contractor during inception phase and duly assured during implementation phase. Design for flexibility.
14	DEVICE MANAGEMENT & DCU RESPONSIBILITIES	The RFP defines detailed requirements for smart meter firmware upgrade (FOTA), but does not specify any firmware upgrade process for DCUs. Could UNDP clarify whether DCU firmware updates are in scope for the HES, or whether DCU firmware maintenance will	DCU firmware updates are out of scope. Focus on meter firmware management through DCU interfaces.

		remain under the responsibility of the DCU manufacturers and the DSOs?	
15	METERING DATA GRANULARITY	Could UNDP confirm the required granularity of the meter data to be collected (e.g., monthly billing readings, daily readings, hourly or 15-minute load profiles)? This is necessary to size storage, processing, communication and database performance for the HES/MDMS system.	System must support at least: 15-minute intervals (standard), hourly, daily, and monthly readings. Configure per meter type/customer category. Load profiles primarily at 15-minute intervals.
16	METERING DATA GRANULARITY	Could UNDP clarify the profile interval (e.g., 15-min / 30-min / 60-min) for load profile collection, and whether multiple profile types per meter are required (e.g., LP, PQ profiles)?	System must support at least: 15-minute intervals (standard), hourly, daily, and monthly readings. Configure per meter type/customer category. Load profiles primarily at 15-minute intervals.
17	SYSTEM INTEGRATION (ADMS, GIS, BILLING, CMS, ERP)	Could UNDP provide complete technical specifications (APIs, endpoints, protocols, versioning) for ADMS, GIS, ERP, CMS and Billing systems to allow accurate integration effort estimation?	High-level integration requirements are defined in the ToR. Detailed API specifications will be provided during inception phase. Propose standard integration patterns (REST, SOAP, file-based) - check for more details: HEST-004 RESTful API architecture with OpenAPI documentation ++ HES-T-009 Web services (SOAP/REST) for system integration +++ NFRAPI-01RESTful APIs supporting JSON and XML data formats
18	SYSTEM INTEGRATION (ADMS, GIS, BILLING, CMS, ERP)	The future CMS ("TBD – 2026") does not yet exist. How should integration effort be estimated? Will interface standards be defined?	Provide integration framework and standard interfaces. CMS specifications will be defined by 2026. Include configurable integration layer in design.
19	INFRASTRUCTURE, CLOUD DEPLOYMENT & SECURITY (HSM, PKI)	Will the solution be deployed on-premise, private cloud or public cloud? Who provides infrastructure (compute, storage, network, load balancers)?	On-premise deployment at Beneficiary data centers. Infrastructure provided by Beneficiary. Contractor supplies software and configuration.
20	INFRASTRUCTURE, CLOUD DEPLOYMENT & SECURITY (HSM, PKI)	Should the bidder supply the HSM, full PKI infrastructure, and certification services, or will these be provided by the DSO/UNDP?	HSM delivery is optional and out of scope. But, if proposed, specify details in technical and financial offers, and if so - include all software licensing for HA in financial proposal. PKI infrastructure coordination will be at the inception phase with Beneficiary.
21	INFRASTRUCTURE, CLOUD DEPLOYMENT & SECURITY (HSM, PKI)	Should redundant licensing, DR nodes and HA infrastructure be included in the Financial Proposal, or only technical capability?	HSM delivery is optional and out of scope. But, if proposed, specify details in technical and financial offers, and if so - include all software licensing for HA in financial proposal. PKI infrastructure coordination will be at the inception phase with Beneficiary. + check HESFR-029 Support for Hardware Security Modules (HSM)
22	TIMELINE, PHASES AND CONTRACT DURATION	Could UNDP confirm the expected contract signing date, as the 10-month execution period depends entirely on this date?	At this stage, the contract signing date cannot be confirmed, as it is contingent upon the completion of the evaluation and award process in accordance with UNDP procurement procedures. Bidders are therefore requested to base their implementation schedules on the indicative timelines and durations specified in the RFP, which are defined in months. The assignment duration up to full system commissioning shall not exceed ten (10) months from the contract signing date. While the RFP indicates that the assignment must be completed no later than 31 December 2026, this date should be considered indicative and tentative in light of the

			extension of the bid submission deadline to 15 January 2026.
23	TIMELINE, PHASES AND CONTRACT DURATION	Is there any flexibility regarding the maximum 10-month execution period if award or contract signature is delayed?	The execution periods indicated in the RFP and Annexes are indicative and form the basis for bidders' proposed implementation plans. Any adjustments, if required, would be addressed contractually following award and are subject to UNDP approval.
24	LICENSING, CAPACITY, IP RIGHTS	Must licensing capacity cover 55,000 endpoints from day one, even if meters are not yet deployed?	License for contracted capacity (55,000) from day one to enable phased deployment without licensing constraints.
25	LICENSING, CAPACITY, IP RIGHTS	Does source-code delivery apply only to custom developments or also to configuration of standard product modules?	Applies only to custom developments and configurations, not core platform code.
26	KEY PERSONNEL, FORM H & FORM I	Can proposed experts be partially allocated to other projects, provided full availability is ensured for required tasks? Is there a minimum availability percentage?	Proposed experts may be partially allocated to other projects, provided that their availability fully meets the requirements of the assignment and all required tasks and milestones can be delivered as specified in the RFP. No minimum availability percentage is prescribed. In the case a bidder applies for both Lots, separate teams with distinct qualifications and experience must be provided for each Lot. A team member (except the Team Leader) who is not fully engaged in one Lot may be proposed as Key Personnel for the other Lot, provided this is fully justified. The bidder must clearly demonstrate availability, workload allocation, and non-overlap of responsibilities, supported by an appropriate justification and a Gantt chart.
