United Nations Development Programme

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

Rapid Feasibility Assessment of the "National Register of Consumption Points" (RNLC) and Feasibility Study for the "National Energy Management Platform" (PNME)

RFP Reference No.:	**RfP26/03219**
Project:	**Accelerating a just energy transition in Moldova**
Country:	**Moldova, Republic of**

SECTION 1: LETTER OF INVITATION

United Nations Development Programme, through its **"Accelerating a just energy transition in the Republic of Moldova"** Project hereby invites prospective proposers to submit a proposal in accordance with the General Conditions of Contract and the Terms of Reference as set out in this Request for Proposal (RFP).
To enable you to submit a proposal, please read the following attached documents carefully.

Section 1: This Letter of Invitation
Section 2: Instruction to Proposers
Section 3: Data Sheet
Section 4: Evaluation Criteria
Section 5: Terms of Reference
Section 6: Conditions of Contract and Contract Forms
Section 7: Proposal Forms
- Form A: Proposal Confirmation
- Form B: Checklist
- Form C: Technical Proposal Submission
- Form D: Proposer Information
- Form E: Joint Venture/Consortium/Association Information
- Form F: Eligibility and Qualification
- Form G: Format for Technical Proposal
- Form H: Format for CV of proposed key personnel
- Form I: Statement of Exclusivity and Availability
- Form J: Financial Proposal Submission
- Form K: Format for Financial Proposal

- Annex 1 – Operating Concept of the National Register of Consumption Points (RNLC), provided as background documentation. The Concept is provided so that bidders and the Contractor understand the conceptual principles already validated with the institutions. It is not binding as to the institutional holder, the ownership model, the identifier scheme or the architecture, each of which is reopened by these Terms of Reference and is to be determined by the assessment.
- Annex 2 – Structure and requirements of the feasibility assessment of the National Register of Consumption Points (RNLC), which forms an integral part of these Terms of Reference and is binding on the Contractor.
- Annex 3 – Structure and requirements of the feasibility study for the implementation of the National Energy Management Platform (PNME), which forms an integral part of these Terms of Reference and is binding on the Contractor.

If you are interested in submitting a proposal in response to this RFP, please prepare your proposal in accordance with the requirements and procedure as set out in this RFP and submit it by the deadline for submission of proposals set out in Section 3: Data Sheet.

Should you be interested to submit a proposal, please log in to the Quantum NextGenERP supplier portal and subscribe to this tender following the instructions in the system user guide. Please search for the tender using search filters, namely **Negotiation ID: UNDP-MDA-01148**. Once subscribed to the tender, you will be able to receive notifications in case of amendments of the tender document and requirements.

Please indicate whether you intend to submit a bid by creating a draft response without submitting directly in the Quantum NextGenERP supplier portal.

Offers must be submitted directly in the Quantum NextGenERP supplier portal following this link: http://supplier.quantum.partneragencies.org/ using the profile you may have in the portal (please log in using your username and password). In case you have never registered before, follow the Supplier Portal Registration Link.

Please note that the access link to the Supplier registered profile is sent from Oracle within up to 3 days. In case you have not received the access link after 3 days since registration, you should address for support to UNDP at

the email address: sc.md@undp.org. In case you encounter errors with registration (e.g. system states Supplier already is registered), you should address for support to UNDP at the email address: sc.md@undp.org.

Computer firewall could block *oracle* or *undp.org extension* and Suppliers might not receive the Oracle notifications. Please turn down any firewalls on your computers to ensure receipt of email notification.

Do not create a new profile if you already have one. Use the forgotten password feature in case you do not remember the password or the username from previous registration.

Should you require further clarifications on the application through the Quantum online portal, kindly contact the Procurement Unit at sc.md@undp.org. Please pay attention that the proposal shall be submitted online through the Quantum system and any proposal sent to the above email shall be disqualified.

Should you require further clarifications on the Request for Proposal, Terms of Reference or other requirements, kindly communicate using the messaging functionality in the portal.

Deadline for Submission of Offers (Date and Time), which is visible in the online procurement system will be final. System will not accept submission of any proposal after that date and time. It is the responsibility of the bidder to make sure that the proposal is submitted prior to this deadline for submission.

Bidders are advised to upload proposal documents and to submit their offer a day prior or well before the date and time indicated under the deadline for submission of Offers. Do not wait until last minute. If Bidder faces any issue during submitting offers at the last minutes prior to the deadline for submission, UNDP may not be able to assist on such a short notice and will not be held liable in such instance. UNDP will not accept any offer that is not submitted directly through the System.

We look forward to receiving your proposal.

UNDP Moldova

SECTION 2: INSTRUCTIONS TO PROPOSERS

GENERAL	
1. Scope	Proposers are invited to submit a proposal for the services specified in Section 5: Terms of Reference, in accordance with this Request for Proposal (RFP). A summary of the scope of the proposal is included in Section 3: Data Sheet. Proposers shall adhere to all the requirements of this RFP, including any amendment made in writing by UNDP. This RFP is conducted in accordance with Policies and Procedures of UNDP which can be accessed at UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures/Procurement. As part of the bid, it is desired that the Bidder registers at the United Nations Global Marketplace (UNGM) website (www.ungm.org). The Bidder may still submit a bid even if not registered with the UNGM. However, if the Bidder is selected for contract award, the Bidder must register on the UNGM prior to contract signature.
2. Interpretation of the RFP	Any proposal submitted will be regarded as an offer by the proposer and does not constitute or imply the acceptance of the proposal by UNDP. UNDP is under no obligation to award a contract to any proposer as a result of this RFP.
3. Supplier Code of Conduct, Fraud, Corruption, Gifts and Hospitality	All proposers must read the United Nations Supplier Code of Conduct and acknowledge that it provides the minimum standards expected of suppliers to the UN. The Code of Conduct, which includes **principles on labour, human rights, environment and ethical conduct** may be found at: https://www.un.org/Depts/ptd/about-us/un-supplier-code-conduct Moreover, suppliers should note that certain provisions of the Code of Conduct will be binding on the supplier in the event that the supplier is awarded a contract, pursuant to the terms and conditions of any such contract. UNDP strictly enforces a policy of zero tolerance on proscribed practices, including fraud, corruption, collusion, unethical or unprofessional practices, and obstruction of UNDP vendors and requires all bidders/vendors observe the highest standard of ethics during the procurement process and contract implementation. UNDP's Anti-Fraud Policy can be found at UNDP Policy against fraud and other corrupt practices. Bidders/vendors shall not offer gifts or hospitality of any kind to UNDP staff members including recreational trips to sporting or cultural events, theme parks or offers of holidays, transportation, or invitations to extravagant lunches or dinners. In pursuance of this policy, UNDP: (a) Shall reject a proposal if it determines that the selected proposer has engaged in any corrupt or fraudulent practices in competing for the contract in question; (b) Further to the UNDP's vendor sanctions policy, shall declare a vendor ineligible, either indefinitely or for a stated period, to be awarded a contract if at any time it determines that the vendor has engaged in any corrupt or fraudulent practices in competing for, or in executing a UNDP contract.
4. Eligible proposers	Proposers shall have the legal capacity to enter into a binding contract with UNDP. A proposer, and all parties constituting the proposer, may have the nationality of any country with the exception of the nationalities, if any, listed in Section 3: Data Sheet. A proposer shall be deemed to have the nationality of a country if the proposer is a citizen or is constituted, incorporated, or registered and operates in conformity with the provisions of the laws of that country. All proposers found to have a conflict of interest shall be disqualified. Proposers may be considered to have a conflict of interest if they are or have been associated in the past, with a firm or any of its affiliates that have been engaged by UNDP to provide consulting services for the preparation of the design, specifications, Terms of Reference, cost

	analysis/estimation and other documents to be used for the procurement of the services required in the present procurement process; were involved in the preparation and/or design of the programme/project related to the services requested under this RFP; or are found to be in conflict for any other reason, as may be established by, or at the discretion of UNDP and/or are found to be in conflict for any other reason, as may be established by, or at the discretion of UNDP. In the event of any uncertainty in the interpretation of a potential conflict of interest, Bidders must disclose to UNDP, and seek UNDP's confirmation on whether or not such a conflict exists. Similarly, the Bidders must disclose in their proposal their knowledge of the following: a) If the owners, part-owners, officers, directors, controlling shareholders, of the bidding entity or key personnel are family members of UNDP staff involved in the procurement functions and/or the Government of the country or any Implementing Partner receiving services under this RFP; and b) All other circumstances that could potentially lead to actual or perceived conflict of interest, collusion or unfair competition practices. Failure to disclose such an information may result in the rejection of the proposal or proposals affected by the non-disclosure. The eligibility of Bidders that are wholly or partly owned by the Government shall be subject to UNDP's further evaluation and review of various factors such as being registered, operated and managed as an independent business entity, the extent of Government ownership/share, receipt of subsidies, mandate and access to information in relation to this RFP, among others. Conditions that may lead to undue advantage against other Bidders may result in the eventual rejection of the Proposal. Proposers shall not be eligible to submit a proposal if at the time of proposal submission: • is included in the Ineligibility List, hosted by UNGM, that aggregates information disclosed by Agencies, Funds or Programs of the UN System; • is included in the Consolidated United Nations Security Council Sanctions List, including the UN Security Council Resolution 1267/1989 list; • is included in the World Bank Corporate Procurement Listing of Non-Responsible Vendors and World Bank Listing of Ineligible Firms and Individuals.
5. Proprietary information	The RFP documents and any Terms of Reference or information issued or furnished by UNDP are issued solely for the purpose of enabling a proposal to be completed and may not be used for any other purpose. The RFP documents and any additional information provided to proposers shall remain the property of UNDP. All documents which may form part of the proposal will become the property of UNDP, who will not be required to return them to your firm.
6. Publicity	During the RFP process, a proposer is not permitted to create any publicity in connection with the RFP.
SOLICITATION DOCUMENTS	
7. Clarification of solicitation documents	Proposers may request clarifications on any of the RFP documents no later than the date indicated in Section 3: Data Sheet. Any request for clarification must be sent in writing in the manner indicated in Section 3: Data Sheet. Explanations or interpretations provided by personnel other than the named contact person will not be considered binding or official. UNDP will provide the responses to clarifications through the method specified in Section 3: Data Sheet. UNDP shall endeavour to provide responses to clarifications in an expeditious manner, but any delay in such response shall not cause an obligation on the part of UNDP to extend

	the submission date of the proposals, unless UNDP deems that such an extension is justified and necessary.
8. Amendment of solicitation documents	At any time prior to the deadline for proposal submission, UNDP may for any reason, such as in response to a clarification requested by a proposer, modify the RFP in the form of an amendment to the RFP. Amendments will be made available to all prospective proposers. If the amendment is substantial, UNDP may extend the deadline for submission of proposals to give the proposers reasonable time to incorporate the amendment into their proposal.
PREPARATION OF PROPOSALS	
9. Cost of preparation of proposal	The proposer shall bear all costs related to the preparation and/or submission of the proposal, regardless of whether its proposal is selected or not. UNDP shall not be responsible or liable for those costs, regardless of the conduct or outcome of the procurement process.
10. Language	The proposal, as well as any and all related correspondence exchanged by the proposer and UNDP, shall be written in the language(s) specified in Section 3: Data Sheet.
11. Documents establishing eligibility and qualifications of the proposer	The proposer shall furnish documentary evidence of its status as an eligible and qualified vendor, using the forms provided in Section 7 and providing the documents required in those forms. In order to award a contract to a proposer, its qualifications must be documented to UNDP's satisfaction.
11.a Documents comprising the proposal	The proposal bid shall comprise of the following documents and related forms which details are provided in Section 3: Data Sheet: ▪ Documents Establishing the Eligibility and Qualifications of the Bidder; ▪ Technical Proposal; ▪ Financial Proposal; ▪ Proposal Security, if required by DS; ▪ Any attachments and/or appendices to the Proposal.
12. Technical proposal format and content	The proposer is required to submit a technical proposal using the forms provided in Section 7 and taking into consideration the requirements in the RFP. The technical proposal shall not include any price or financial information. A technical proposal containing material financial information may be declared non-responsive.
13. Financial proposal	The financial proposal shall be prepared using the form provided in Section 7 and taking into consideration the requirements in the RFP. It shall list all major cost components associated with the services, and the detailed breakdown of such costs. Any output and activities described in the technical proposal but not priced in the financial proposal, shall be assumed to be included in the prices of other activities or items as well as in the final total price. Prices and other financial information must not be disclosed in any other place except in the financial proposal.
14. Currencies	All prices shall be quoted in the currency or currencies indicated in Section 3: Data Sheet. Where proposals are quoted in different currencies, for the purposes of comparison of all proposals: • UNDP will convert the currency quoted in the proposal into the UNDP preferred currency, in accordance with the UN Operational Rate of Exchange. • In the event that UNDP selects a proposal for award that is quoted in a currency different from the preferred currency in Section 3: Data Sheet, UNDP shall reserve the right to award the contract in the currency of UNDP's preference, using the conversion method specified above.

	• In case of contract award to a local company, payments will be made in Moldovan Leu based on UN Operational Rate of Exchange valid on the date of money transfer, as per the "payment terms and conditions" stipulated in this solicitation document: https://treasury.un.org/operationalrates/OperationalRates.php. • UNDP shall not be kept liable for any fluctuations of the exchange market during contract implementation, the Contractor being legally responsible to register any loss/gain of currency exchange resulting from payments against the Contract in accordance with the national legislation.
15. Duties and taxes	Article II, Section 7, of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities provides, inter alia, that the United Nations, including UNDP as a subsidiary organ, is exempt from all direct taxes, except charges for public utility services, and is exempt from customs restrictions, duties, and charges of a similar nature in respect of articles imported or exported for its official use. All proposals shall be submitted net of any direct taxes and any other taxes and duties, unless otherwise specified in Section 3: Data Sheet
16. Proposal validity period	Proposals shall remain valid for the period specified in Section 3: Data Sheet, commencing on the deadline for submission of proposals. A proposal valid for a shorter period may be rejected by UNDP and rendered non-responsive. During the proposal validity period, the proposer shall maintain its original proposal without any change, including the availability of the key personnel, the proposed rates and the total price. In exceptional circumstances, prior to the expiration of the proposal validity period, UNDP may request proposers to extend the period of validity of their proposals. The request and the responses shall be made in writing and shall be considered integral to the proposal. If the proposer agrees to extend the validity of its proposal, it shall be done without any change to the original proposal but will be required to extend the validity of the proposal security, if required, for the period of the extension, and in compliance with Article 17 (Proposal security) in all respects. The proposer has the right to refuse to extend the validity of its proposal without forfeiting the proposal security, if required, in which case, the proposal shall not be further evaluated.
17. Proposal security	A proposal security, if required by Section 3: Data Sheet, shall be provided in the amount and form indicated in the Section 3: Data Sheet. The proposal security shall be valid for a minimum of thirty (30) days after the final date of validity of the proposal. The proposal security shall be included along with the proposal. If a proposal security is required by the RFP but is not found in the proposal, the offer shall be rejected. If the proposal security amount, or its validity period, is found to be less than is required by UNDP, UNDP shall reject the proposal. In the event an electronic submission is allowed in Section 3: Data Sheet, proposers shall include a copy of the proposal security in their proposal and the original of the proposal security must be sent via courier or hand delivery as per the instructions in Section 3: Data Sheet. Unsuccessful proposers' proposal securities will be discharged/returned as promptly as possible but no later than thirty (30) days after the expiration of the period of proposal validity prescribed by UNDP pursuant to Article 16 (Proposal Validity Period). The Proposal security may be forfeited by UNDP, and the proposal rejected, in the event of any, or combination, of the following conditions: • If the proposer withdraws its offer during the period of the proposal validity specified in Section 3: Data Sheet, or; • In the event the successful Proposer fails:

	○ to sign the contract after UNDP has issued an award; or ○ to furnish the performance security, insurances, or other documents that UNDP may require as a condition precedent to the effectivity of the contract that may be awarded to the proposer.
18. Joint Venture, Consortium or Association	If the proposer is a group of legal entities that will form or have formed a Joint Venture (JV), Consortium or Association for the proposal, each such legal entity will confirm in their joint proposal that: • they have designated one party to act as a lead entity, duly vested with authority to legally bind the members of the JV, Consortium or Association jointly and severally, and this will be evidenced by a duly notarised agreement among the legal entities, which will be submitted along with the proposal; and • if they are awarded the contract, the contract shall be entered into by and between UNDP and the designated lead entity, who will be acting for and on behalf of all the member entities comprising the joint venture. After the deadline for submission of proposal, the lead entity identified to represent the JV, Consortium or Association shall not be altered without the prior written consent of UNDP. If a JV, Consortium or Association's proposal is the proposal selected for award, UNDP will award the contract to the joint venture, in the name of its designated lead entity. The lead entity will sign the contract for and on behalf of all other member entities. The lead entity and the member entities of the JV, Consortium or Association shall abide by the provisions of Article 19 (Only one Proposal) herein in respect of submitting only one proposal. The description of the organization of the JV, Consortium or Association must clearly define the expected role of each of the entities in the joint venture in delivering the requirements of the RFP, both in the proposal and the JV, Consortium or Association Agreement. All entities that comprise the JV, Consortium or Association shall be subject to the eligibility and qualification assessment by UNDP. A JV, Consortium or Association, in presenting its track record and experience, should clearly differentiate between: • Those that were undertaken together by the JV, Consortium or Association; and • Those that were undertaken by the individual entities of the JV, Consortium or Association. Previous contracts completed by individual experts working privately but who are permanently or were temporarily associated with any of the member firms cannot be claimed as the experience of the JV, Consortium or Association or those of its members, but should only be claimed by the individual experts themselves in their presentation of their individual credentials. JV, Consortium or Associations are encouraged for high value, multi-sectoral requirements when the spectrum of expertise and resources required may not be available within one firm.
19. Only one proposal	The proposer (including the individual members of any Joint Venture) shall submit only one proposal, either in its own name or as part of a Joint Venture. Proposals submitted by two (2) or more proposers shall all be rejected if they are found to have any of the following: • they have at least one controlling partner, director or shareholder in common; or • any one of them receive or have received any direct or indirect subsidy from the other/s; or • they have the same legal representative for purposes of this RFP; or

	• they have a relationship with each other, directly or through common third parties, that puts them in a position to have access to information about, or influence on the proposal of another proposer regarding this RFP process; • they are subcontractors to each other's proposal, or a subcontractor to one proposal also submits another proposal under its name as lead proposer; or some key personnel proposed to be in the team of one proposer participates in more than one proposal received for this RFP process. This condition relating to the personnel, does not apply to subcontractors being included in more than one proposal.
20. Alternative proposals	Unless otherwise specified in Section 3: Data Sheet, alternative proposals shall not be considered. If submission of alternative proposals is allowed in Section 3: Data Sheet, a proposer may submit an alternative proposal, but only if it also submits a proposal conforming to the RFP requirements. Where the conditions for its acceptance are met, or justifications are clearly established, UNDP reserves the right to award a contract based on an alternative proposal. If multiple/alternative proposals are being submitted, proposer must create an alternate response directly in the system and upload all attachments relevant to the alternate proposal separately together with the alternate response...
21. Pre-proposal conference	When appropriate, a pre-proposal conference will be conducted at the date, time and location and according to any instructions specified in Section 3: Data Sheet. If it is stated in Section 3: Data Sheet that the pre-proposal conference is mandatory, a Proposer which does not attend the pre-proposal conference shall become ineligible to submit a proposal under this RFP. If it is stated in Section 3: Data Sheet that the pre-proposal conference is not mandatory, non-attendance shall not result in disqualification of an interested proposer. UNDP will not issue any formal answers to questions from proposers regarding the RFP or proposal process during the pre-proposal conference. All questions shall be submitted in accordance with Article 38 (Clarification of Proposals). The pre-proposal conference shall be conducted for the purpose of providing background information only. Without limiting Article 24 (Proposers responsibility) proposers shall not rely upon any information, statement or representation made at the pre-proposal conference unless that information, statement or representation is confirmed by UNDP in writing. Minutes of the pre-proposal conference will be disseminated as specified in Section 3: Data Sheet. No verbal statement made during the conference shall modify the terms and conditions of the RFP, unless specifically incorporated in the minutes of the proposer's conference or issued/posted as an amendment to RFP.
22. Site inspection	When appropriate, a site inspection will be conducted at the date, time and location and according to any instructions specified in Section 3: Data Sheet. If it is stated in Section 3: Data Sheet that the site inspection is mandatory, a proposer which does not attend the site inspection shall become ineligible to submit a proposal under this RFP. If it is stated in Section 3: Data Sheet that the site inspection is not mandatory, non-attendance, shall not result in disqualification of an interested proposer. Proposers participating in a site inspection shall be responsible for making and obtaining any visa arrangements that may be required for the proposers to participate in a site inspection. Prior to attending a site inspection, proposers shall execute an indemnity and a waiver releasing UNDP in respect of any liability that may arise from:

	○ loss of or damage to any real or personal property; ○ personal injury, disease or illness to, or death of, any person; ○ financial loss or expense, arising out of the carrying out of that site inspection; and ○ transportation by UNDP to the site (if provided) as a result of any accidents or malicious acts by third parties. UNDPwill not issue any formal answers to questions from proposers regarding the RFP or solicitation process during a site inspection. All questions shall be submitted in accordance with Article 7 (Clarification of solicitation documents). A site inspection will be conducted for the purpose of providing background information only. Without limiting Article 24 (Proposers Responsibility), proposers shall not rely upon any information, statement or representation made at a site inspection unless that information, statement or representation is confirmed by UNDP in writing.
23. Errors or omissions	Proposers shall immediately notify UNDP in writing of any ambiguities, errors, omissions, discrepancies, inconsistencies or other faults in any part of the RFP, with full details of those ambiguities, errors, omissions, discrepancies, inconsistencies or other faults. Proposers shall not benefit from such ambiguities, errors, omissions, discrepancies, inconsistencies or other faults.
24. Proposers responsibility to inform themselves	Proposers shall be responsible for informing themselves in preparing their proposal. In this regard, proposers shall ensure that they: • examine and fully inform themselves in relation to all aspects of the RFP, including the Contract and all other documents included or referred to in this RFP; • review the RFP to ensure that they have a complete copy of all documents; • obtain and examine all other information relevant to the project and the scope of the requirements available on reasonable enquiry; • verify all relevant representations, statements and information, including those contained or referred to in the RFP or made orally during any clarification meeting or site Inspection or any discussion with UNDP, its employees or agents; • attend any pre-proposal conference if it is mandatory under this RFP; • fully inform and satisfy themselves as to requirements of any relevant authorities and laws that apply, or may in the future apply, to the supply of the services; and • form their own assessment of the nature and extent of the services required as included in Section 5: Terms of Reference and properly account for all requirements in their proposal. Proposers acknowledge that UNDP, its directors, employees and agents make no representations or warranties (express or implied) as to the accuracy, currency or completeness of this RFP or any other information provided to the proposers.
25. No material change(s) in circumstances	The proposer shall inform UNDP of any change(s) of circumstances arising during the RFP process, including but not limited to: • a change affecting any declaration, accreditation, license or approval; • major re-organisational changes, company re-structuring, a take-over, buy-out or similar event(s) affecting the operation and/or financing of the proposer or its major sub-contractors; • a change to any information on which UNDP may rely in assessing proposals.
SUBMISSION AND OPENING OF PROPOSALS	
26. Instruction for proposal submission	The proposer shall submit a complete proposal in the format and comprising the documents and forms in accordance with requirements in Section 3: Data Sheet. The proposal shall be delivered according to the method specified in Section 3: Data Sheet. The proposal shall be submitted? by the proposer or person(s) duly authorized to commit

	the proposer. The authorization shall be communicated through a document evidencing such authorization issued by the legal representative of the proposing entity, or, if requested, a Power of Attorney, accompanying the proposal. Proposers must be aware that the mere act of submission of a proposal, in and of itself, implies that the proposer fully accepts the UNDP General Conditions of Contract.
26A. Online submission	1.1 Electronic submission through online portal shall be governed as follows: • Electronic files that form part of the proposal must be in accordance with the format and requirements indicated in Data Sheet; • The Technical Proposal and the Financial Proposal files MUST BE COMPLETELY SEPARATE and each of them must be uploaded individually and clearly labelled. • The Financial Proposal file must be uploaded separately only in the commercial section of the RFP in the system. • Documents which are required to be in original form (e.g., Bid Security, etc.) must be sent via courier or hand delivery as per the instructions in Data Sheet. Detailed instructions on how to submit, modify or cancel a bid in the online portal are provided in the system Bidder User Guide made available in the procurement notice site and in the portal.
27. Deadline for Submission of Proposals and Late Proposals	Complete proposals must be received by UNDP in the manner, and no later than the date and time, specified in Section 3: Data Sheet. If any doubt exists as to the time zone in which the Proposal should be submitted, refer to http://www.timeanddate.com/worldclock/. It shall be the sole responsibility of the proposers to ensure that their proposal is received by the closing date and time. UNDP shall accept no responsibility for proposals that arrive late due to any technical issues and shall only recognise the actual date and time that the proposal was received by UNDP. UNDP may, at its discretion, extend this deadline for the submission of proposals by amending the solicitation documents in accordance with Article 8 (Amendment of solicitation documents). In this case, all rights and obligations of UNDP and proposers subject to the previous deadline will thereafter be subject to the new deadline as extended.
28. Withdrawal, substitution and modification of proposals	A proposer may withdraw or modify its proposal after it has been submitted at any time prior to the deadline for submission directly in the system following the instructions provided in the user guide. However, after the deadline for proposal submission, the proposals shall remain valid and open for acceptance by UNDP for the entire proposal validity period, as may be extended.
29. Storage of proposals	Proposals received are kept confidential and unopened in the system as part security protocols built in the system until the proposal opening date stated in Section 3: Data Sheet.
30. Proposal opening	There is no mandatory public bid opening for RFPs however UNDP may at its discretion sent a public bid opening report from the system only to suppliers who successfully submitted a proposal. The report will include only the names of the companies but not the financial proposal.
31. Late proposals	Any proposal received by UNDP after the deadline for submission of proposals will be destroyed unless the proposer requests that it be returned and assumes the responsibility and expenses for the re-possession of the returned proposal documents. In exceptional circumstances, late proposals may be accepted if it is determined that the submission was sent in ample time prior to the proposal closing and the delay could not be reasonably foreseen by the proposer or were due to force majeure.

EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS	
32. Confidentiality	Information relating to the examination, evaluation, and comparison of proposals, and the recommendation of contract award, shall not be disclosed to proposers or any other persons not officially concerned with such process, even after publication of the contract award. Any effort by a proposer or anyone on behalf of the proposer to influence UNDP in the examination, evaluation and comparison of the proposals or contract award decisions may, at UNDP's decision, result in the rejection of its proposal and may subsequently be subject to the application of prevailing UNDP's vendor sanctions procedures.
33. Evaluation of proposals	UNDP shall evaluate a proposal using only the methodologies and criteria defined in this RFP. No other criteria or methodology shall be permitted. UNDP shall conduct the evaluation solely on the basis of the submitted technical and financial proposals. Evaluation of proposals shall be undertaken in the following steps: a) Preliminary examination b) Evaluation of minimum eligibility and qualification (if pre-qualification is not done) c) Evaluation of technical proposals d) Evaluation of financial proposals.
34. Preliminary examination	UNDP shall examine the proposals to determine whether they are complete with respect to minimum documentary requirements, whether the documents have been properly signed, and whether the proposals are generally in order, among other indicators that may be used at this stage. UNDP reserves the right to reject any proposal at this stage.
35. Evaluation of eligibility and qualification	Eligibility and qualification of the proposer will be evaluated against the minimum eligibility and qualification requirements specified in Section 4: Evaluation Criteria and in Article 4 (Eligible proposers). In general terms, vendors that meet the following criteria may be considered qualified: a) They are not included in the UN Security Council 1267/1989 Committee's list of terrorists and terrorist financiers, and in UNDP's ineligible vendors' list; b) They have a good financial standing and have access to adequate financial resources to perform the contract and all existing commercial commitments, c) They have the necessary similar experience, technical expertise, production capacity, quality certifications, quality assurance procedures and other resources applicable to the supply of goods and/or services required; d) They are able to comply fully with the UNDP General Terms and Conditions of Contract; e) They do not have a consistent history of court/arbitral award decisions against the Bidder; and f) They have a record of timely and satisfactory performance with their clients.
36. Evaluation of technical and financial proposals	The evaluation team shall review and evaluate the technical proposals on the basis of their responsiveness to the Terms of Reference and other RFP documents, applying the evaluation criteria, sub-criteria, and point system specified in Section 4: Evaluation Criteria. A proposal shall be rendered non-responsive at the technical evaluation stage if it fails to achieve the minimum technical score indicated in Section 3: Data Sheet. When necessary, and if stated in the Data Sheet, UNDP may invite technically responsive proposers for a presentation related to their technical proposals. The conditions for the presentation shall be provided in the proposal document where required.

	When necessary, and if stated in the Section 3: Data Sheet, UNDP may invite technically responsive bidders for a presentation related to their technical Proposals. The conditions for the presentation shall be provided in the bid document where required. In the second stage, only the financial proposals of those proposers who achieve the minimum technical score will be opened for evaluation. The evaluation method that applies for this RFP shall be as indicated in Section 3: Data Sheet, which may be either of two (2) possible methods, as follows: (a) the lowest priced method which selects the lowest evaluated financial proposal of the technically responsive Proposers; or (b) the combined scoring method which will be based on a combination of the technical and financial score. When the Data Sheet specifies a **combined scoring method**, the formula for the rating of the proposals will be as follows: Rating the Technical Proposal (TP): **TP Rating** = (Total Score Obtained by the Offer / Max. Obtainable Score for TP) x 100 Rating the Financial Proposal (FP): **FP Rating** = (Lowest Priced Offer / Price of the Offer Being Reviewed) x 100 Total Combined Score: **Combined Score =** (TP Rating) x (Weight of TP, e.g. 70%) + (FP Rating) x (Weight of FP, e.g., 30%)
37. Post-qualification/Due Diligence	UNDP reserves the right to undertake a post-qualification assessment, aimed at determining, to its satisfaction, the validity of the information provided by the proposer. Such exercise shall be fully documented and may include, but need not be limited to, all or any combination of the following: a) Verification of accuracy, correctness and authenticity of information provided by the proposer; b) Validation of extent of compliance to the RFP requirements and evaluation criteria based on what has so far been found by the evaluation team; c) Inquiry and reference checking with Government entities with jurisdiction on the proposer, or with previous clients, or any other entity that may have done business with the proposer; d) Inquiry and reference checking with previous clients on the performance on on-going or completed contracts, including physical inspections of previous works, as deemed necessary; e) Physical inspection of the proposer's offices, branches or other places where business transpires, with or without notice to the proposer; f) Other means that UNDP may deem appropriate, at any stage within the selection process, prior to awarding the contract.
38. Clarification of proposals	UNDP may request clarification or further information in writing from the proposers at any time during the evaluation process. The proposers' responses shall not contain any changes regarding the substance or price of the proposal, except to confirm the correction of arithmetic errors discovered by UNDP in the evaluation of the proposals, in accordance with Instructions to Proposers Article 23 (Errors or omissions). UNDP may use such information in interpreting and evaluating the relevant proposal but is under no obligation to take it into account.