27	KEY PERSONNEL, FORM H & FORM I	Will UNDP conduct mandatory interviews to validate Key Personnel? What is the evaluation weight of such interviews?	UNDP will not conduct interviews for the evaluation of Key Personnel. The evaluation committee will assess the proposed CVs and supporting documentation strictly in accordance with the requirements of the solicitation and the minimum evaluation criteria specified for each position in the RFP.
28	KEY PERSONNEL, FORM H & FORM I	Can one expert be proposed for LOT 1 and LOT 2 if workloads do not overlap? For example, there is no overlap between the Testing and Validation phase in LOT1 and LOT2, assuming the same kick-off date.	In the case of bidding for both Lots, separate teams with distinct qualifications and experience are required, as specified in the RFP. Any proposed overlap of team members (excluding the Team Leader) must be fully justified, supported by a clear workload allocation and a Gantt chart demonstrating no overlap of critical activities.
29	COMPLIANCE MATRICES, EVIDENCE REQUIREMENTS & DOCUMENTATION	Must the bidder provide documentary evidence for every requirement in the matrix (screenshots, certificates, architecture diagrams), or only for critical items?	Lack of information for the mandatory requirements for confirmation of compliance may lead to disqualification of interested bidders.
30	COMPLIANCE MATRICES, EVIDENCE REQUIREMENTS & DOCUMENTATION	Should the contractor use UNDP's reporting templates (weekly/monthly), or may existing internal formats be used?	The reporting requirements are defined in the Terms of Reference within the RFP's solicitation document, specifically under Section D – Reporting Instructions & Institutional Arrangements. The Contractor shall report directly to the UNDP Project Manager. The Contractor shall submit weekly progress reports, monthly status reports, phase completion reports, and a final project report, in accordance with the

			timelines, content, language, and formats specified in the Terms of Reference.
31	WARRANTY, SUPPORT & OPERATIONAL CONTINUITY	Is post-deployment support required 24/7, 12/5, or another minimum service level?	Strongly recommended for the Bidders to consult and conduct accordingly for offer preparation with specified SLA requirements - 31. SUPPORT LEVEL DEFINITIONS AND USE CASES FOR HES/MDMS. These requirements will be part of the Contract and mandatory obligations for the selected Contractor for included 12 months support and maintenance.
32	WARRANTY, SUPPORT & OPERATIONAL CONTINUITY	Should the bidder include the estimated cost of the 60-month operational continuity in the Financial Proposal, or only a declaration of availability?	In line with the RFP and the relevant Annexes, bidders are required to submit an Operational Continuity Declaration confirming a minimum five (5) years support commitment, including End-of-Support (EOS) and End-of-Life (EOL). This requirement is a declaration statement and is not subject to pricing and shall not be included in the Financial Proposal.
33	PROJECT DELIVERY MODEL & TRAVEL REQUIREMENTS	Could UNDP confirm whether the project may be delivered fully remotely, as no on-site activities are explicitly required in the RFP (including workshops, training, FAT/SAT/UAT or support)?	As the RFP does not explicitly define the location of performance, bidders are invited to propose the delivery model they consider most effective to meet the requirements set out in the Terms of Reference. Where the proposed methodology includes on-site activities, all associated travel and accommodation costs must be clearly detailed and included in the financial proposal, in accordance with the RFP documentation provisions. A hybrid delivery model is proposed, with mandatory on-site activities including project kickoff, deployment in the production environment, critical workshops, acceptance testing, and knowledge transfer.
34	PROJECT DELIVERY MODEL & TRAVEL REQUIREMENTS	If any on-site visits in Moldova are expected, could UNDP please clarify the number, purpose and duration of such missions, and indicate whether travel and accommodation costs should be included in the financial proposal?	As the RFP does not explicitly define the location of performance, bidders are invited to propose the delivery model they consider most effective to meet the requirements set out in the Terms of Reference. Where the proposed methodology includes on-site activities, all associated travel and accommodation costs must be clearly detailed and included in the financial proposal, in accordance with the RFP documentation provisions. A hybrid delivery model is proposed, with mandatory on-site activities including project kickoff, deployment in the production environment, critical workshops, acceptance testing, and knowledge transfer.
35	LEGACY SYSTEMS & DATA MIGRATION	Does UNDP confirm whether any legacy HES/MDMS system or meter management platform exists, whose historical data or configuration should be migrated? If so, could UNDP provide details (data model, volume, format, interfaces)?	As per Annex 1 – LOT 1 PED Technical Specifications, Section 27, the awarded bidder will be responsible for data migration from the Beneficiary's existing systems. However, detailed specifications of the legacy systems (including data model, volume, format, and interfaces) are not considered relevant in the RFP. Bidders are requested to describe their proposed technical methodology and approach for data migration and to state any assumptions made in their technical proposal. The financial proposal should include the costs for performing data

			migration based on these assumptions. Further details on the legacy systems will be provided to the awarded contractor during the project implementation phase.