	Any unsolicited clarification submitted by a proposer in respect to its proposal which is not a response to a request by UNDP, shall not be considered during the review and evaluation of the proposals.
39. Responsiveness of proposal	UNDP's determination of a proposal's responsiveness is to be based on the contents of the proposal itself. A substantially responsive proposal is one that conforms to all the terms, conditions, TOR and other requirements of the RFP without material deviation, reservation, or omission. A material deviation, reservation, or omission is one that: a) affects in any substantial way the scope, quality, or performance of the services specified in the contract; or b) limits in any substantial way, inconsistent with the solicitation documents, UNDP's rights or the proposer's obligations under the contract; or c) if rectified would unfairly affect the competitive position of other proposers presenting substantially responsive proposals. If a proposal is not substantially responsive, it shall be rejected by UNDP and may not subsequently be made responsive by the proposer by correction of the material deviation, reservation, or omission.
40. Nonconformities, reparable errors and omission	Provided that a proposal is substantially responsive, UNDP may waive any non-conformities or omissions in the proposal that, in the opinion of UNDP, do not constitute a material deviation. These are a matter of form and not of substance and can be corrected or waived without being prejudicial to other proposers. Provided that a proposal is substantially responsive UNDP may request the proposer to submit the necessary information or documentation, within a reasonable period, to rectify nonmaterial nonconformities or omissions in the proposal related to documentation requirements. Such omission shall not be related to any aspect of the price of the proposal. Failure of the proposer to comply with the request may result in the rejection of its proposal. For financial proposals that have been opened, UNDP shall check and correct arithmetical errors as follows: a) if there is a discrepancy between the unit price and the line-item total that is obtained by multiplying the unit price by the quantity, the unit price shall prevail and the line item total shall be corrected, unless in the opinion of UNDP there is an obvious misplacement of the decimal point in the unit price; in which case, the line item total as quoted shall govern and the unit price shall be corrected; b) if there is an error in a total corresponding to the addition or subtraction of subtotals, the subtotals shall prevail, and the total shall be corrected; and c) if there is a discrepancy between words and figures, the amount in words shall prevail, unless the amount expressed in words is related to an arithmetic error, in which case the amount in figures shall prevail. If the proposer does not accept the correction of errors, its proposal shall be rejected, and its proposal security may be forfeited.
41. Right to accept any proposal and to reject any or all proposals	UNDP reserves the right to accept or reject any proposals, and to annul the proposal process and reject all proposals at any time prior to contract award, without thereby incurring any liability to the affected proposer or proposers or any obligation to inform the affected proposer or proposers of the grounds for UNDP's action. UNDP shall not be obliged to award the contract to the lowest priced offer.
AWARD OF CONTRACT	
42. Award criteria	Prior to expiration of the proposal validity, UNDP shall award the Contract to the qualified proposer based on the award criteria indicated in Section 3: Data Sheet.

43. Right to vary requirement at time of award	At the time the Contract is awarded, UNDP reserves the right to increase or decrease the quantity of services originally specified by up to a maximum twenty-five per cent (25%) of the total offer, without any change in the unit price or other terms and conditions and the solicitation document.
44. Notification of award	Prior to the expiration of the period of proposal validity, UNDP will notify the successful proposer in writing by email, fax or post, that its proposal has been accepted. Please note that the proposer, if not already registered at the appropriate level in UNGM, will be required to complete the vendor registration process on the UNGM prior to the signature and finalization of the contract.
45. Debriefing	In the event that a proposer is unsuccessful, the proposer may request a debriefing from UNDP. The purpose of the debriefing is to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the proposer's submission, in order to assist the proposer in improving its future proposals for UNDP procurement opportunities. The content of other proposals and how they compare to the proposer's submission shall not be discussed.
46. Publication of contract award	UNDP will publish the contract award on UNDP Procurement Notices website https://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_awards.cfm which is linked to the United Nations Global Marketplace, with the RFP Reference number, the information of the awarded proposer's company name, contract amount or LTA and the date of the contract.
47. Contract Signature	Within fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of the Contract, the successful Bidder shall sign and date the Contract and return it to UNDP. Failure to do so may constitute sufficient grounds for the annulment of the award, and forfeiture of the Bid Security, if any, and on which event, UNDP may award the Contract to the Second highest rated or call for new Bids.
48. Contract Type and General Terms and Conditions	The types of Contract to be signed and the applicable UNDP Contract General Terms and Conditions, as specified in Data Sheet, can be accessed at http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/procurement/business/how-we-buy.html
49. Performance security	The successful Proposer, if so specified in Section 3: Data Sheet shall furnish a Performance Security in the amount and form specified herein: https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Solicitation_Performance%20Guarantee%20Form.docx&action=default, within the specified number of days after receipt of the Contract from UNDP. Banks issuing performance securities must be acceptable to the UNDP comptroller, i.e. banks certified by the central bank of the country to operate as a commercial bank. The Performance Security form is available here. . UNDP shall promptly discharge the proposal securities of the unsuccessful proposers pursuant to Article 17 (Proposal security). Failure of the successful proposer to submit the above-mentioned Performance Security or sign the Contract shall constitute sufficient grounds for the annulment of the award and forfeiture of the proposal security. In that event UNDP may award the contract to the next lowest ranked proposer.
50. Bank guarantee for advance payment	Except when the interests of UNDP so require, it is UNDP's standard practice not to make advance payment(s) (i.e., payments without having received any outputs). If an advance payment is allowed as per Section 3: Data Sheet, and if specified there, the proposer shall submit a Bank Guarantee in the full amount of the advance payment using this bank guarantee form available at : https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Contract%20Management%20Payment%20and%20Taxes_Advanced%20Payment%20Guarantee%20Form.docx&action=default. Banks issuing bank guarantees must be acceptable to the UNDP comptroller, i.e. banks certified by the central bank of the country to operate as a commercial bank.

51. Liquidated Damages	If specified in Section 3: Data Sheet, UNDP shall apply Liquidated Damages for the damages and/or risks caused to UNDP resulting from the Contractor's delays or breach of its obligations as per the Contract. The payment or deduction of such liquidated damages shall not relieve the Contractor from any of its other obligations or liabilities pursuant to any current contract or purchase order.
52. Proposal protest	Any proposer that believes to have been unjustly treated in connection with this proposal process or any contract that may be awarded as a result of such proposal process may submit a complaint to UNDP. The following link provides further details regarding UNDP vendor protest procedures: http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/procurement/business/protest-and-sanctions.html
53. Other Provisions	In the event that the Bidder offers a lower price to the host Government (e.g. General Services Administration (GSA) of the federal government of the United States of America) for similar goods and/or services, UNDP shall be entitled to the same lower price. The UNDP General Terms and Conditions shall have precedence. UNDP is entitled to receive the same pricing offered by the same Contractor in contracts with the United Nations and/or its Agencies. The UNDP General Terms and Conditions shall have precedence. The United Nations has established restrictions on employment of (former) UN staff who have been involved in the procurement process as per bulletin ST/SGB/2006/15 http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=ST/SGB/2006/15&referer

SECTION 3: DATA SHEET (DS)

Ref. Article in Section 2	Description	Specific Instructions / Requirements
1.	Scope	The reference number of this Request for Proposal (RFP) is **RfP26/03219** The competition goal is to contract a specialized and experienced company (hereinafter "the Company") to conduct a Rapid Feasibility Assessment of the National Register of Consumption Points (RNLC) and Feasibility Study for the National Energy Management Platform (PNME), *as further described in Section 5 of this RfP.*
4.	Eligible proposers	Proposers from all countries are eligible to participate in this proposal process.
7.	Clarification of solicitation documents	Any request for clarification of solicitation documents must be sent directly in the system through **Quantum message functionality**. **ATTENTION: PROPOSALS (OR ANY PART OF IT) SHALL NOT BE SUBMITTED IN THE ABOVE MANNER**
		Deadline for submitting requests for clarifications / questions: **5 (five) working days before the submission deadline**
		Supplemental information to the RFP and responses / clarifications to queries will be posted directly in the system.
10.	Language	All proposals, information, documents, and correspondence exchanged between UNDP and the proposers in relation to this solicitation process shall be in **English (supporting documents issued by Moldovan authorities may be in Romanian).**
	Partial proposals	Not allowed
14.	Currencies	Prices shall be quoted only in the currency indicated in the system: • **MDL (Moldovan Leu) for local suppliers only and** • **USD (US Dollars) for both international and local suppliers** Local Bidders may submit their financial offers either in USD or MDL, at their discretion. For evaluation purposes, financial proposals shall be recalculated at UN Operational Rate of Exchange on the submission deadline: https://treasury.un.org/operationalrates/OperationalRates.php If the contract is awarded to a local Bidder that submitted its financial offer in USD, payments will be made in MDL based on UN Operational Rate of Exchange valid on the date of money transfer, as per the "payment terms and conditions" stipulated in this solicitation document: https://treasury.un.org/operationalrates/OperationalRates.php UNDP shall not be kept liable for any fluctuations of the exchange market during contract implementation, the Contractor being legally responsible to register any loss/gain of currency exchange resulting from payments against the Contract in accordance with the national legislation.
15.	Duties and taxes	All prices shall: Be exclusive of VAT and other applicable indirect taxes.

Ref. Article in Section 2	Description	Specific Instructions / Requirements
16.	Proposal validity period	90 days
17.	Proposal security	Not Required
20.	Alternative proposals	Shall not be considered.
21.	Pre-proposal conference	Will not be conducted
22.	Site inspection	A site inspection will not be held.
26.	Instructions for proposal submission	**Bidders must submit their proposal directly in Quantum.** Allowable manner of submitting proposals: ▪ File Format: PDF files only ▪ File names must be maximum 60 characters long and must not contain any letter or special character other than from Latin alphabet/keyboard. ▪ All files must be free of viruses and not corrupted. ▪ It is recommended that bidders organize and name the files according to the requirements and structure of the bid to facilitate their review. ▪ The bidder should receive an email acknowledging email receipt from the system. ▪ **The Financial Proposal (Forms J and K) shall be submitted directly in the system only in the "Commercial section" of the requirements. Non-compliance with this instruction may result in rejection of the proposal received.**
27.	Deadline for proposal submission	Deadline for proposal submission is indicated **in the portal**. In case of discrepancies between the deadline in the system and deadline indicated elsewhere, the one in the system prevails. It is the responsibility of the bidder to be informed on the tender deadline. **Note that system time zone is in EST/EDT (New York) time zone.**
30.	Proposal Opening	Public proposal opening will **NOT** be held
36.	Evaluation of technical and financial proposals	Evaluation will be based on: ☒ Combined scoring method using a distribution of **70%-30%** Technical proposal - financial proposal The maximum number of technical points is detailed in Section 4: Evaluation Criteria. To be substantially compliant, Proposers must obtain a minimum threshold of 70% of maximum points from technical evaluation.
43.	Right to vary requirement at time of award	The maximum percentage by which quantities may be increased is 25 % The maximum percentage by which quantities may be decreased is 25 %
	Contract award to one or more proposer	UNDP will award a contract to: One Bidder Only
48.	Type of contract to be awarded	Contract Face Sheet

Ref. Article in Section 2	Description	Specific Instructions / Requirements
		http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/procurement/business/how-we-buy.html See Section 6: for sample contract.
	Expected date for commencement of contract	Estimative: December 2026
48.	Conditions of contract to apply	UNDP General Terms and Conditions for contracts (goods and/or services) See Section 6.
49.	Performance Security	Not Required
50.	Advance payment	Not Allowed
51.	Liquidated damages	Will be imposed as follows: Percentage of contract price per week of delay: 2.5% up to a maximum of 10% of the Contract value, after which UNDP may terminate the contract. Liquidated damages shall not apply to delays attributable to UNDP or to the beneficiary institutions and operators (e.g. late data, samples or access, or deliverable review beyond the agreed periods).
	Other information related to the RFP – Documents to be submitted	**Please attach the following documents with your Bid:** ▪ Company Profile, which should not exceed ten (10) pages, including list of relevant institutions the Company has been cooperating with, including the topic and year must be presented together with the application package. ▪ Certificate of Business Registration ▪ List of Shareholders and Other Entities Financially Interested in the Firm owning 5% or more of the stocks and other interests, or its equivalent if Bidder is not a corporation including the Certificate from State Register ▪ Tax Registration/Payment Certificate issued by the Internal Revenue Authority evidencing that the Bidder is updated with its tax payment obligations, or Certificate of Tax exemption, if any such privilege is enjoyed by the Bidder ▪ Latest Financial Statements (Income Statements and Balance Sheets) including Auditor's Reports for the past 3 (three) years for the Bidder (2023-2025) ▪ Statement of Satisfactory Performance from the Top three 3 Clients' statements confirming satisfactory performance by the Proposer, each JV partner/Subcontractor (if the case), on the contracts of highest value carried out, during the past 7 (seven) years, by each intended participant ▪ For JV/Consortium/Association: Form E with a letter of intent or the agreement signed by all partners; the notarized agreement (Section 2, Art. 18) is required from the selected proposer before contract signature. ▪ Detailed description of the Methodology approach, and Implementation Plan (sequence of actions) for the services required in the ToR, with clear distribution of roles and responsibilities of the proposed key personnel. ▪ Copies of contracts to prove that Offeror meets the similar experience requirement (stated under Section 4: Evaluation Criteria) ▪ CVs and Statements of Exclusivity and Availability (signed by the envisaged person) of the Key personnel (mentioned under Section 4: Evaluation

Ref. Article in Section 2	Description	Specific Instructions / Requirements
		Criteria and Section 5: Terms of Reference), clearly stipulating the relevant experience which meets the listed requirements. ▪ A statement of the bidder's and each key expert's experience of the national information-technology governance framework of the Republic of Moldova, listing for each cited assignment the client, the period, the deliverable produced, the normative instrument or coordination process to which it related and a contact for reference purposes. ▪ A written statement certifying that the proposed key personnel have no personal, professional, or financial conflict of interest under the envisaged contract. ▪ Quality Certificate (e.g., ISO, etc.) and/or other similar certificates, accreditations, awards, and citations received by the Bidder, if any ▪ Environmental Compliance Certificates, Accreditations, Markings/Labels, if any. ▪ **Dully filled in Proposal Forms A-K (as per Section 7: Proposal Forms). Forms A-I, representing the Technical Proposal, shall be submitted directly in the system in the "Technical section" of the requirements** ▪ **Forms J and K, representing the Financial Proposal shall be submitted directly in the system only in the "Commercial section" of the requirements. Please, ensure that no other documents are disclosing your financial proposal apart from Forms J and K. Non-compliance with this instruction may result in rejection of the proposal received**

SECTION 4: EVALUATION CRITERIA

Preliminary Examination Criteria
All criteria will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis and checked during Preliminary Examination.

Criteria	Documents to establish compliance
Completeness of the Proposal	All documents requested in Section 3: Data Sheet (item 25) have been provided and are complete.
Proposer accepts UNDP General Conditions of Contract as specified in Section 6.	Duly signed and stamped Form C: Technical Proposal Submission has been provided.
Proposal Validity	Duly signed and stamped Form C: Technical Proposal Submission has been provided.
Appropriate signatures	Proposal Forms have been duly signed and stamped.
Power of Attorney *[if applicable]*	Certified Letter of Appointment and/or power of attorney authorizing the representative of the Bidder to sign bids has been provided.

Minimum Eligibility and Qualification Criteria

Minimum eligibility and qualification criteria will be evaluated on a **Pass/Fail basis**.

If the Proposal is submitted as a Joint Venture, Consortium or Association, each member should meet the minimum criteria, unless otherwise specified.

Eligibility Criteria	Documents to establish compliance
Legal Status: Proposer is a legally registered entity	Form D: Proposer Information
Eligibility: Vendor is not suspended, nor otherwise identified as ineligible by any UN Organization, the World Bank Group or any other International Organisation in accordance with Section 2 Article 4.	Form C: Technical Proposal Submission
Conflict of Interest: No conflicts of interest in accordance with Section 2 Article 4.	Form C: Technical Proposal Submission
Bankruptcy: The Proposer has not declared bankruptcy, is not involved in bankruptcy or receivership proceedings, and there is no judgment or pending legal action against the vendor that could impair its operations in the foreseeable future	Form C: Technical Proposal Submission

Qualification Criteria	Documents to establish compliance
History of non-performing contracts[1]**:** Non-performance of a contract did not occur as a result of contractor default within the last 3 years.	Form F: Eligibility and Qualification
Litigation History: No consistent history of court/arbitral award decisions against the Proposer for the last 3 years.	Form F: Eligibility and Qualification
Previous Experience	

[1] Non-performance, as decided by UNDP, shall include all contracts where (a) non-performance was not challenged by the contractor, including through referral to the dispute resolution mechanism under the respective contract, and (b) contracts that were so challenged but fully settled against the contractor. Non-performance shall not include contracts where Employer's decision was overruled by the dispute resolution mechanism. Non-performance must be based on all information on fully settled disputes or litigation, i.e. dispute or litigation that has been resolved in accordance with the dispute resolution mechanism under the respective contract and where all appeal instances available to the Bidder have been exhausted.

Legally registered entity (including a member firm of an international group in which case the experience of the group will be counted) or consortium of firms, with at least three (3) years of activity in one or more of the following areas: ICT or digital-government advisory; feasibility studies, business analysis or technical specifications for information systems; data architecture or data governance; or energy-sector advisory services. *(For JV/Consortium/Association, the lead partner shall have at least three (3) years and each consortium partner at least two (2) years of experience)*	Form F: Eligibility and Qualification
At least one (1) assignment involving the analysis, design or feasibility assessment of a data platform, data warehouse, data hub or sectoral analytical and reporting solution integrating data from multiple independent source systems completed in the past seven (7) years. *(For JV/Consortium/Association, all Parties cumulatively should meet requirement).*	Form F: Eligibility and Qualification The bidder shall provide supporting evidence for the reference contract, such as a copy of the contract, performance/completion certificate and/or client reference, demonstrating compliance with the above requirement.
Qualification rule: Experience acquired by the bidder as a member of a JV/Consortium/Association counts in full towards the experience criteria above, provided that the bidder's role and the deliverable it produced are identified and confirmed by the lead entity or by the end client. As alternatives to a client confirmation letter, the following are accepted as means of proof: the contract together with the act of acceptance, the published normative act citing or approving the deliverable, or the registration record in the Register of State Information Resources and Systems from Republic of Moldova. UNDP may request clarification of the evidence submitted (Section 2, Art. 38); clarifications shall not introduce experience not listed in the proposal.	
Minimum Key Personnel	
The following Key Personnel are mandatory for the implementation of the contract: • 1 (one) Team Leader / Project Manager • 1 (one) Energy sector expert • 1 (one) Data architecture and data governance expert • 1 (one) Information technology and e-government systems architecture expert • 1 (one) Financial and cost-benefit analysis expert • 1 (one) Legal and Government IT governance expert *Please note: The above listed roles can be cumulated by certain team members, but not more than two roles per team member, clarifying in the Methodology the reasoning for such approach and distribution of tasks. A person proposed for two roles is evaluated separately against the criteria of each role.* *(For JV/Consortium/Association, all Parties cumulatively should meet requirement).*	Duly signed CVs and Statements of Exclusivity and Availability, including any other supporting documents, attached to Form H: Format for CV of proposed Key Personnel
Turnover: Minimum average turnover of USD 250,000.00 for the last 3 (three) years. *For JV/Consortium/Association, all Parties cumulatively should meet requirement*	Copy of audited financial statements for the last 3 (three) years. Form F: Eligibility and Qualification

Liquidity: The Ratio Average current assets / Current liabilities over the last 3 (three) years must be equal or greater than 1. Proposers must include in their Proposal audited balance sheets cover the last 3 (three) years. *If QR is less than 1:* UNDP shall verify financial capacity of the bidder and has the authority to seek references from concerned parties & banks on the bidder' financial standing. UNDP has the right to reject any bid if submitted by a contractor whom investigation leads to a result that he is not financially capable and/or had serious financial problems. *For JV/Consortium/Association, all Parties cumulatively should meet requirement*	Copy of audited financial statements for the last 3 (three) years. Form F: Eligibility and Qualification

Technical Evaluation Criteria

#	Technical proposal evaluation section	Points obtainable
1	Proposer's qualification, capacity and experience	250
2	Proposed methodology, approach and implementation plan	400
3	Management structure and key personnel	350
	Total technical score	**1000**

Scoring rule for Section 1 (Proposer's qualification, capacity and experience):
Experience acquired by the bidder as a member of a JV/Consortium/Association counts in full towards the criteria 1.2.1 to 1.2.4 of the technical evaluation below, provided that the bidder's role and the deliverable it produced are identified and confirmed by the lead entity or by the end client.

As alternatives to a client confirmation letter, the following are accepted as means of proof: the contract together with the act of acceptance, the published normative act citing or approving the deliverable, or the registration record in the Register of State Information Resources and Systems. UNDP may request clarification of the evidence submitted (Section 2, Art. 38); clarifications shall not introduce experience not listed in the proposal.

Section 1	Proposer's qualification, capacity and experience	Scoring guidance	Points obtainable
1.1	**Organisational standing, continuity and clarity of the consortium or subcontracting arrangement**		**50**
1.1.1	Continuity of the legal entity and clarity of the consortium or subcontracting arrangement	*Excellent (40) – Minimum 3 years of relevant activity. Strong, verifiable record in public-sector analytical or system-design work, with strong references. Role, scope and level of effort of each partner or subcontractor stated. Each deliverable allocated to a named entity. Single point of contractual responsibility designated. Consortium agreement or letters of commitment provided. A sole bidder that meets these conditions and states it clearly scores at this level.* *Good (36) – Minimum 3 years of relevant activity. Good record and references. Roles and allocation of deliverables clear; level of effort or partner commitment partly incomplete.* *Satisfactory (28) – Minimum 3 years of relevant activity. Limited or mixed record; references satisfactory. Partners named with general roles only; single point of responsibility implied rather than stated.* *Poor (16) – Weak record or weak references, or roles overlapping or undefined. Clarification may be required.* *Very Poor (4) – No credible information on record or years of activity; partners mentioned without roles.* *No Submission (0).*	**40**
1.1.2	Project management support mechanism and management controls	Documented project management methodology, quality gates, reporting lines and	**10**

		escalation route, evidenced by procedures or prior project documentation. *Excellent (10) – established project management methodology applied across the organisation, with defined quality gates for each deliverable, clear reporting lines to the client, a named escalation route and change-control procedure; evidenced by internal procedures and by documentation from comparable prior projects.* *Good (9) – documented methodology covering quality gates, reporting and escalation; evidence from prior projects provided but less complete.* *Satisfactory (7) – management arrangements described in general terms; some elements (quality gates, escalation route, change control) missing or not evidenced.* *Poor (4) – largely generic description of management controls, not supported by procedures or prior project documentation. Clarification may be required.* *Very Poor (1) – management controls mentioned without a credible description or evidence.* *No Submission (0).*	
1.2	**Relevance of specialised knowledge and experience**		**140**
1.2.1	Experience of the national information-technology governance framework of the Republic of Moldova is an asset	*No relevant assignment – 0 pts; 1 relevant assignment – 35 pts; each additional relevant assignment – 10 pts, up to 45 pts.* A relevant assignment is one completed in the last seven (7) years, confirmed by the client, in which the bidder produced a deliverable prepared for or accepted by a public authority or institution of the Republic of Moldova involving one or more of: the concept of a State information system; the regulation of a State information resource; the technical specification (caiet de sarcini) for a State information system; registration or prior coordination of a State information resource with the e-Governance Agency; integration with the Government interoperability platform or the Government shared services; or hosting on the common Government technology platform.	**45**
1.2.2	Feasibility studies, assessments, business analysis or technical specifications for information systems and/or data hubs/warehouses in the public sector or the utilities sector	Assignments completed in the last seven (7) years, any jurisdiction. *No assignment – 0 pts; 1 assignment – 25 pts; 2 assignments – 35 pts; each additional assignment – 5 pts, up to 40 pts.*	**40**

1.2.3	Assignments in the energy, utilities or another regulated network sector involving sectoral data, metering, market processes or energy efficiency	Assignments completed in the last seven (7) years, any jurisdiction. *No assignment – 0 pts; 1 assignment – 25 pts; each additional assignment – 5 pts, up to 45 pts.*	**45**
1.2.4	Experience of working with UNDP or other international development partners and of managing a donor-funded contract	Assignments completed in the last seven (7) years, any jurisdiction. *No experience – 0 pts; 1 contract – 6 pts; each additional contract – 2 pts, up to 10 pts.*	**10**
1.3	**Quality assurance procedures and risk mitigation measures, and Organization Commitment to Sustainability**		**60**
1.3.1	**Quality assurance and risk management for the assignment**	*Excellent (30) – QA framework covering peer review, factual verification, traceability of conclusions to evidence, version control and client sign-off, evidenced by procedures or prior deliverables. Risk register specific to the assignment, covering both pillars, with likelihood, impact, owner and mitigation for each risk. The Pillar A data-access risk is addressed with concrete mitigation (early data requests, formal access through the beneficiary institutions, alternative evidence sources, escalation route), and its effect on the schedule is stated.* *Good (27) – QA framework covering review, factual verification and version control, evidenced. Risks tailored to the assignment. The Pillar A data-access risk is addressed, with less developed mitigation.* *Satisfactory (21) – Basic QA procedures with limited evidence. Risks partly generic. The Pillar A data-access risk is mentioned, with general mitigation only.* *Poor (12) – QA not evidenced. Generic risk list. The Pillar A data-access risk is not addressed. Clarification may be required.* *Very Poor (3) – QA and risk management mentioned without a credible description.* *No Submission (0).*	**30**
1.3.2.	Organization Commitment to Sustainability	*Organisation is compliant with ISO 14001 or ISO 14064 or equivalent (e.g. EMAS) – 20 pts;* *Organisation is a member of the UN Global Compact – 5 pts;* *Organisation demonstrates significant commitment to sustainability through other means (e.g. internal policy documents on women's empowerment or renewable energy, or membership of trade institutions promoting such issues) – 5 pts.* *Points are cumulative, up to 30 pts. Evidence: certificate, UNGC participant listing, or policy documents.*	**30**
Total	**Total Section 1**		**250**

Section 2	Proposed methodology, approach and implementation plan	Scoring guidance	Points obtainable

2.1	To what degree does the Proposer understand the assignment?	*Excellent (90) – comprehensive command of both pillars: the four decision-critical questions of Pillar A (institutional holder, cost and its bearer, interdependence with the PNME and SINEE, modular sequence); the qualification of the RNLC and the PNME as State information resources and the consequences of that qualification; the divergence between measure 52 of Government Decision No. 652/2025 and the Operating Concept as to the object of registration; and the distinct character of Pillar B as a full feasibility study. Risks and mitigations identified and built into the approach.* *Good (81) – good understanding of both pillars and of the national framework; some aspects require elaboration.* *Satisfactory (63) – partial understanding; the national framework is acknowledged but not integrated into the approach; gaps in one pillar.* *Poor (36) – limited or incorrect understanding; the resources are treated as market or operator infrastructure rather than State information resources; major revision required.* *Very Poor (9) – objectives acknowledged but not substantively addressed.* *No Submission (0).*	**90**
2.2	Are the proposed methodology, approach and tools appropriate for the assignment?	*Excellent (100) – fully meets the Terms of Reference and adds justified value: a defensible method for the legal gap analysis across the candidate holders; a workable method for testing the interdependence with SINEE against CNED technical documentation; a credible multi-criteria evaluation with weighting and sensitivity analysis; a costing method covering hosting, technical administration and participant integration costs; and a method for the reuse assessment against the Government shared services.* *Good (90) – relevant and responds to all requirements; appropriate and well considered.* *Satisfactory (70) – generally adequate; non-critical gaps requiring clarification.* *Poor (40) – not fully adequate; significant gaps in how key requirements will be met.* *Very Poor (10) – inadequate; no confidence that requirements can be met.* *No Submission (0).*	**100**

2.3	Approach to obtaining, profiling and validating institutional and operator data	*Excellent (50) – complete and credible evidence strategy: a concrete route to access operator customer, billing, meter-register and geospatial data (legal basis, data-sharing and confidentiality arrangements, personal data safeguards); a sampling design with an explicit basis of representativeness; a defined profiling method covering completeness, uniqueness, duplication and address and cadastral matching, with the metrics to be reported; a clear rule for distinguishing measured findings from declared or estimated ones; and stated confidence limits. Consistent with the Pillar A timeline and the Pillar B As-Is analysis.* *Good (45) – all elements addressed and appropriate; one or two (such as the basis of representativeness or the confidence limits) require elaboration.* *Satisfactory (35) – data access and profiling addressed in general terms; the sampling design, the distinction between measured and declared findings, or the confidence limits missing or unclear.* *Poor (20) – relies mainly on declared data or desk review; no credible route to operator data and no defined profiling method. Clarification may be required.* *Very Poor (5) – data collection mentioned without a method.* *No Submission (0).*	**50**
2.4	Approach to constructing and validating the actor × scenario interaction matrices	*Draft interview protocol – up to 10 pts* *Scenario template and worked example – up to 15 pts* *Preliminary actors and use cases, with reasoning – up to 10 pts* *Validation workflow, including recording of agreement, handling of disagreements and non-responsive institutions – up to 15 pts*	**50**
2.5	Implementation plan, milestones and deliverables	*Excellent (60) – detailed work plan fully consistent with Section E of the Terms of Reference: all deliverable groups and deadlines reflected, Pillar A within approximately four months and Pillar B within twelve months; coordination and approval gates built into the schedule with realistic review periods; the two pillars sequenced in parallel with their interfaces identified; the critical-path dependency on institutional access shown explicitly, with buffers or contingency.* *Good (54) – consistent with Section E and realistic; approval gates and parallel sequencing reflected; treatment of the critical path less fully*	**60**

		developed. *Satisfactory (42) – broadly consistent with Section E, but approval gates, review periods or the critical-path dependency not clearly reflected; some timings optimistic.* *Poor (24) – inconsistent with Section E in material respects (deliverables missing, deadlines not met, pillars sequenced without justification); critical path not addressed. Clarification may be required.* *Very Poor (6) – work plan unrealistic, or so general that milestones and deliverables cannot be verified.* *No Submission (0).*	
2.6	Distribution of roles and working-days across the key experts and between Pillar A and Pillar B	*Excellent (40) – working-days set out per expert and per pillar consistent with the indicative level of effort in Section 5, H, or with any deviation justified; the distribution fully coherent with the methodology, traceable to the deliverable groups, proportionate to the intensity of each task (data collection and profiling, legal analysis, architecture, costing) and justified for every expert.* *Good (36) – coherent and consistent with the indicative level of effort or with deviations justified; justified for most experts; minor imbalances between tasks or pillars.* *Satisfactory (28) – consistent with the indicative level of effort, but justification limited; the allocation of some experts appears insufficient or excessive for the deliverables of one pillar.* *Poor (16) – distribution not coherent with the methodology or insufficient for key deliverables of a pillar; largely unjustified. Clarification may be required.* *Very Poor (4) – no breakdown per expert or per pillar, or an allocation that is clearly unrealistic.* *No Submission (0).*	**40**
2.7	Approach to knowledge transfer and national capacity building	*Excellent (10) – The proposal states who in the beneficiary institutions will receive the knowledge transfer, what will be transferred (methodology, models, tools) and how the sessions will be organised.* *Good (9) – Audience and content stated; organisation of the sessions outlined in general terms.* *Satisfactory (7) – Knowledge transfer sessions acknowledged; audience or content not stated.* *Poor (4) – Knowledge transfer limited to the hand-over of final outputs.*	**10**

		Very Poor (1) – Mentioned without an approach. No Submission (0).	
Total	**Total Section 2**		**400**

Scoring rules for Section 3 (Management structure and key personnel):
(a) a CV below the first scoring level of a sub-criterion receives 0 points for that sub-criterion; these levels are not grounds for rejection of the proposal;
(b) 'each additional' refers to years or assignments beyond the first scoring level;
(c) only experience evidenced in the CV with dates, client, role and deliverable is scored, and overlapping periods count once towards years of experience;
(d) one assignment may be credited under more than one sub-criterion where it meets the definition of each;
(e) where one person holds two roles, the CV is scored separately against each role.