36	ROLES & SYSTEM RESPONSIBILITIES CLARIFICATION	Could UNDP clarify the exact functional role of the CMS/ERP described in the Business Processes? Several steps assign CMS responsibilities commonly associated with an MDMS (e.g., exporting consumption indices, technical parameters, meter data to suppliers and to MDM). Should CMS be understood as a legacy billing/data hub system, or will MDMS become the authoritative repository for AMI meter data as defined in the Technical Specifications?	MDMS is the authoritative source for smart meter data. ERP/CMS handle customer/billing master data. Business process diagrams show current state; to-be processes will optimize around MDMS as central repository. Detailed data ownership matrix to be defined during inception and TO-BE design phase by selected contractor.
37	BUSINESS PROCESSES – DATA OWNERSHIP	Business Processes describe ERP as the system exporting meter readings, consumption indices and technical parameters to the MDM, including data from legacy (non-smart) meters. Could UNDP clarify whether ERP is intended to be the authoritative source of meter data (smart and legacy), or whether HES → MDM should remain the primary AMI data flow? Please confirm which system is the master for consumption data.	MDMS is the authoritative source for smart meter data. ERP/CMS handle customer/billing master data. Business process diagrams show current state; to-be processes will optimize around MDMS as central repository. Detailed data ownership matrix to be defined during inception and TO-BE design phase by selected contractor.
38	BUSINESS PROCESSES & MDM REQUIREMENTS	Should the MDM detect inconsistencies between ERP commissioning data (meter type, installation details, initial readings) and HES data, and if discrepancies exist, must the MDM trigger alerts toward Billing ES and ERP?	MDMS is the authoritative source for smart meter data. ERP/CMS handle customer/billing master data. Business process diagrams show current state; to-be processes will optimize around MDMS as central repository. Detailed data ownership matrix to be defined during inception and TO-BE design phase by selected contractor.
39	METER REPLACEMENT & DATA CONTINUITY	How should the MDMS handle consumption history continuity during meter replacement, including linking old/new meter IDs, managing overlapping intervals, and addressing gaps or inconsistencies?	MDMS is the authoritative source for smart meter data. ERP/CMS handle customer/billing master data. Business process diagrams show current state; to-be processes will optimize around MDMS as central repository. Detailed data ownership matrix to be defined during inception and TO-BE design phase by selected contractor.
40	MANUAL METER READING & FIELD OPERATIONS	Could UNDP confirm that the MDMS is not expected to generate or manage reading routes or itineraries for classic (non-smart) meter readings, and that such operational planning will remain within ERP/WFM or field applications? The MDMS should only receive and validate manual readings, not plan or orchestrate field activities.	MDMS is the authoritative source for smart meter data. ERP/CMS handle customer/billing master data. Business process diagrams show current state; to-be processes will optimize around MDMS as central repository. Detailed data ownership matrix to be defined during inception and TO-BE design phase by selected contractor.
41	MANUAL METER READING & EXCEPTION MANAGEMENT	Should manual meter readings be ingested directly into the MDMS, or should they flow first through ERP as depicted in the Business Processes?	MDMS is the authoritative source for smart meter data. ERP/CMS handle customer/billing master data. Business process diagrams show current state; to-be processes will optimize around MDMS as central repository. Detailed data ownership matrix to be defined during inception and TO-BE design phase by selected contractor.
42	LOAD PROFILE & DATA RETENTION REQUIREMENTS	Could UNDP clarify retention periods for load profiles and whether MDMS must store raw interval data, aggregated data, or both?	MDMS is the authoritative source for smart meter data. ERP/CMS handle customer/billing master data. Business process diagrams show current state; to-be processes will optimize around MDMS as central repository. Detailed data ownership matrix to be defined during inception and TO-BE design phase by selected contractor.

43	NEW CLIENT ENROLLMENT IN MDM	There are several references to "The MDM system receives the data exported by the DSO ERP", is this data 'exported' via API exposed by the MDM or should the MDM consider the importation of data files created/exported by the ERP?	Consider to implement flexible integration supporting both API and file-based exchanges. Specific methods per system will be determined during inception phase and dully assured during implementation phase by selected contractor.
44	MONTHLY CLOSING	This requirement indicates that "This report is transmitted to each producer…", is this report sent electronically via API of the producers' systems or should it be exported as a file by the MDM?	Consider to implement flexible integration supporting both API and file-based exchanges. Specific methods per system will be determined during inception phase and dully assured during implementation phase by selected contractor.
45	DATA MANAGEMENT AND REGISTRATION OF CLASSIC MEASUREMENT AND CONTROL DEVICES IN MDM, ITEM 9	"MDM automatically calculates the electricity consumed and losses associated with classic measurement and control devices, using data collected by reading teams. These calculations are integrated into the MDM system, ensuring accurate reporting of consumption and losses for each CPN". Please clarify how UNDP expect this calculation, as the only available data is the reading coming from the Reading Team.	Consider to implement flexible integration supporting both API and file-based exchanges. Specific methods per system will be determined during inception phase and dully assured during implementation phase by selected contractor.
46	NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (NMS)	Could UNDP clarify whether a full Network Management System (NMS) for G3-PLC/PRIME/OSGP is expected as part of the HES scope? The RFP does not specify responsibilities for network topology management, noise/interference analysis, routing tree monitoring, KPI dashboards or link-quality supervision, which are typically handled by an NMS. Should bidders assume these functions are out of scope unless explicitly stated?	Basic network monitoring included in HES. Advanced NMS features (topology management, link quality analysis) are out of scope unless specifically proposed as value-add.