Section 3	Management structure and key personnel	Scoring guidance	Points obtainable
3.1	**Key personnel 1 – Team Leader / Project Manager (Pillar A and Pillar B)**		**70**
3.1.1	Academic qualification - University degree in project management, information systems, engineering, public administration, economics, public policy or another field directly relevant to the management of complex analytical assignments.	*Master's or equivalent advanced degree – 5 pts;* *Bachelor's degree – 3 pts.*	**5**
3.1.2	At least 8 years of professional experience in the management or leadership of analytical, feasibility, institutional reform or digital transformation assignments	*8 years – 14 pts; each additional year – 2 pts, up to 18 pts.*	**18**
3.1.3	Project management of at least 3 multi-disciplinary analytical assignments, leading to a decision making and/or normative process	*3 assignments – 10 pts; each additional assignment – 3 pts, up to 16 pts.* *Of these, at least 1 assignment performed for a public authority or institution of the Republic of Moldova, or for a development partner working with such an authority, in which the analysis was used in a national decision-making or normative process – 2 pts; each additional such assignment – 2 pts, up to 8 pts.* *A recognised project management certification (PMP, PRINCE2, IPMA or equivalent) – 2 pts.*	**26**
3.1.4	At least 2 assignments in the analysis and development of public-sector information systems or State information resources	*2 assignments – 9 pts; each additional assignment – 4 pts, up to 17 pts.* *An assignment concerning an information system or register in another regulated public sector based on network infrastructure (telecommunications, water, transport) will also be credited under this criterion.*	**17**
3.1.5	Language	*Fluency in English – 2 pts; fluency in Romanian – 2 pts. Up to 4 pts.*	**4**
3.2	**Key personnel 2 – Energy sector expert (Pillar A and Pillar B)**		**60**
3.2.1	Academic qualification - University degree in energy, energy engineering, electrical engineering, power systems engineering,	*Master's or equivalent advanced degree – 5 pts; Bachelor's degree – 3 pts.*	**5**

	mechanical or thermal engineering, or another technical field directly relevant to the energy sector		
3.2.2	At least 5 years of professional experience in the energy sector, including in the implementation and practical application of the primary and secondary regulatory framework governing the energy and electricity sectors	*5 years – 12 pts; each additional year – 2 pts, up to 20 pts.*	**20**
3.2.3	At least 1 assignment involving energy-sector operators or licence holders in the Republic of Moldova, covering their reporting obligations to ANRE, the requirements for the collection, maintenance and provision of sectoral data, and the obligations arising from the applicable licensing conditions and ANRE regulations.	*1 assignment – 10 pts; each additional assignment – 4 pts, up to 18 pts.*	**18**
3.2.4	Knowledge of the international energy sector and of the EU energy acquis in practice evidenced by assignments involving national energy data hubs, consumption point or metering point registers, building energy performance databases or equivalent national energy data infrastructures in European Union Member States or comparable jurisdictions.	*No such assignment – 0 pts; 1 assignment – 8 pts; 2 or more – 12 pts.*	**12**
3.2.5	Language	*Fluency in Romanian – 3 pts; working proficiency in English – 2 pts. Up to 5 pts.*	**5**
3.3	**Key personnel 3 – Data architecture and data governance expert (Pillar A and Pillar B)**		**75**
3.3.1	Academic qualification - University degree in computer science, data engineering, software engineering or another relevant field	*Master's or equivalent advanced degree – 5 pts; Bachelor's degree – 3 pts.*	**5**
3.3.2	At least 3 years of professional experience in data architecture, master data management, register or reference data design, data modelling and data governance	*3 years – 12 pts; each additional year – 2 pts, up to 18 pts.*	**18**
3.3.3	At least 2 assignments involving the design of a register, a master data set or a unique identifier scheme, and data quality profiling and reconciliation across independent source systems	*2 assignments – 10 pts; each additional assignment – 3 pts, up to 16 pts.*	**16**
3.3.4	At least 1 assignment involving a State information resource or register of the Republic of Moldova, or demonstrated equivalent command (e.g. State register work in another jurisdiction).	*1 assignment – 12 pts; each additional assignment – 3 pts, up to 18 pts.* *Equivalent command demonstrated in the CV without a Moldovan assignment– 6 pts;* *Note: 6 points, awarded once, for demonstrated equivalent command only where no Moldovan assignment is evidenced. It does not add to the assignment-based points.*	**18**
3.3.5	Understanding of the Government shared services and interoperability platform of the Republic of Moldova demonstrated through completed assignments	*Excellent (10) – two or more assignments in which the expert designed or implemented integration with MConnect, the Government shared services or hosting on MCloud for a State information resource.*	**10**

		Good (9) – one such assignment. *Satisfactory (7) – assignments involving these platforms where the expert held a technical role (e.g., developer, integration engineer, system administrator, tester) but did not design the integration or hosting architecture.* *Poor (4) – assignments involving these platforms where the expert's role was non-technical only (e.g., concept or feasibility study, drafting ToR or technical specifications, legal or regulatory advice, project coordination, or training), with no design, development, integration or hosting work on the platforms.* *None (0).*	
3.3.6	At least 1 assignment involving geospatial or cadastral data	*1 assignment – 4 pts.*	**4**
3.3.7	Language	*Fluency in English – 2 pts; fluency in Romanian – 2 pts. Up to 4 pts.*	**4**
3.4	**Key personnel 4 – Information technology and e-government systems architecture expert (Pillar A and Pillar B)**		**50**
3.4.1	Academic qualification - University degree in computer science, information systems, software engineering or another relevant field	*Master's or equivalent advanced degree – 5 pts; Bachelor's degree – 3 pts.*	**5**
3.4.2	At least 5 years of professional experience in the design or architecture of information systems	*5 years – 10 pts; each additional year – 2 pts, up to 14 pts.*	**14**
3.4.3	At least 2 assignments involving a State information system of the Republic of Moldova, involving the coordination with the e-Governance Agency, the integration with MConnect or with the Government shared services, or the hosting on the common Government technology platform (MCloud)	*2 assignments – 13 pts; each additional assignment – 5 pts, up to 18 pts.* *Additional points where, in an assignment counted above, the expert designed or implemented integrations in accordance with the e-Governance Agency developer documentation (API design guide; MPass, MSign, MConnect integration guides): 1 such assignment – 5 pts; 2 or more – 8 pts.*	**26**
3.4.4	At least 1 assignment involving the cybersecurity requirements applicable to State information systems (Law No. 48/2023)	*1 assignment – 2 pts; 2 or more – 3 pts.*	**3**
3.4.5	Language	*Fluency in English – 1 pt; fluency in Romanian – 1 pt. Up to 2 pts.*	**2**
3.5	**Key personnel 5 – Financial and cost-benefit analysis expert (Pillar A and Pillar B)**		**35**
3.5.1	Academic qualification - University degree in economics, finance, business administration or another relevant field	*Master's or equivalent advanced degree – 4 pts; Bachelor's degree – 2 pts.*	**4**
3.5.2	At least 3 years of professional experience in cost-benefit analysis, total cost of ownership modelling, investment appraisal or business case preparation	*3 years – 8 pts; each additional year – 1 pt, up to 10 pts.*	**10**
3.5.3	At least 3 assignments involving cost-benefit analysis or business case preparation for infrastructure or information technology	*3 assignments – 8 pts; each additional assignment – 2 pts, up to 12 pts.*	**12**

	investments, including recurrent operating costs borne by a public institution		
3.5.4	At least 1 assignment in which recurrent hosting and technical administration cost was estimated on the basis of a public or government cloud service catalogue and its published tariffs	*1 assignment – 4 pts; more than 1 – 5 pts.*	**5**
3.5.5	Language	*Working proficiency in English – 2 pt; knowledge of Romanian – 2 pt. Up to 4 pt.*	**4**
3.6	**Key personnel 6 – Legal and Government IT governance expert (Pillar A and Pillar B)**		**60**
3.6.1	Academic qualification - University degree in law, public administration, information systems or another relevant field	*Master's or equivalent advanced degree – 5 pts; Bachelor's degree – 3 pts.*	**5**
3.6.2	At least 5 years of professional experience in the legal and institutional analysis and legal drafting related to public-sector information systems, information resources or registers	*5 years – 10 pts; each additional year – 2 pts, up to 14 pts.*	**14**
3.6.3	At least 2 assignments performed for or accepted by a public authority or institution of the Republic of Moldova involving one or more of the following: the legal and institutional framework governing State information resources and systems, personal data protection, cybersecurity, and public procurement	*2 assignments – 12 pts; each additional assignment – 6 pts, up to 24 pts.*	**24**
3.6.4	At least 2 assignments involving legal gap analyses resulting in amendments to legislation, normative acts or public policy documents in a regulated sector, including at least 1 involving the drafting or substantive revision of a normative act; energy sector is an advantage	*2 assignments – 9 pts; each additional assignment – 2 pts, up to 11 pts.* *Assignments counted in the energy sector – additional 1 pt per assignment up to 2 pts.*	**13**
3.6.5	Language	*Fluency in Romanian – 2 pts; working proficiency in English – 2 pt.*	**4**
Total	**Total Section 3**		**350**
TOTAL	**Total technical score (maximum 1000 points)**		**1000**

SECTION 5: TERMS OF REFERENCE

Assignment title:	Rapid Feasibility Assessment of the National Register of Consumption Points (RNLC) and Feasibility Study for the National Energy Management Platform (PNME), as State information resources of the Republic of Moldova
Contract duration:	Thirteen (13) months from the date of signature of the contract Assignment execution distribution: Pillar A – 4 months Pillar B – 12 months

A. Abbreviations and acronyms

The abbreviations and acronyms below are used in these Terms of Reference and in their annexes. Where an institution, system or platform of the Republic of Moldova is designated by an abbreviation, the official Romanian denomination is given first, followed by its rendering in English; the Romanian denomination prevails for the purposes of identifying the body or system concerned.

Abbreviation	Meaning
ANRE	Agenția Națională pentru Reglementare în Energetică – the National Agency for Energy Regulation of the Republic of Moldova
API	application programming interface
CAPEX	capital expenditure
CIM	Common Information Model – the IEC 61968 and 61970 family of standards for electricity information exchange
CIS	customer information system
CLC	Codul unic al locului de consum – the unique code of the place of consumption, the identifier assigned by the RNLC
CNED	Centrul Național pentru Energie Durabilă – the National Centre for Sustainable Energy
CV	curriculum vitae
DPIA	data protection impact assessment
DSO	distribution system operator
ebIX	European forum for energy Business Information eXchange – the legacy European energy data exchange models
EDC/OTE	Elektroenergetické datové centrum, the Czech electricity data centre operated by OTE, a.s.
EDSN	Energie Data Services Nederland – the Netherlands energy data services organisation
EMS	energy management system
ENTSO-E	European Network of Transmission System Operators for Electricity
EP-Online	the Netherlands national register of energy performance certificates for buildings
EPBD	Energy Performance of Buildings Directive – Directive (EU) 2024/1275
ERP	enterprise resource planning

ESO	Energijos skirstymo operatorius – the Lithuanian electricity and gas distribution system operator
EU	European Union
EVO	the integrated Government portal and the integrated Government application of the Republic of Moldova
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation – Regulation (EU) 2016/679
GIS	geographic information system
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH
GNSS	global navigation satellite system
GS1	the international organisation maintaining standards for identification keys in supply chains and utilities
GSRN	Global Service Relation Number – the GS1 identifier used in several jurisdictions for metering and service points
HES	head-end system – the system that communicates with smart meters
IaaS	infrastructure as a service
ICT	information and communication technology
IDNO	numărul de identificare de stat al unității de drept – the State identification number of a legal entity
IDNP	numărul de identificare de stat al persoanei fizice – the personal identification number
IEC	International Electrotechnical Commission
IPMA	International Project Management Association
ISGE	Informacijski sustav za gospodarenje energijom – the Croatian energy management information system
IT	information technology
JET	the UNDP “Accelerating a Just Energy Transition in the Republic of Moldova” Programme
MCloud	the common Government technology platform of the Republic of Moldova
MConnect	the Government interoperability platform
MDelivery	the Government delivery service
MDL	Moldovan leu
MDMS	meter data management system
MDocs	the Government platform for the generation, hosting and sharing of documents
MLog	the Government journaling and audit service
MNotify	the Government notification service
MPass	the Government authentication and access control service
MPay	the Government electronic payment service
MPower	the Government service for the delegation of powers of representation
MSign	the Government electronic signature service

NIS2	Directive (EU) 2022/2555 on measures for a high common level of cybersecurity across the Union
OPERAT	Observatoire de la performance énergétique, de la rénovation et des actions du tertiaire – the French reporting platform for energy consumption in tertiary buildings
OPEX	operating expenditure
PMP	Project Management Professional
PNME	Platforma Națională de Management Energetic – the National Energy Management Platform
PRINCE2	PRojects IN Controlled Environments, version 2
RACI	responsible, accountable, consulted, informed – a matrix for allocating roles and responsibilities
RED-Nord	Î.C.S. RED Nord S.A. – electricity distribution system operator in the north of the Republic of Moldova
RNLC	Registrul Național al Locurilor de Consum – the National Register of Consumption Points
RSI	Registrul resurselor și sistemelor informaționale de stat – the Register of State Information Resources and Systems
SCADA	supervisory control and data acquisition
SCE	Sistema de Certificação Energética dos Edifícios – the Portuguese energy certification system for buildings
SEAI	Sustainable Energy Authority of Ireland
SIEEC	the SINEE subsystem for the energy performance of buildings
SINEE	Sistemul informațional național în domeniul eficienței energetice – the National Information System in the Field of Energy Efficiency
STEP	the Latvian electricity market data exchange platform
STISC	Serviciul Tehnologia Informației și Securitate Cibernetică – the Information Technology and Cyber Security Service
T0	the date of signature of the contract, from which all deadlines in these Terms of Reference are calculated
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
USD	United States dollar

B. Project description

In the context of the regional energy crisis and the profound impact of the war in Ukraine on regional energy markets, the Republic of Moldova faces an urgent need to restructure its energy sector and establish sustainable mechanisms for the efficient, reliable and transparent delivery of energy services. Moldova has been a Contracting Party to the Energy Community Treaty since 2010, signed an Association Agreement with the EU in 2014, was granted EU candidate status in June 2022 and formally opened accession negotiations in June 2024; as a candidate country, it is required to transpose and implement the EU acquis in all energy-related areas. The energy sector is a top national priority, reflected in the National Integrated Energy and Climate Plan 2025–2030 (PNIEC), which sets a target of 30% renewable electricity and a 2.8% annual improvement in energy efficiency and references smart metering as a quantified energy-efficiency measure (PM_EE5).

In October 2025, the Government approved the National Programme for the Digital Transformation of the Energy Sector 2026–2030 (hereinafter 'the Digitalization Programme'), elaborated by the Ministry of Energy with the support of UNDP Moldova and the Government of Italy and approved through Government Decision No. 652/2025.

The UNDP JET Programme – Accelerating a Just Energy Transition in the Republic of Moldova (hereinafter 'the JET Programme') is implemented by UNDP with financial support from the Government of Italy (AICS/MAECI). Since 2024, the JET Programme is implementing a smart metering pilot across both distribution system operators – I.C.S. Premier Energy Distribution S.A. and S.A. RED-Nord – covering 21 districts and deploying approximately 44,520 smart meters together with a complete AMI chain (head-end system and meter data management system) and is now entering an expansion phase targeting at least 100,000 installations by 2027. A substantial share of the JET Programme's results is delivered through the digitalisation of the energy sector, in support of the Ministry of Energy, ANRE and the two DSOs.

Among the commitments of the Digitalization Programme, two are foundational to the others: the National Register of Consumption Points (RNLC), a standardised and persistent identifier for every place of consumption in the country, and the National Energy Management Platform (PNME), to collect, analyse and report data on energy production, imports and consumption (measures 52 and 53 of the Digitalization Programme and actions 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 of its Action Plan). Both are intended to strengthen the management of the energy sector through digitalisation, by giving the institutions, operators and consumers concerned a common and reliable data foundation.

The Digitalization Programme thus provides the policy mandate for both the RNLC and the PNME. Translating that mandate into operational State information resources and Registers now calls for a substantiated definition of their institutional, legal, technical and financial arrangements, in line with the national framework governing State resources, under which the concept, the regulation and the technical specification of each resource are approved before its development is procured.

In support of the Ministry of Energy, the JET Programme is therefore commissioning a rapid assessment of the RNLC and a feasibility study for the PNME, to establish the enabling environment for both resources and to provide the Government with the evidence needed for informed decisions on their scope, institutional ownership, sequencing and financing.

UNDP Moldova is accordingly seeking to contract a specialized company or consortium, hereinafter the Contractor, to carry out both interlinked studies, as set out in these Terms of Reference.

C. Purpose and objectives of the assignment

The purpose of the assignment is to carry out two interconnected feasibility exercises, reflected further in the ToR as "Pillars" as follows:

- **Pillar A, the rapid feasibility assessment of the National Register of Consumption Points (RNLC), and,**
- **Pillar B, the elaboration of the feasibility study for the National Energy Management Platform (PNME).**

Together, they shall establish the technical, institutional, legal, market and financial feasibility of establishing the RNLC and its interoperability with the PNME, taking into account Moldova's current level of energy-market development, digital maturity and institutional capacity, as well as its progressive alignment with the EU energy acquis.