47	TELCO & COMMUNICATION DEPENDENCIES	Could UNDP confirm which telecommunications operators (TELCOs) are currently used by PED and RED-Nord for WAN connectivity (e.g., DCU backhaul, VPNs, APNs, fixed/mobile links)? Additionally, will the TELCO services (SIMs, APNs, MPLS/VPN, connectivity contracts) be provided by the DSO/UNDP, or are they expected to be included and managed by the bidder?	DSO provides all telecommunications services (SIM cards, VPN, connectivity). Contractor responsible for application-level configuration only.
48	MAINTENANCE	Could UNDP clarify whether database administration activities (e.g. database monitoring, tuning, backups, patching) are included within the scope of the Maintenance Team, or whether these responsibilities remain under the Customer/DSO infrastructure teams?	Selected Contractor will be responsible for supporting HES/MDMS applications only in accordance with SLA provisions specified in the ToR. Infrastructure support (DB admin, network, security) - by Beneficiary teams. Bidder must also include appropriate enhancement effort in financial effort to cover SLA provisions- 31.4 LOW (P4) - MINOR ISSUES OR ENHANCEMENTS, having the knowledge and proper experience for the prospect enhancements for the proposed HES+MDMS solution during 12 months after roll-out.
49	MAINTENANCE	Could UNDP clarify whether the contractor is expected to provide 24/7 support and incident resolution for all critical system issues, including those not directly caused by the Metering/HES/MDMS applications, or whether responsibility is limited to issues within the contractor's solution scope?	Selected Contractor will be responsible for supporting HES/MDMS applications only in accordance with SLA provisions specified in the ToR. Infrastructure support (DB admin, network, security) - by Beneficiary teams. Bidder must also include appropriate enhancement effort in financial effort to cover SLA provisions- 31.4 LOW (P4) - MINOR ISSUES OR ENHANCEMENTS, having the knowledge and proper experience for the prospect enhancements for the proposed HES+MDMS solution during 12 months after roll-out.
50	MAINTENANCE	When "first-line support" is referenced in the RFP, could UNDP confirm whether this refers specifically to	Selected Contractor will be responsible for supporting HES/MDMS applications only in

		the Metering Maintenance Team? Additionally, in the case of security incidents or breaches not originating from the application layer, could UNDP clarify whether such incidents fall within the contractor's support responsibilities or remain under the Customer's cybersecurity operations?	accordance with SLA provisions specified in the ToR. Infrastructure support (DB admin, network, security) - by Beneficiary teams. Bidder must also include appropriate enhancement effort in financial effort to cover SLA provisions- 31.4 LOW (P4) - MINOR ISSUES OR ENHANCEMENTS, having the knowledge and proper experience for the prospect enhancements for the proposed HES+MDMS solution during 12 months after roll-out.
51	MAINTENANCE	The RFP defines SLA timelines for enhancements. Could UNDP clarify whether a predefined annual effort (hours or budget) is allocated for enhancements? Additionally, could UNDP provide a clear definition of what is considered an "enhancement" versus corrective maintenance or configuration changes, possibly with examples?	Selected Contractor will be responsible for supporting HES/MDMS applications only in accordance with SLA provisions specified in the ToR. Infrastructure support (DB admin, network, security) - by Beneficiary teams. Bidder must also include appropriate enhancement effort in financial effort to cover SLA provisions- 31.4 LOW (P4) - MINOR ISSUES OR ENHANCEMENTS, having the knowledge and proper experience for the prospect enhancements for the proposed HES+MDMS solution during 12 months after roll-out.
52	MAINTENANCE	In cases where incidents are not caused by the Metering system (e.g. external systems, infrastructure, network or third-party components), could UNDP clarify whether the contractor is still required to comply with the same SLA response and resolution times, or whether such incidents are excluded from the contractor's SLA obligations?	Selected Contractor will be responsible for supporting HES/MDMS applications only in accordance with SLA provisions specified in the ToR. Infrastructure support (DB admin, network, security) - by Beneficiary teams. Bidder must also include appropriate enhancement effort in financial effort to cover SLA provisions- 31.4 LOW (P4) - MINOR ISSUES OR ENHANCEMENTS, having the knowledge and proper experience for the prospect enhancements for the proposed HES+MDMS solution during 12 months after roll-out.
53	COMMUNICATION MANAGEMENT / METER BRAND COMPATIBILITY	In the context of the PRIME communication standard, could you please confirm the mandatory STG-DC protocol version (example: 3.4) that the Head-End System (HES) must support?	It is recommended to support the latest STG-DC protocol version (currently v3.4) while ensuring backward compatibility with at least the three preceding versions. More precise details can be defined and validated directly with the Beneficiary by the selected Contractor during the inception phase.
54	COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES, PROTOCOLS & DEVICE COMPATIBILITY	Considering that the majority of the listed meters operate over PLC technologies (G3-PLC, PRIME, OSGP), and that in such architectures the Head-End System (HES) typically communicates with the meters through DCUs/concentrators — with meter behavior, firmware management, routing and PLC stack implementation being largely dependent on the specific DCU manufacturer, firmware version and exposed interfaces — could UNDP please clarify the following: 1.Is the HES expected to integrate directly with each individual smart meter model listed in Section 7.7, or is the integration expected to be performed via DCUs, with the HES relying on the protocols, APIs and services exposed by the DCU layer?	HES integrates primarily through DCUs using standard protocols. Direct meter integration evidence demonstrates protocol expertise. Detailed meter-specific testing during implementation phase, not required at offer stage. Focus for technical proposal(offer) on platform capabilities and integration framework.