Pillar A responds to the Operating Concept for the RNLC (Annex 1), which concluded that the institutional, functional, legal and technical form of the solution should not be assumed in advance of a substantive analysis. **The Operating Concept provided as Annex 1 is background documentation and is not binding. Where the assessment concludes that a provision of the Concept should be altered, the Contractor shall say so expressly and shall formulate the corresponding amendment, so that the Concept can be updated in the light of the assessment before it is carried into the normative package.**

The required study = structure and content are set out in Annex 2, which forms an integral part of these Terms of Reference.

Pillar B responds to the request of the Ministry of Energy for a full feasibility study before any PNME solution is procured, the relationship of the platform with SINEE[2], with the operators' systems and with existing statutory reporting not having been established; its required structure and content are set out in Annex 3, which forms an integral part of these Terms of Reference.

The two pillars are procured together because the RNLC provides the identity layer on which the services of the PNME depend, so that the assignment yields one delineation between the two systems, one evidence base drawn once from the same institutions and operators, and one coherent sequencing of the two investments.

Under Pillar A, the objectives set for the Contractor are:

a. To establish an evidence-based baseline of the registers, information systems, data and institutional arrangements that already exist – including the Government platforms, shared services and reference registers of the Republic of Moldova – and to determine what shall be reused, extended or integrated before any new development is contemplated;

b. To determine, by reasoned legal analysis rather than by assumption or preference, which institution shall exercise each of the statutory roles of holder, keeper, technical administrator and registrar of the RNLC, and the amendments and obligations that the designation entails;

c. To test, on measured evidence, whether the data held by the network operators can support the constitution and maintenance of the RNLC, and whether the institutions and operators concerned have the capacity to deliver and sustain the infrastructure proposed;

d. To resolve the open design questions – the definition of a place of consumption, the identity model and the unique code, the interaction of each actor with the Register, and the delineation between the RNLC, the PNME, SINEE and the operators' systems;

e. To compare the strategic options for scope, institutional ownership, delivery approach and phasing against a documented multi-criteria framework and a cost-benefit analysis, and to reach an explicit feasibility conclusion on the RNLC, expressed as GO, CONDITIONAL GO or NO-GO, capable of supporting a Government decision;

f. To prepare, on the basis of that conclusion, the annotated outlines and drafting instructions for the normative package required to establish the RNLC – the Concept of the information system, the Regulation of the information resource and the Technical Specification (Caiet de sarcini) – together with a costed and sequenced legislative roadmap; the drafting of the package itself will be procured separately, conditional upon the feasibility conclusion.

Under Pillar B, the objectives are:

g. To prepare the feasibility study for the PNME in full accordance with the structure and requirements set out in Annex 3, including the readiness of each authority and operator to supply the data on which the platform would depend, the options for its delivery and their business case, and a GO, CONDITIONAL GO or NO-GO conclusion on implementation procurement;

h. To maintain, across both pillars, the single delineation between the RNLC, the PNME, SINEE and the operators' systems established under Pillar A, and to sequence the two investments coherently.

D. Scope of work

Under Pillar A, the Contractor will carry out the feasibility assessment of the RNLC, from the establishment of the baseline through to the feasibility conclusion and, where that conclusion permits, the annotated outlines and drafting instructions for the normative package required to establish the Register. Under Pillar B, the Contractor will prepare the feasibility study for the PNME, in full accordance with the structure and requirements set out in Annex 3.

[2] SINEE — *Sistemul Informațional Național în domeniul Eficienței Energetice* (National Information System in the Field of Energy Efficiency). Concept approved by Government Decision No. 144/2025, developed and administered by the National Centre for Sustainable Energy (CNED) under Law No. 139/2018 on energy efficiency. SINEE consolidates data on energy-efficiency measures and energy savings across ten specialised subsystems, including SIME (energy management in public buildings) and SIEEC (energy performance of buildings), and underpins monitoring of the national target of reducing final energy consumption by 0.8% annually.

The Contractor will not develop or implement either the RNLC or the PNME; each will be part of separate arrangements to follow.

The two pillars run in parallel from inception, Pillar A is the shorter, decision-triggering exercise and its schedule shall not be subordinated to the schedule of Pillar B.

The feasibility assessment shall distinguish between current, near-term and future use cases, considering the present level of development and liquidity of Moldova's electricity and natural gas markets. Benefits shall not be assumed solely on the basis of EU market models but shall be linked to realistic market development milestones and expected adoption by market participants.

Inputs to be tested, not conclusions to be confirmed. The Operating Concept for the RNLC (Annex 1) is provided as background and shall be treated as inputs to be tested; where they propose an institutional or architectural arrangement that is not supported by the national framework governing State information resources, the Contractor shall say so expressly and shall reason from that framework. In particular, the designation of ANRE as institutional holder and operator of the Register in the Operating Concept has not been validated by a substantiated analysis and is expressly reopened by these Terms of Reference: the Contractor shall reach its own reasoned and unbiased conclusion on the institutional model and shall state the reasons for confirming or departing from the Concept. The Contractor shall also resolve the divergence between measure 52 of the Programme approved by Government Decision No. 652/2025, which associates each place of consumption with "data about the consumer" and a cadastral identifier, and the Operating Concept, which excludes personal and contractual data from the object of the Register and treats the cadastral reference as a non-determinative attribute, stating which reading is legally sustainable and formulating the corresponding normative correction – by amendment of Government Decision No. 652/2025, by an interpretative provision in the establishing Government Decision, or otherwise.

D.1 Applicable legal and architectural framework for context

The framework set out in this sub-section binds both pillars. The RNLC and the PNME are State information resources and State information systems. They are not, and shall not be treated as, corporate or sectoral systems of the transmission, distribution, supply, generation or market operators; analyses that treat either resource as an operator-owned or market-participant-owned asset are inconsistent with the applicable national framework and shall not be adopted as a working premise. Every analysis, option, cost estimate, architecture and roadmap produced under either pillar shall be constructed within, and tested against, the national framework governing such resources. That framework comprises, at a minimum: Law No. 467/2003 on informatisation and State information resources, in particular Articles 7^1 to 7^6 (the roles of owner, holder, keeper, technical administrator and user, and the three mandatory documents – concept of the information system, technical specification, regulation of the information resource) and Article 19 (conformity assessment by the e-Governance Agency), Law No. 71/2007 on registers, in particular Article 4 (principles, including unique identification of every register object using the State system of identifiers), Articles 9 to 15 (the subjects of legal relations in respect of registers – owner, holder, keeper, registrar and sub-registrar, data provider and data recipient), Article 16 (establishment of a register by Government decision and prior approval of its regulation), Article 19(8) (prohibition of repeated registration of an object already registered in another State register and of repeated accumulation of data on the same object), Article 19(10) (mandatory integration of State registers through unique identifiers and the State system of classifiers), Article 20(2) (the mandatory, invariable and non-reusable unique identifier) and Article 29 (provision of register data through the interoperability platform), Law No. 142/2018 on data exchange and interoperability, Law No. 234/2021 on public services, Law No. 133/2011 and Law No. 195/2024 on the protection of personal data, and Law No. 48/2023 on cybersecurity.

It further comprises the secondary framework governing Government ICT infrastructure and its use: Government Decision No. 414/2018 and Government Decision No. 823/2020, which transfer the technical administration and maintenance of State information systems to the Public Institution Information Technology and Cyber Security Service (STISC), designate STISC as holder of the common Government technology platform (MCloud) and require the consolidation of public-sector data centres into it, Government Decision No. 128/2014 on MCloud, Government Decision No. 153/2021, which requires holders and keepers to register a future State information resource or system in the Register of State Information Resources and Systems (RSI) before its creation or implementation begins and to obtain the prior coordination of the e-Governance Agency on the intention to create it and on its concept, Government Decision No. 544/2019 on the organisation of ICT procurement, which subjects ICT budget proposals, procurement plans and procurement procedures to coordination with the e-Governance Agency irrespective of the source of financing, Government Decision No. 211/2019 (MConnect), No. 1090/2013 (MPass),

No. 405/2014 (MSign), No. 708/2014 (MLog), No. 376/2020 (MNotify), No. 305/2024 (MDocs), No. 5/2024 (the integrated Government EVO application) and No. 677/2025 (the integrated Government EVO portal and the Unitary Design Model), and the technical documentation published by the e-Governance Agency for developers, including the API design guide, code standards, architecture decision records and integration guides for MPass, MSign, MPower, MPay, MConnect and MConnect Events, MNotify, MDelivery, MDocs, MLog and the EVO Wallet.

It comprises, thirdly, the public procurement framework, which is in transition during the period of this assignment and which conditions everything the Contractor recommends for the subsequent development of either resource. Law No. 131/2015 on public procurement applies until 31 December 2026. Law No. 325/2025 on public procurement, which partially transposes Directive 2014/24/EU, enters into force on 1 January 2027 and repeals Law No. 131/2015, under its transitional provision, contracts under execution and award procedures under way at that date are completed under the law in force when they were initiated. The procurement of the design, development and implementation of the RNLC and of the PNME cannot, on any realistic schedule, be initiated before 1 January 2027. It follows that every procurement-facing output of this assignment, as specified under Pillar A, shall be constructed on Law No. 325/2025 and not on Law No. 131/2015. Where the Contractor considers that a provision of Law No. 131/2015 remains relevant, it shall say why.

The framework further comprises Government Decision No. 695/2025 approving the Regulation on the planning of public procurement, under which a procurement procedure of any estimated value may be initiated only after it has been included in the provisional or annual procurement plan and the availability of the necessary funds has been secured, under which the procurement plan is approved within ten days of approval of the institution's budget and published within five working days, and under which the plan may not be modified after 5 December of the budget year and no procedure may be initiated on the basis of a plan modified after that date, save for autonomous public authorities and authorities not financed from the national public budget. The Contractor shall note that this Regulation rests on Law No. 131/2015 and will require alignment with Law No. 325/2025 before that law enters into force, that the secondary framework under the new law is not yet complete, and that the resulting uncertainty is itself a scheduling risk to be recorded in the risk register.

Coordination of ICT procurement, provided for in the Government Decision No. 544/2019, in the version amended by Government Decision No. 677/2025, approves the Methodology for the coordination of procurement in the field of information and communication technology. The Methodology applies irrespective of the type of procurement, the method and the source of financing, and expressly extends to technical assistance projects implemented in accordance with the specific procedures of donors or international organisations, where those procurements are initiated and carried out by ministries, other central administrative authorities subordinated to the Government, the State Chancellery and the organisational structures within their competence, including public institutions and State enterprises founded by them, and by public authorities, public institutions and autonomous State organisations subordinated to or founded by the Government. The Contractor shall establish, and state expressly, whether and how the Methodology applies to the subsequent development procurement under each institutional scenario that is, according to whether the contracting authority is the Ministry of Energy, CNED, ANRE, or a development partner acting on behalf of one of them and shall set out the consequences of each answer for the procurement route, the timetable and the obligations of the beneficiary. Compliance with the national framework is therefore imperative for the RNLC and the PNME whether the funds come from the national public budget or from development partners – including UNDP, the World Bank Group and the International Finance Corporation, GIZ or others and the recommendations of both pillars shall be constructed on that basis. The Contractor shall not treat donor financing as displacing the national requirements on planning, coordination, hosting, interoperability, identifiers or the recording of deliverables.

Risk category and its consequences. On the indicative envelopes recorded in the Action Plan of the Programme approved by Government Decision No. 652/2025 (Section B), and having regard to the fact that both derive directly from an approved Government programme and are critical in their impact on the sector, each development procurement falls within risk category I of that Methodology, which is defined by a budget above MDL 10 million together with derivation from a State strategy, criticality of impact and a large number of beneficiaries. For category I procurements the Methodology requires: prior coordination with the e-Governance Agency of the opportunity of the procurement, irrespective of category, prior coordination with that Agency of the entire procurement documentation, including the announcement, the technical specification, the qualification criteria and the terms of reference, the mandatory participation of the Agency's designated representative in the procurement working group throughout the procedure, including the evaluation of offers, the final validation and approval by the Agency of the evaluation documentation and of the procurement documentation, joint monitoring of contract execution

against deviations in time, budget, scope and planned benefits, on a reporting mechanism established by the Agency, and the recording of the deliverables, the source code of the information system, the complete technical documentation and the user and administration guides, including through the specialised repository made available and administered by the Agency. The Contractor shall model these as binding steps with realistic lead times and shall reflect the deliverable, source code and documentation obligations in the annotated outline of the Technical Specification. The Contractor shall further note that the Ministry of Finance approves for financing only ICT budget proposals that have been consulted and positively endorsed by the Agency, and that the reference ICT technical specifications used in procurement documentation are those elaborated and approved by the Ministry of Economic Development and Digitalisation with the support of that Agency.

This framework is not background material to be listed. It is determinative of what may lawfully be built, by whom, where it may be hosted, how it must exchange data and what it will cost. Accordingly, the Contractor shall demonstrate, for every architectural or institutional option it puts forward, that the option is consistent with that framework, or shall identify precisely the normative amendment that would be required to make it consistent. An option that presupposes a dedicated server and storage infrastructure outside MCloud, a bespoke authentication service in place of MPass, direct system-to-system interfaces bypassing MConnect, a proprietary identifier for natural or legal persons in place of IDNP and IDNO, or a parallel register duplicating an object already registered in another State register, shall be presented as non-compliant and the consequences of that non-compliance stated.

D.2 Cross-cutting requirements: Government platforms, hosting and approval requirements for context

Reuse of Government platforms and shared services. The Contractor shall assess, for each functional requirement of the RNLC and of the PNME, whether that requirement is already met by an existing Government platform or shared service and shall justify in writing any proposal to develop an equivalent function. The assessment shall cover at a minimum: MCloud for hosting, MConnect and MConnect Events for data exchange and event-driven, proactive processes, MPass for authentication and access control, MSign for electronic signature, MLog for journaling and audit, MNotify for notification, MDocs for document generation, hosting and sharing, MPay where any charged service is contemplated, MPower for the delegation of powers, which is directly relevant to consumer-authorised third-party access to energy data and to representation in supplier-switching processes, MDelivery where physical delivery arises, the EVO integrated Government portal and the EVO application, together with the Unitary Design Model, for any citizen- or business-facing interface, including the public CLC verification service, the EVO Wallet where a verifiable credential or attestation is contemplated, the semantic catalogue for the registration of semantic assets, and the national open data portal for publishable datasets. Where the analysis concludes that reuse is not possible, the deliverable shall state the specific technical, legal or functional reason and the residual cost of the alternative.

Relationship with STISC and MCloud. The Contractor shall consult STISC in the course of both pillars and shall reflect the outcome of that consultation in the deliverables. The analysis shall establish: the role STISC would exercise as technical administrator of each resource under Government Decision No. 414/2018, and how that role differs depending on which institution is designated holder – noting in particular that the transfer of technical administration under point 19 of that Decision applies to public authorities and institutions subordinated to or founded by the Government, whereas for administrative authorities autonomous of the Government point 23 expresses a recommendation rather than an obligation, with direct consequences for the ANRE scenario, the MCloud IaaS service catalogue, service levels and applicable tariffs, and the resulting recurrent hosting cost of each option, sized against the data volumes and availability requirements derived from the use cases, the technical compatibility requirements applicable to any equipment or software procured in support of the resources, and the coordination procedure applicable to them, the segregation of environments, backup, continuity and recovery arrangements available within MCloud and any residual requirement not met by them, and the sequence and lead times of the coordination steps that must be completed with STISC before development may be procured. The recurrent MCloud and STISC costs so established shall be carried into the cost-benefit analysis and into the statement of the future holder's financial obligations, and shall not be omitted as an unquantified assumption.