55	COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES, PROTOCOLS & DEVICE COMPATIBILITY	Continuing from the previous one: 2.Given that the Offer documentation does not provide detailed information on the DCU landscape (manufacturers, models, firmware versions, supported PLC stacks, exposed APIs or proprietary services), could	HES integrates primarily through DCUs using standard protocols. Direct meter integration evidence demonstrates protocol expertise. Detailed meter-specific testing during implementation phase, not required at offer stage. Focus for technical

		UNDP clarify how bidders are expected to provide meter-level integration evidence that may, in practice, depend on DCU-specific implementations and configurations that are not yet defined?	proposal(offer) on platform capabilities and integration framework.
56	COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES, PROTOCOLS & DEVICE COMPATIBILITY	Continuing from the previous one: 3.Additionally, the RFP documentation does not explicitly specify whether all listed meter brands and models, despite using different communication technologies and stacks, are expected to implement the same DLMS/COSEM Companion Specifications (including object models, profiles and security suites). In this context, could UNDP confirm whether the term "meter model / technology stack" should be understood as a combination of meter brand, meter model, communication protocol and major firmware version? Furthermore, could UNDP clarify whether support for multiple firmware versions per meter model is expected to be included within the base integration scope?	HES integrates primarily through DCUs using standard protocols. Direct meter integration evidence demonstrates protocol expertise. Detailed meter-specific testing during implementation phase, not required at offer stage. Focus for technical proposal(offer) on platform capabilities and integration framework.
57	COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES, PROTOCOLS & DEVICE COMPATIBILITY	Continuing from the previous one: 4.Given this context, could UNDP clarify the rationale and scope of the extensive meter-level evidence requested at the Offer Evaluation Stage (e.g. test lab results, firmware upgrade tests, long-term stability tests, security validation), particularly when such evidence may be strongly influenced by DCU behavior, firmware versions and vendor-specific DLMS/PLC implementations that are outside the direct control of the HES provider?	HES integrates primarily through DCUs using standard protocols. Direct meter integration evidence demonstrates protocol expertise. Detailed meter-specific testing during implementation phase, not required at offer stage. Focus for technical proposal(offer) on platform capabilities and integration framework.
58	COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES, PROTOCOLS & DEVICE COMPATIBILITY	Continuing from the previous one: 5.Finally, could UNDP confirm whether full meter- and DCU-specific functional validation (including firmware upgrade tests, stability tests and performance benchmarks) is expected at the Offer stage, or whether such validations are intended to be executed during project phases such as FAT/SAT, once the actual DCU models, firmware versions, DLMS companions and network configurations are defined?	HES integrates primarily through DCUs using standard protocols. Direct meter integration evidence demonstrates protocol expertise. Detailed meter-specific testing during implementation phase, not required at offer stage. Focus for technical proposal(offer) on platform capabilities and integration framework.
59	COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES, PROTOCOLS & DEVICE COMPATIBILITY	Could RED-Nord provide complete details of meter brand, model, firmware version, communication protocol (G3-PLC, PRIME, OSGP, RF) and quantities for each listed meter type?	Detailed meter inventory (brand and model/series) is clearly listed in the p.7.7, all other details will be provided to the winning bidder during inception phase. For proposal purposes, assume mixed deployment of all listed brands with PRIME/G3-PLC predominant. Bidders should demonstrate firm compatibility capability of the proposed HES+MDMS platforms for all listed meter types regardless of quantities.
60	TIMELINE, PHASES AND CONTRACT DURATION	LOT 2 includes a 3-month design phase vs. 2 months in LOT 1. Must this difference be strictly respected?	The timelines specified in Annex 2 for LOT 2, including the 3-month design phase, represent the maximum duration of the respective activities and are expressed in months. Bidders shall not propose longer implementation periods. Proposals may indicate shorter durations, provided these are technically justified and consistent with the proposed methodology.

61	LICENSING, CAPACITY, IP RIGHTS	Must licensing capacity cover 45,000 endpoints from day one, even if meters are not yet deployed?	License for contracted capacity (45,000) from day one to enable phased deployment without licensing constraints.
62	METER REPLACEMENT & DATA CONTINUITY	Is the MDMS expected to reconcile end-of-life meter readings with new meter initial readings and flag discrepancies exceeding tolerance thresholds?	MDMS is the authoritative source for smart meter data. ERP/CMS handle customer/billing master data. Business process diagrams show current state; to-be processes will optimize around MDMS as central repository. Detailed data ownership matrix to be defined during inception and TO-BE design phase by selected contractor.
63	MANUAL METER READING & EXCEPTION MANAGEMENT	Is the MDMS responsible for merging manual readings with estimated values and generating exception/explanatory reports for Billing ES?	MDMS is the authoritative source for smart meter data. ERP/CMS handle customer/billing master data. Business process diagrams show current state; to-be processes will optimize around MDMS as central repository. Detailed data ownership matrix to be defined during inception and TO-BE design phase by selected contractor.