Coordination and approval gates. The roadmaps produced under both pillars shall model, as dated and sequenced gates with realistic lead times, the coordination and approval steps that condition implementation: registration of the intention to create the resource in the RSI and its prior coordination with the e-Governance Agency; the two rounds of examination and the issuance of the Agency's opinion on the draft Concept and draft Regulation through the RSI, followed by the meeting of secretaries general, inter-ministerial endorsement and expert examination, and approval by the Government; the endorsement by the Agency of the ICT budget proposal, without which the Ministry of Finance will not approve financing; the inclusion of the procurement in the provisional or annual

procurement plan of the contracting authority and the confirmation of the availability of funds, subject to the planning calendar and to the 5 December prohibition under Government Decision No. 695/2025, and to the exemption from that prohibition enjoyed by autonomous public authorities and by authorities not financed from the national public budget, which is a material scheduling difference between the institutional scenarios; the coordination of the opportunity of the procurement and of the complete procurement documentation with the e-Governance Agency under Government Decision No. 544/2019, and the participation of that Agency's designated representative in the procurement working group; the coordination with STISC where applicable; and the multi-annual budget commitment required from the designated holder. A roadmap that assumes development can begin without these steps, or that treats them as instantaneous, shall not be accepted. The roadmap shall show how these gates interact with the budget calendar, so that the Beneficiary can see in which budget year each increment can realistically be launched.

D.3 General principles

The Contractor shall observe the following six principles throughout, in both pillars.

- Reuse before build. Existing registers, infrastructures, reference sources and government platform services shall be assessed for reuse or extension before the development of new components is contemplated, and any recommendation to build shall be justified against the reuse alternatives.
- Evidence before assumption. Statements about data quality, matching feasibility, integration effort or operator readiness shall be supported by profiling results, documented interviews or verifiable sources, and the assumptions that could not be tested shall be identified as such.
- Non-substitution. The RNLC shall be treated as a national reference function and the PNME as a service and analytics layer over authoritative sources. Neither analysis shall presuppose the development of a new technical platform, nor the substitution of SINEE, of the operational, metering and commercial systems of the network operators, or of the systems that remain authoritative for their own data.
- One delineation. The boundary between the RNLC, the PNME, SINEE and the operators' systems shall be established once and maintained consistently across both pillars, and shall not be restated differently in the outputs of each.
- Source authority and federation. Operator operational, customer, billing, head-end and meter data management systems shall remain authoritative for their own data. The RNLC shall not become a detailed time-series repository, and the PNME shall store or access only data products justified by approved use cases.
- Scalable continuity. The identity, governance and access model shall remain stable from the use of existing data through full smart-meter deployment, and growth in interval data shall not require a different core architecture.

For this purpose, source authority shall mean that each data item has one recognised source system, one responsible data owner, one data steward, one correction route and one audit trail. The RNLC and PNME shall not create parallel authoritative records where an existing institution or operator remains responsible for the source data. Any recommendation to store, replicate, transform, aggregate or publish data shall identify the approved use case, legal basis, source authority, data-quality rule, retention rule and access regime.

Security, privacy and operational resilience shall be treated as design constraints for both pillars, not as post-design compliance checks. The assessment shall distinguish operational systems, analytical services and public outputs, and shall ensure that no RNLC or PNME service creates an external operational command route to meters, HES, MDMS, SCADA, EMS or distribution systems. All proposed access, exchange, storage, publication and analytics arrangements shall be assessed against personal data protection, confidentiality, cybersecurity, auditability, incident management, continuity and recovery requirements.

D.4 Pillar A – Detailed context and requirements for Rapid Feasibility assessment for the National Register of Consumption Points (RNLC)

Pillar A is a focused, decision-triggering assessment to be delivered and its purpose is not to produce an exhaustive study but to close, on defensible evidence, the four questions that currently block a Government decision: who shall hold the Register and on what legal basis, what it will cost to build, host and operate it and who will bear those costs, what its technical interdependence with the PNME and with SINEE actually is, and in what modular sequence it can realistically be implemented. Depth shall be concentrated on those four questions. Where the four-month

window does not permit exhaustive evidence on a secondary matter, the Contractor shall state the limitation expressly and shall not substitute assumption for evidence.

The scale of the evidence base shall be proportionate to that window. The data profiling required under this Pillar shall be performed on representative anonymised or pseudonymised samples agreed with UNDP at inception, sufficient to establish orders of magnitude and the incidence of the problem classes identified, and not on full population extracts. Where sampling limits the confidence of a finding, the confidence level and its consequences for the feasibility conclusion shall be stated.

Baseline and evidence

- Inventory the existing registers, information systems, infrastructures and reference sources relevant to the identification of places of consumption, including the real estate register (which integrates spatial and legal/ownership data) and official address records (Registrul [3])[4], SINEE[5]interoperability[6], authentication[7] and logging services, the ERP, GIS, customer information, billing and customer-facing systems of the distribution system operators, the head-end and meter data management platforms under deployment, the systems of the transmission system operator and the registers operated by ANRE and CNED, and establish for each what could be reused, extended or integrated.
- Perform a dedicated digital-maturity assessment of the distribution system operators – Premier Energy Distribution, RED-Nord and the natural gas distribution operators, covering customer information, GIS, head-end and meter data management systems, metering infrastructure, identifiers, APIs, data quality, cybersecurity, staffing and integration capacity. The assessment shall not stop at an inventory of systems: the question to be answered is whether each operator can reliably maintain and exchange RNLC data.
- Assess integration readiness for each relevant source system, including data ownership, available APIs or export facilities, bidirectional synchronisation, event handling, error correction, reconciliation, cybersecurity, staffing and the capacity to maintain RNLC mappings over time, distinguishing capabilities available now from those dependent on the head-end and meter data management roll-out.
- Document the As-Is processes through which places of consumption are currently identified, recorded, corrected and reconciled, and identify the duplications, manual interventions and bottlenecks.
- Conduct individual structured interviews and working sessions with each institution and operator concerned, and validate the resulting findings with them.
- Establish the institutional and legal baseline, comprising the mandates, competences, resources and technical capacity of the institutions concerned, and a gap analysis of the legal framework identifying every provision that would need to be amended or newly created.
- Conduct a dedicated legal gap analysis of the institutional holder scenarios. For each candidate institution the analysis shall establish, by reference to the instruments that govern it, whether it may lawfully be designated holder of a State information resource of this nature and what would have to be amended for it to be so designated.
- For the National Centre for Sustainable Energy (CNED), the analysis shall proceed from Government Decision No. 1060/2023 on the organisation and functioning of the Centre, read with Law No. 139/2018 on energy efficiency and Law No. 282/2023 on the energy performance of buildings. It shall establish whether the Centre's statutory mission and enumerated functions – which are confined to energy efficiency, renewable energy, financial assistance and the issuance of financial guarantees, and which expressly provide for the creation, administration, development and maintenance of SINEE and of no other information system accommodate the holding of a national register of places of consumption serving regulated electricity and gas market processes. It shall identify the specific amendments to the Statute of the Centre, to its structure and staffing ceiling, to its tariff nomenclature and to any tangential normative act that would be required, it shall assess whether the Centre, as a self-financing public institution founded by the Ministry of Energy, has or can acquire the budgetary and staffing capacity to sustain the Register, and it shall identify any legal inconsistency that would categorically preclude that role, in particular any conflict between the Centre's role as beneficiary

[3] e-Cadastru | Instituția Publică Cadastrul Bunurilor Imobile
[4] Sisteme Informationale | CNED
[5] Government Interoperability Platform | Government of Republic of Moldova
[6] Electronic Signature Governmental Service | Government of Republic of Moldova
[7] Authentication and Access Control Service | Government of Republic of Moldova

and implementer of energy-efficiency financing programmes and its neutrality as holder of a register on which market participants depend.

- For the National Agency for Energy Regulation (ANRE), the analysis shall proceed from the Regulation on the organisation and functioning of the Agency approved by Parliament Decision No. 334/2018, read with Law No. 174/2017 on energy and the sectoral laws. It shall establish whether the Agency's competences – which are those of a regulatory and monitoring authority, and which extend to holding registers of licence holders but not, on their face, to holding a national reference register of places of consumption accommodate that role, and shall identify the amendments to the Regulation, to Law No. 174/2017 and to any tangential act that would be required. The analysis shall address, expressly and without eliding them: the Agency's status as an administrative authority autonomous of the Government and accountable to Parliament, and the consequences of that status for the applicability of Government Decision No. 414/2018 on the transfer of technical administration, for the mandatory character of MCloud hosting, and for the Government's ability to impose obligations on the Agency by Government decision rather than by law, the funding of the Agency from regulatory charges and the mechanism by which the capital and recurrent costs of the Register would be recognised in that budget and, ultimately, in regulated tariffs, and the institutional conflict inherent in an authority that regulates, supervises and sanctions the network operators also operating a register that depends on data supplied by those same operators, together with the organisational, procedural and access-control separations that would be required to contain it, and whether such separation is achievable within the Agency's present structure.
- For the Ministry of Energy, the analysis shall establish whether the arrangement already applied to SINEE under Government Decision No. 144/2025 – in which the Ministry is holder (posesor) of the information system and a subordinated public institution is keeper (deținător), is available and appropriate for the RNLC, and shall test it as a full scenario rather than as a residual option. The analysis shall note that the Action Plan of the Programme approved by Government Decision No. 652/2025 designates the Ministry of Energy as the authority responsible for the regulation and implementation of both the RNLC and the PNME, with ANRE responsible for monitoring, and shall reconcile that designation with whichever institutional model it ultimately recommends.
- In every scenario the four statutory roles shall be assessed separately and may be assigned to different entities: holder (posesor), which bears the legal, financial and organisational responsibility for the resource, keeper (deținător), which creates, administers, maintains and develops it, technical administrator (administrator tehnic), which operates the infrastructure and implements the security requirements, and registrar (registrator), which decides on entry, modification and removal of register objects and which, under Article 13 of Law No. 71/2007, may be a participant in data exchange – a provision of direct relevance to the role of the distribution system operators in initiating registrations. The Contractor shall state, for the recommended configuration, the instrument by which each role is to be conferred and the delimitation of attributions to be set out in the Regulation of the information resource.
- Establish the interdependence of the RNLC with SINEE on evidence rather than assertion. The Contractor shall obtain from CNED, and analyse, the technical documentation and technical designs prepared for SINEE, whether completed or in progress, and shall assess each of the ten subsystems provided for by Government Decision No. 144/2025 – the CNED public portal, programme and project management, energy management in buildings, energy performance of buildings, energy audit, monitoring and verification of energy savings, the register of energy-efficiency specialists, administration and system functionalities, data analysis and reporting, and the GIS platform, in order to determine which of them could host, feed or serve part of the RNLC or PNME function, which could be reused as a shared service, and which must remain separate. The assessment shall extend to the SINEE integration microservice, the SINEE object model and, in particular, the identifier chosen for the building object, which under that Decision is the State cadastral number taken from the Real Estate Register, a choice that must be reconciled with the position that the identity of a place of consumption should not depend on a cadastral identifier. The Contractor shall have regard to the state of development of the SIEEC subsystem, for which a software developer has already been engaged, and shall state expressly what would have to be communicated to CNED, and what amendment to Government Decision No. 144/2025 would be required, if the recommended option altered the SINEE concept, its subsystem boundaries or its interfaces.
- Conclude, on that evidence, on the three architectural options for the relationship between the RNLC and SINEE agreed at the technical validation workshop of 22 July 2026: the RNLC developed as a distinct information resource, integrated and synchronised with SINEE through dedicated interfaces, the RNLC function absorbed into SINEE and operated as a subsystem of it, and any intermediate arrangement the

evidence supports. For each option the assessment shall establish the extent to which existing infrastructure can be reused, the associated costs and risks, the impact on implementation timescales, the consequences for the designation of the holder, and the amendments to Government Decision No. 144/2025 and to the Statute of CNED that would follow. The assessment shall address expressly the concern that a surplus of resources is created which must be maintained but whose use is marginal or not understood, and shall state, for the recommended option, what would be lost if the RNLC were not created and what would be duplicated if it were created alongside SINEE.

- Assess the reuse of Government platforms and shared services for each RNLC function, and consult STISC on hosting, technical administration, sizing, service levels and tariffs, in accordance with Section D.2. The findings shall be expressed as concrete architectural requirements and as costed recurrent obligations of the future holder, not as a statement of intent.
- Obtain anonymised or pseudonymised samples of live data from the distribution system operators and the relevant reference registers, and profile them to establish measured values for completeness, uniqueness, duplication, , cadastral and address match rates before and after normalisation, owner-tenant divergence, multiple consumption points per coordinate or building, bulk metering relationships, and the residual volume of cases requiring manual resolution.

  Geospatial attributes shall be profiled separately. For each georeferenced record in the sample, the assessment shall classify the coordinate by: (i) the object to which it refers, distinguishing at minimum the metering device, the connection point, the building, the building unit and the cadastral parcel, (ii) the source and method of acquisition, distinguishing field survey or GNSS capture, digitisation from a map or plan, derivation from a postal address, and assignment of a parcel or building centroid, (iii) positional accuracy, stated in metres where known, (iv) the date of capture or last update, and (v) the confidence or quality level assigned by the source system. Where an attribute is not held by the source system, its absence shall be recorded as a finding and shall not be inferred or substituted.

  The assessment shall establish, rather than assume, whether coordinates can serve as a matching key. It shall quantify the incidence of coordinates denoting an approximate rather than a surveyed location, and of legitimate distinct consumption points sharing a single coordinate, building or parcel, and shall state the consequences of both for matching, deduplication and the assignment of the CLC.

  Delays in concluding data-sharing agreements or in extraction and anonymisation shall be recorded and reflected in the feasibility conclusions.
- Conclude on the feasibility, effort, cost and timescale of the initial constitution of the RNLC database, on the minimum data-quality thresholds required before any sector may be declared operational, and on the remediation required of each operator.
- Establish explicit readiness gates and conclude on a GO, CONDITIONAL GO or NO-GO basis, assessing data quality against the minimum thresholds required before each sector can become operational:
  - GO – minimum conditions are met and an electricity-first RNLC can proceed to implementation or pilot;
  - CONDITIONAL GO – an electricity-first RNLC is feasible, but certain data-quality or system deficiencies must be remedied before operational launch;
  - NO-GO – current data, system or market readiness is insufficient for an electricity-first RNLC.

Business analysis, options and business case

- Establish the operational definition of the place of consumption and its relationships with sub-locations, connection points, metering points, meters, contracts, customers and cadastral objects, with explicit rules for the complex cases identified during the technical validation workshop, and without transforming the register into a register of persons or of contracts.
- Model the building or unit, the accounting or market point, the metering point and the meter asset as distinct objects with persistent, versioned relationships and effective dates. A place of consumption is not necessarily a building, the unique code shall not be used as a building identifier or as a meter-asset identifier.
- Design the unique code of the place of consumption, including its structure, the arguments for a nationally defined and an internationally standardised scheme, the lifecycle and non-reuse rules, the treatment of time-aware relationships and effective dates, and the alias and migration approach for the identifiers already in use by the operators.