64	LOAD PROFILE & DATA RETENTION REQUIREMENTS	Should MDMS allow ad-hoc extraction of historical load profiles for regulatory audits as implied in the Business Processes?	MDMS is the authoritative source for smart meter data. ERP/CMS handle customer/billing master data. Business process diagrams show current state; to-be processes will optimize around MDMS as central repository. Detailed data ownership matrix to be defined during inception and TO-BE design phase by selected contractor.
65	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	With reference to the stated meter quantities 55,000 smart meters for Lot 1 (PED) and 45,000 smart meters for Lot 2 (RED-NORD), Please confirm the following: 1.1 number and types of registers to be read per meter (e.g., active/reactive energy, power, voltage, current, power quality, etc.), 1.2 confirm that the reading interval is 15 minutes, 1.3 specify if different registers have different reading intervals, 1.4 How many Direct Commands to Meters (DCTs/commands) need to be executed per day (e.g., connect/disconnect, parameter updates, firmware upgrades) 1.5 Please confirm that meter data must be stored in active storage for 18 months and archived for 6 years. 1.6 Please confirm whether data migration from existing systems is required as part of the scope. If applicable, kindly specify the expected data volume (e.g., estimated data size in GB/TB or number of records); or the historical data range to be migrated (e.g., number of years)	1.1) minimum Standard registers: Active/reactive energy (import/export), voltage, current, power factor, max demand. Additional PQ registers for capable meters, etc. - to be validated with Beneficiary during inception phase. 1.2) Confirmed: min. 15-minute standard interval. 1.3) Billing registers: monthly; Load profiles: 15-min; Events: real-time. 1.4) Estimate 1-2% daily command rate (connect/disconnect, config changes). 1.5) Confirmed: 18 months active, 6 years archived. 1.6) No data migration required - greenfield implementation.
66	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	The tender mentions integration with multiple existing Head-End Systems (HES), including third-party HES platforms and up to five integrations. Kindly list the specific HES systems that are to be integrated with the proposed solution. Also, please define any other HES functionalities beyond standard meter data collection.	MDMS must integrate with existing meter vendor HES platforms (e.g., ADD, NIK systems). Specific HES details to be provided during inception phase. Design for flexible multi-HES integration framework supporting up to 5 concurrent systems.
67	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	The tender requests submission of technical documentation (e.g., datasheets, protocol details, certifications) for the listed meter models. As a Head-End System (HES) and Meter Data Management System (MDMS) solution provider and not a meter manufacturer, we request confirmation that it is acceptable to instead demonstrate integration capability for each listed meter model (e.g., integration	Confirmed. Integration capability documentation is acceptable. Provide integration methodology, protocol support evidence, and reference deployments instead of manufacturer documents.

		methodology), rather than providing manufacturer-specific documents. Please confirm this approach is acceptable.	
68	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	Regarding requirement HES-FR-047 ("Real-time dashboard with key performance indicators") to ensure proper configuration and alignment with expectations, please clarify which specific KPIs are required to be included in the real-time dashboard. A list of expected KPIs and their definitions would be highly appreciated.	Core KPIs include i.e.: Collection success rate, communication availability, data completeness, command execution rate, system performance metrics. Detailed KPI to be defined and validated during design phase based on operational priorities.
69	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	Regarding requirement HES-FR-050 ("API for external analytics platforms") please confirm whether a summary API overview document (including high-level description, authentication methods, and sample endpoints) is sufficient for the proposal stage. The full OpenAPI documentation exceeds 500 pages and includes licensed interfaces not suitable for public sharing at this stage.	Confirmed. High-level API overview sufficient for proposal. Full OpenAPI documentation required during implementation phase only.
70	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	Regarding requirement MDMS-FR-016 ("Check meter support"), the meaning and context of this requirement are unclear. Kindly provide a detailed explanation of what is expected, including any relevant use cases or examples.	Check meters are reference meters installed for accuracy verification. MDMS must support variance analysis between standard and check meters, flagging discrepancies exceeding thresholds.
71	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	Regarding requirement MPP-004 ("Connection voltage level classification – HV/MV/LV"), we request further clarification on what is expected under this requirement. Kindly provide more details, including the intended use, classification logic, and reporting needs, along with any relevant use cases or examples.	Classify connection points as High Voltage (>35kV), Medium Voltage (1-35kV), or Low Voltage (<1kV) for reporting, loss calculation, and tariff application purposes, etc. - other details to be clarified and validated by selected contractor directly with Beneficiary during inception and design TO-BE phases.
72	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	Regarding requirement MPP-006 ("EIC Code support where applicable"), we request further clarification on the expected scope of EIC code handling. Please provide additional details, including use cases, required format standards, validation expectations, integration needs, and display requirements.	Energy Identification Code support for cross-border trading and market operations where applicable. Store, validate format, and include in market reports - other details to be clarified and validated by selected contractor directly with Beneficiary during inception and design TO-BE phases.
73	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	Regarding requirement MPP-013 ("Metrology term validity dates"), we request additional details on the intended scope of this requirement. Please clarify what is meant by metrology term validity, the expected logic or rules for managing validity periods, alerting mechanisms, compliance considerations, and any related reporting expectations.	Track meter calibration/verification validity periods per national regulations. Generate alerts before expiry for replacement planning. Standard validity and other details to be clarified and validated by selected contractor directly with Beneficiary during inception and design TO-BE phases.
74	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	Regarding requirement MDMS-T-010 ("Automated backup and recovery procedures"), please provide clarification on the expected backup strategy including frequency (e.g., daily, hourly, every 6 hours), type (e.g., full, incremental, differential), retention duration, and recovery time expectations. This information will help us align our proposed solution accordingly.	Minimum requirements i.e.: Daily full backup, 4-hour incremental. 30-day online retention, annual archives. RTO: 1 hour, RPO: 15 minutes. Bidder to propose optimal strategy, other details to be clarified and validated by selected contractor directly with Beneficiary during inception and design TO-BE phases.
75	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	Regarding requirement SVC-HES-C02 ("Custom command sequences for local utility requirements"), please clarify the expected scope of this requirement. Specifically, what types of command sequences are required (e.g. connect/disconnect, firmware updates, etc.,) and what level of customization is expected? A detailed description or example would be appreciated to better understand the utility's operational needs.	Support utility-specific command chains (e.g., disconnect + parameter update + reconnect). Provide scripting capability for operational procedures. Examples to be defined and validated during inception and design phases.
76	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	Regarding Section 24.2 (MDMS Customization Services) and the related requirements (SVC-MDMS-C01 to SVC-	Customization framework required, specific rules defined during inception, design and

		MDMS-C06), we request additional details and use cases for each customization area. In order to provide an accurate and compliant response, please clarify the expected scope, business rules, regulatory references, and specific configurations required for: (1) VEE rules for the Moldova market, (2) Billing determinant calculations for local tariffs, (3) Regulatory report templates, (4) Energy community settlement algorithms, (5) Grid loss analytics, and (6) Time-of-use (TOU) processing for Moldova's rate schedules.	implementation: VEE rules based on Moldova grid characteristics; Local tariff structures; Regulatory reports per ANRE requirements; Energy community algorithms per legislation; Grid loss calculation per network topology; TOU schedules aligned with Moldova tariffs.
77	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	Regarding the documentation requirements listed in Section 28. please confirm whether these are expected at the proposal stage. Typically, such documentation is prepared as part of the High-Level Design (HLD) and Low-Level Design (LLD) phases after contract award during project implementation.	Proposal requires high-level documentation only. Detailed documentation (HLD/LLD) to be developed during design and implementation phases post-signing the contract.
78	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	Regarding requirement TRN-MDMS-03 ("Analytics and Reporting"), please provide clarification on the following: (a) What level of report customization is required: are reports expected to be fully user-defined or based on predefined templates? If predefined, please specify the required report types. (b) What reporting intervals are expected (e.g., real-time, daily, weekly, monthly)? (c) How many reports (please include the type of report) should be delivered as part of the implementation scope?	(a) Both template-based and user-configurable reports required. (b) Real-time dashboards, daily operational, weekly/monthly management reports. (c) Minimum # of the standard reports additionally to be defined and validated during inception and design phases.
79	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	Regarding the Key Management System (KMS) and security implementation, the following aspects are not clearly addressed in the tender. Please clarify: -Should it support automatic key rotation, lifecycle management, and audit logging? -Should PKI be used for device authentication and secure communication? -Should the system integrate with an existing CA (Certificate Authority) or require a new one? -DLMS/COSEM Security: Which DLMS Security Suites must be supported? (Suite 0, Suite 1, Suite 2 – AES-GCM, AES-CCM) -Should mutual authentication and role-based access be enforced? -Should secure channels be mandatory for all communication?	KMS: Support key lifecycle management with audit logging. Automatic rotation optional. PKI: Integration capability required, existing CA preferred. DLMS: Suite 0 minimum, Suite 2 preferred. Mutual authentication and secure channels mandatory for critical operations - other details to be defined and validated during inception and design phases.
80	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	For the meter models specified in the tender, please indicate which Security Suite(s) it supports.	Meter security capabilities vary by model and firmware. Detailed matrix to be provided during inception phase by Beneficiary. Design for multi-suite support. Other details to be defined and validated during inception and design phases.
81	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	Regarding requirement NFR-SEC-03 ("FIPS 140-2"), please specify which FIPS 140-2 security level (Level 1, 2, 3, or 4) is required for compliance.	FIPS 140-2 Level 2 minimum for cryptographic modules. Level 3 optional for enhanced security. Other details to be defined and validated during inception and design phases.
82	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	Please provide the estimated value for each lot.	Budget estimates for each lot are not disclosed. This procurement is conducted as a competitive process, and proposals will be evaluated strictly in accordance with the RFP provisions and UNDP rules, based on technical quality and value for money, not against a pre-communicated budget ceiling.

83	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	Please clarify where the prices for the licenses should be included in Form K: Format for Financial Proposal.	Include all licensing costs in Form K under "Software Licenses" line item. Break down by component if needed. Strongly recommended to follow strictly THE RFP provisions for technical and financial offers formats and details.
84	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	Please confirm that delivery, installation and configuration of hardware infrastructure is not included in the scope of the project	Confirmed. Hardware infrastructure is out of the RFP scope and to be provided by Beneficiary. Contractor responsible for software, configuration, and integration only.
85	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	In the list of documents to be submitted there is a requirement to present: Official Letter of Appointment as local representative, if Bidder is submitting a Bid on behalf of an entity located outside the country. Please clarify this request. What are the responsibilities of a local representative for the purpose of the project? The local representative can be an individual and/or legal entity established in the Republic of Moldova? This requirement implies the establishment of a local branch, subsidiary, or office in the Republic of Moldova? If this requirement is mandatory can the appointment of a local representative or local presence may be fulfilled at contract signature, rather than at bid submission? Please note that requiring a local representative established in the Republic of Moldova at the bid submission stage may significantly limit competition and the participation of foreign bidders.	As per RFP Section 2, an "Official Letter of Appointment as local representative" is required only if the Bidder chooses to submit a Bid on behalf of an entity located outside the Republic of Moldova (i.e., if a foreign entity appoints a local representative to act on their behalf). Bidders from outside Moldova are not required to establish a local branch, subsidiary, or office in the Republic of Moldova. They may submit their bid directly without appointing a local representative. The local representative letter is only required if the bidder explicitly chooses to have a local entity represent them in the bidding process.
86	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	Could you please clarify how Section 1 – Proposer's qualification, capacity and experience is evaluated in the case of a association/joint venture, for example, how should criteria such as the age of the legal entity and years of experience be assessed?	As per RFP Section 2, Qualification Criteria: Years of Experience & Completed Projects: Only the TEAM Lead Company must meet these requirements. Financial Standing (Turnover & Liquidity): All consortium members cumulatively must meet these requirements. Therefore, age and years of experience are assessed based on the TEAM Lead Company only.
87	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	In Section 3. Management Structure and Key Personnel, for Software Developers, criteria MDM platform development/implementation experience: please note the requirement for Informatica/Oracle MDM is restrictive as it should be a general MDM experience, not for a specific platform.	General MDM/MDMS experience is acceptable, not limited to specific platforms. Demonstrate relevant smart metering MDM expertise.
88	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	Please clarify it the JV/Consortium/Association agreement should be provided notarized when submitting proposal or at contract award.	In accordance with RFP Section 7 and Form E, at proposal submission bidders must submit a fully completed and signed Form E together with either a signed Letter of Intent or a signed JV/Consortium/Association Agreement; notarization is only required after contract award, prior to contract signature.
89	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	Please detail type/model of the existing 18,716 Red-Nord pilot smart meters deployed in the field and that require immediate integration.	Pilot meter details (models, protocols, versions) will be provided to selected contractor(s) directly by each Beneficiary of Lot 1 and 2. Proposal should demonstrate capability for immediate integration of whole operational meters, in p.7.7 being specified the list of reference models.
90	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	Please detail type/model of the existing 25,804 PED pilot smart meters deployed in the field and that require immediate integration.	Pilot meter details (models, protocols, versions) will be provided to selected contractor(s) directly by each Beneficiary of Lot 1 and 2. Proposal should demonstrate capability for immediate integration of

			whole operational meters, in p.7.7 being specified the list of reference models.
91	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	As per deliverable plan, Integration specifications must be performed during month 2 of the contract. As integration require alignment with 3rd party system vendors please confirm availability of 3rd party technical personnel for this activity.	Beneficiary will be responsible to coordinate 3rd party vendor availability during all phases: inception/design/integration phase. Include coordination time in project planning.
92	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	As per preliminary BPMNs workflows there are actions initiated in 3rd party systems that interface with MDM. Please confirm 3rd party systems can implement timely changes in their systems in order to have functional interfaces.	Beneficiary is directly responsible for ensuring 3rd party systems implement required changes. Selected Contractor to provide integration specifications and dully technical support. Timeline dependencies to be managed jointly.
93	GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS	The solicitation documents require the submission of the Offer Compliance Checklist Matrix (Annex 3/4) demonstrating adherence to all mandatory functional and non-functional requirements (i.e., those not explicitly marked as Optional). Given that the Technical Evaluation criteria (Section 2) reward the degree to which the methodology *meets or exceeds* the ToR requirements: 1. We are assuming that those requirements no expressively marked as optional and neither marked as mandatory (only section 6.1 is expressively marked as mandatory) in both Lots) are all mandatory. Please Could you confirm this point? 2. Can UNDP confirm that the **non-compliance with a single mandatory technical requirement** specified in Annex 1 or Annex 2 (i.e., any requirement not explicitly listed as Optional or "Not required for initial acceptance") will automatically result in the proposal being classified as **substantially non-responsive** and thus rejected, regardless of the overall technical score achieved in the other sections of the evaluation?	1) Bidders are required to complete the Offer Compliance Checklist Matrix (Annex 3 for LOT 1, Annex 4 for LOT 2) to demonstrate their adherence to the functional and non-functional requirements specified in the Terms of Reference. **All requirements not explicitly marked as 'Optional'** are considered **mandatory** for the purpose of evaluation. The degree of compliance with these mandatory requirements will be assessed as part of the technical evaluation, as detailed in Section 4: Evaluation Criteria. Bidders must provide clear evidence and documentation to support their claims of compliance. 2) No. Non-compliance with a single mandatory technical requirement will not automatically result in rejection. **<u>As per RFP Section 2, Article 39,</u>** UNDP determines whether a non-compliance constitutes a **"material deviation"** based on whether it substantially affects the scope, quality, or performance of the services, or limits UNDP's rights under the Contract. The evaluation methodology in Section 4 uses a graduated scoring system (Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, Poor, Very Poor, No Submission). Non-compliance with mandatory requirements will result in a lower score within the applicable evaluation section, but the proposal will be assessed holistically across all sections. Rejection occurs only if the non-compliance is deemed material by UNDP.

All other terms and conditions of the solicitation documents, except as amended herein, shall remain unchanged and shall continue in full force and effect.