- Compare the existing or proposed CLC scheme with at least one internationally standardised opaque identifier option, including GS1 GSRN, and assess a transition in which the current CLC may be retained as a display or legacy alias mapped one-to-one to the canonical identifier. The recommendation shall not use one identifier for logically distinct objects.
- Identify, prioritise and specify the use cases, establishing for each the process, actors, data required, authoritative source, legal basis, expected benefit and the boundary of the register's responsibility, and derive from them the minimum logical data model.
- Re-map the actors and their interaction scenarios with the RNLC. Section 1.4 of the Operating Concept identifies the actors involved in the establishment and operation of the Register and describes their attributions, but it does not establish how each actor would actually interact with the Register in a given process. That omission is the principal source of the uncertainty expressed by the institutions. The Contractor shall close it by producing an actor × scenario interaction matrix covering, at a minimum, the Ministry of Energy, ANRE, CNED, the transmission system operator, the electricity and natural gas distribution system operators, the suppliers, the electricity market operator, the cadastral authority and the address register, the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection and the Energy Vulnerability information system, the e-Governance Agency, STISC, the National Bureau of Statistics, other institutional users, and end users.
- Each scenario in the matrix shall state: the triggering event, the initiating actor and the actor responsible for the outcome, the legal basis for the interaction and the instrument that establishes it, the channel and the specific service used, distinguishing interaction through the interoperability platform from interaction through a user interface, the data transmitted and the data returned, by attribute, the authoritative source of each attribute, the validation, reconciliation and error-handling rules applied, whether the exchange is unidirectional or bidirectional and at what frequency or on what event, what is logged and where, the response time or service level expected, the party responsible if the interaction fails, and what changes in each participant's own systems and internal processes in order to support it. Scenarios shall be developed at a minimum for: registration and lifecycle change of a place of consumption initiated by a network operator, correction of a disputed record, supplier switching, connection, disconnection and reconnection, verification of a CLC in a social-protection process and pre-filling under the once-only principle, including in the „Ajutor la Contor" programme, correlation of a place of consumption with a building record in SINEE, prosumer and collective self-consumption configurations, bulk metering serving multiple consumption units, and public verification through the CLC verification service.
- The matrix shall be validated with each actor individually and shall be presented in editable tabular form. It is the instrument by which the institutions are expected to understand, and to accept or contest, what participation in the RNLC would require of them, and it shall be drafted to that standard.
- Establish the functional delineation between the RNLC, SINEE, the PNME and the systems of the operators, including the objects and data managed by each, the authoritative source for every attribute, and the synchronisation and reconciliation flows.
- For every proposed integration, specify the system of record, data direction, trigger or frequency, latency, validation, acknowledgement, error handling, retry, reconciliation, versioning and audit requirements, and identify which exchanges must operate bidirectionally.
- Compare the energy scope options, the institutional ownership scenarios, the delivery and architecture options and the phasing options against a documented multi-criteria framework with explicit criteria, weightings and scores, treating the roles of institutional holder, functional authority, data administrator and technical administrator as distinct roles that may or may not be exercised by the same entity.
- The comparison of institutional ownership scenarios shall not be reduced to a binary choice between two institutions. It shall present, at a minimum, the ANRE scenario, the CNED scenario and the Ministry of Energy scenario, and shall in addition present at least one distributed configuration in which the statutory roles are separated between institutions – for example, the Ministry of Energy as holder, a subordinated public institution as keeper and STISC as technical administrator. For each configuration the comparison shall state the amendments required, the time needed to adopt them, the recurrent cost and its bearer, the neutrality risks and their mitigation, the operational capacity required and how it would be built, and the consequences for the participating operators. The comparison shall include a public procurement dimension: the threshold applicable to each candidate as contracting authority, whether each is subject to the prohibition on modifying the procurement plan after 5 December, having regard to the exemption for autonomous public authorities and for authorities not financed from the national public budget, whether each is within the scope of the

Methodology for the coordination of ICT procurement and therefore subject to the opportunity and documentation coordination, the participation of the e-Governance Agency in the working group and the deliverable-recording obligations, the working-group composition and certified-specialist requirements applicable to it, and the practical procurement capacity of each institution, evidenced by the ICT procurements it has actually conducted.

- Produce the cost-benefit case, including capital and institutional operating cost estimates with explicit assumptions and ranges, the integration costs falling on the participants, the recurrent operating costs and their bearer, the quantified and qualitative benefits including energy market benefits and EU-integration benefits, the funding and sustainability options, and an international benchmark of ownership, operating, funding and regulatory models. Particular attention shall be given to institutional operating costs, which may represent significant hidden long-term costs for the public institutions concerned.
- Cover in the benchmark at least the capabilities and governance practices of Norway's Elhub, Finland's Datahub, Estonia's Estfeed, Latvia's STEP, Lithuania's ESO Data Hub, the Czech EDC/OTE model, Slovenia and the Netherlands' EDSN, drawing transferable principles – role clarity, stable identifiers, APIs, permissions, audit and testing environments rather than copying another country's institutional ownership model.
- Comparative and benchmarking analysis is a core research method for this assignment and is not the responsibility of any single expert. The Contractor shall set out in the inception report how comparators are identified, how they are compared, and how the transferability of each arrangement to the Republic of Moldova is assessed by reference to the national legal, institutional, technical and energy-market context. The value sought is not familiarity with foreign models as such, but a reasoned judgement on which of their features can operate within the national framework and which cannot.
- Assess the alignment of the recommended option with Directive (EU) 2019/944, Implementing Regulation (EU) 2023/1162 and Article 22 of Directive (EU) 2024/1275, and state whether and how the proposed identity model would support the national building energy performance database that Moldova will be required to establish.
- Use current EU electricity-data interoperability work led jointly by the EU DSO Entity and ENTSO-E, including the Harmonised Electricity Market Role Model, applicable European Style Market Profiles and the legacy ebIX models, as reference material. CIM shall not be prescribed at this stage, its suitability shall be assessed only when the detailed IT architecture and the concrete bidirectional interfaces are being defined, with any recommendation identifying the exact IEC family, profile, version, business process and conformity test.

Feasibility conclusion, roadmap and governmental package outline

- Formulate the recommended option for scope, ownership, architecture and phasing, making the trade-offs explicit and stating the rejected options and the reasons for their rejection.
- Define the target operating model with a RACI matrix, the data governance framework, the access and role model, and the retention, correction and audit arrangements.
- Analyse the personal data protection implications, including the re-identification risk arising from the correlation of consumption point data, the lawful basis for each data flow, and the need for a data protection impact assessment for the public verification service and for the exchanges with other systems, and define the cybersecurity classification, the segregation of operational, analytical and public data layers, and the monitoring, incident and continuity requirements.
- Assess purpose-separated portals and shared identity, permission and audit controls. Household interval data shall not be public, and no RNLC or PNME user-facing service shall create a command path to smart meters or operator systems. The control framework shall be aligned with GDPR and NIS2 principles, subject to applicable Moldovan law and transposition.
- Prepare the phased implementation roadmap with a minimum viable product, dependencies, transition criteria between phases and an end-to-end pilot across both electricity distribution system operators, together with the preconditions for implementation, the performance and data-quality indicators and the risk register.
- The roadmap shall express modular implementation as discrete, separately fundable increments, each with its own scope, cost, dependencies, entry and exit criteria and decision point, so that the Government may commit to the first increment without committing to the whole. It shall be sequenced against the coordination and approval gates set out in Section D.2 and against the delivery dates and coverage targets fixed by the

Action Plan of the Programme approved by Government Decision No. 652/2025, and shall state expressly where those targets are no longer attainable and what revision of the Programme would be required.

- Prepare the annotated outline and drafting instructions for the Technical Specification (Caiet de sarcini) for the design, development and implementation of the recommended solution, establishing the chapter structure, the functional and non-functional requirement areas, the interface and interoperability requirements per participating system, the security, personal data protection, logging and auditability requirements, the hosting, source code, documentation, intellectual property and exit arrangements, the acceptance criteria and gates, the phasing and payment structure, the qualification and technical evaluation criteria, and the indicative budget. The outline shall be vendor-neutral and free of any dependency on a specific supplier or technology stack. The drafting of the Technical Specification itself is not part of this assignment.
- Recommend the procurement strategy for the design, development and implementation of the recommended solution, constructed on Law No. 325/2025. The recommendation shall establish: the estimated value of the contract, calculated in accordance with the rules of that law on the calculation of estimated value and without artificial division of the object, the threshold applicable to the institution that would act as contracting authority, distinguishing the threshold applicable to central public authorities from that applicable to local public authorities and public-law legal persons, and stating the consequence of that distinction for the procedure, the procedure recommended, assessed against open tender, restricted tender, competitive negotiation, competitive dialogue, innovation partnership and the framework agreement, having regard to the fact that where the requirements cannot be met without adapting readily available solutions, or where the technical specifications cannot be defined with sufficient precision at the outset, the law permits the more interactive procedures, and that competitive dialogue may be awarded exclusively on the best price-quality ratio, whether and how the contract should be divided into lots, and how any division would map onto the modular implementation increments recommended under the roadmap, the qualification and selection criteria and the means of proof, the award criterion and the evaluation factors, expressed so that quality is not displaced by price in a procurement of this character, the contract-modification, subcontracting and termination provisions appropriate to a phased development, and the acceptance gates and payment structure.
- Structure the total cost of ownership model produced under the business case so that it can be reused directly as the life-cycle costing method in the future award. Law No. 325/2025 permits the contracting authority to evaluate cost on a life-cycle basis, requiring it to indicate in the award documentation the data to be supplied by bidders and the method by which life-cycle cost will be established. The Contractor shall therefore expose in the costing model the cost categories, the data inputs, the calculation method and the assumptions in a form that a contracting authority could adopt, and shall state which elements would have to be settled before the method could be applied.
- Set out the measures required under Law No. 325/2025 in respect of market consultation and the prior involvement of candidates. That law permits the contracting authority to consult the market before initiating a procedure and to use the opinions received, provided competition is not distorted, and provides that a person who advised the contracting authority or participated in the preparation of the award documentation is not automatically excluded but that the contracting authority shall take appropriate measures, including the communication to other bidders of the relevant information arising from that participation and the setting of reasonable deadlines, and may exclude that person only where no other means secures equal treatment, after giving it the opportunity to demonstrate that its involvement does not distort competition. Because the outputs of this assignment will be carried into the future award documentation, the Contractor shall identify for the beneficiary the specific measures to be applied, and the information to be disclosed, so that the subsequent procurement is not vitiated. This is without prejudice to the exclusion of the Contractor from that procurement provided for in Section G, which is a contractual condition of this assignment.
- Prepare the annotated outline of the Concept of the RNLC information system and of the Regulation of the information resource, in Romanian, structured in accordance with the mandatory chapter structure applicable to concepts of State information systems and clearly delimiting what belongs in the Concept from what belongs in the Regulation, together with the drafting instructions necessary for a subsequent assignment to complete them. The outline shall identify, for each chapter, the substantive conclusions of the feasibility assessment that must be carried into it.
- Prepare a costed and sequenced legislative and normative roadmap. The roadmap shall list every act to be adopted or amended in order to establish the RNLC under the recommended institutional model – primary

legislation, Government decisions, the Statute of the institution designated as holder or keeper, sectoral regulations approved by ANRE, and departmental acts and shall state for each: the provision at issue, the amendment required, the initiating authority, the approval circuit and its stages, the realistic lead time, the dependency on other acts in the sequence, and the consequence of non-adoption. It shall distinguish the acts that must be in force before development may be procured from those that must be in force before the Register may enter operation. Where the assessment concludes NO-GO, the Contractor shall in addition deliver a prioritised remediation plan and explicit readiness gates, so that the package can be completed once the remediation is achieved.

- Validate the assessment with the stakeholders at a workshop, and deliver a hand-over and knowledge transfer session to the beneficiary institutions.

D.5 Pillar B – Detailed context and requirements for the Feasibility study for the National Energy Management Platform (PNME)

Pillar B is a full feasibility study. The national digital ecosystem in the energy sector remains fragmented and insufficiently financed, the digital readiness of the authorities and of the operators, and the actual availability of the data on which the platform would depend, are not established, and the legal analysis required cuts across the Ministry of Energy, ANRE, CNED and the framework governing Government information technology. The study shall answer those questions on evidence, and its schedule shall not be compressed by transferring findings from Pillar A that have not been separately tested for the purposes of the PNME.

The study shall assess, and shall not assume, the digital readiness of each relevant authority and operator to participate in the platform – that is, whether each is actually able to supply the data required, at the granularity, quality and frequency required, through the interfaces required, and to sustain that supply. Declared intentions shall be distinguished from demonstrated capability, and the consequences of any shortfall for the scope, phasing and cost of the platform shall be stated.

The study shall test expressly the proposition that the PNME as originally conceived is oriented to a future state of the sector that is not yet present, and shall accordingly evaluate, as a distinct option to be validated rather than as a premise, the extent to which SINEE would need to be re-engineered, extended or partially superseded in order to serve the purposes attributed to the PNME. No decision has been taken on that question and the study shall place the Beneficiary in a position to take one. The examination shall be conducted against the technical documentation of SINEE obtained from CNED and shall state, for each option, the amendment to Government Decision No. 144/2025 that would be required, the effect on the SIEEC development already under way, and the cost of change.

The study shall be constructed within the legal and architectural framework set out in Section D.1 and shall address, for the PNME as for the RNLC, the reuse of Government platforms and shared services, the relationship with STISC and MCloud, the coordination and approval gates, and the interaction scenarios between each actor and the platform. The actor × scenario interaction matrix required under Pillar A shall have a counterpart for the PNME, developed to the same standard and validated with each actor individually.

As-Is analysis of the energy data ecosystem

- Document the institutional and operational context for the management of energy data, establishing for each institution and operator its current mandate and responsibilities, the data and systems it manages, its reporting and publication obligations, its role in the existing information flows, and its institutional and technical capacity, without presuming its future role within the PNME.
- Inventory the information systems, registers, platforms and datasets relevant to the PNME across electricity, natural gas, district heating, liquid fuels and petroleum products, renewable generation and flexibility, and public-sector energy efficiency, expressly including SINEE and its subsystems, the RNLC, and the operational, metering, billing, reporting, analytical and customer-facing systems of the operators, and establish for each what may be reused, integrated, extended or kept separate.
- Document the current collection, validation, consolidation and reporting flows, and inventory the existing statutory obligations to report and publish data to national and external platforms, identifying for each flow the legal basis, recipient, dataset, format, periodicity, source, validation mechanism and system used, so that the study can establish where the PNME would reuse, automate or consolidate an existing flow rather than create a parallel one.

- The As-Is analysis shall distinguish PNME analytical and reporting outputs from official statistical series and the national energy balance. The study shall identify where PNME outputs should reuse, reconcile with, support or remain separate from official statistics, so that the PNME does not create parallel or contradictory official values.
- Assess the readiness of the data – availability and granularity, quality and consistency, the identifiers available for correlation, and the access and confidentiality regime and state for each significant gap its type, probable cause, priority and implications for requirements, integration, governance, security, cost and timeline.
- Benchmark national energy data platforms and data hubs in comparable jurisdictions, and draw the lessons applicable to Moldova, in particular on governance, phasing, metadata and cataloguing, the separation of operational from analytical and published data, and access and anonymisation rules. The benchmark shall also examine operational building-energy and energy-efficiency systems, including Croatia's ISGE, France's OPERAT, Ireland's SEAI Monitoring and Reporting system, Flanders' Woningpas, the Netherlands' EP-Online, Estonia's Building Register and Portugal's SCE, distinguishing functional comparators from institutional templates.

Needs, use cases and integration requirements

- Identify and prioritise the use cases the PNME is to serve, establishing for each the business process and the decision supported, the beneficiary and business owner, the data required and their authoritative source, the periodicity, level of aggregation and sensitivity, the legal basis for access, exchange and use, the systems and reporting that already cover the need in whole or in part, the added value sought and the measurable benefit.
- Test explicitly whether the primary PNME service scope should centre on the national building-energy database and energy-efficiency use cases required by the EPBD and the Energy Efficiency Directive, while electricity-market and consumption-point registry functions remain within the RNLC domain. Any broader multi-energy analytics or market-monitoring module shall be separately justified by use cases, legal basis, data readiness and measurable benefit.
- Translate Article 22 of Directive (EU) 2024/1275 into testable capability requirements, including building and unit identification, energy performance certificate, inspection, renovation passport and smart-readiness data, calculated and measured consumption, interoperability with the cadastre or land registry and with digital building logbooks, professional submission, owner access, authorised sharing, public aggregates, and applicable EU Building Stock Observatory reporting.
- The translation of Article 22 shall be presented as a traceability matrix, not only as narrative analysis. The matrix shall map each relevant building-energy data category, access right, interoperability requirement and reporting or publication output to the proposed PNME, SINEE, RNLC or source-system capability, identifying the responsible institution, source authority, identifier, legal basis, data-quality dependency, implementation phase and residual gap.
- Assess whether a dedicated capability for monitoring and analysing the electricity market is warranted and, if so, whether it justifies a distinct module of the PNME or can be delivered through common platform services, having regard to the existing systems and processes of ANRE, the system and market operators and other participants.
- Derive the high-level information and technical requirements and the essential non-functional requirements, prioritise them on a must, should and could basis, and state the preconditions without which they cannot be satisfied.

To-Be options, operating model and business case

- Define and compare no fewer than three distinct implementation options in a comparable format, including at a minimum a centralised data warehouse or data lake model, a federated gateway model providing access to data at source, and a hybrid model, without presuming a predetermined technical architecture.
- Include as an explicit option a shared technical foundation with separate RNLC and PNME service domains, portals, data products, roles and legal purposes, and compare it against fully separate implementations. Shared components may include identifier mapping, API or event gateway, identity and access management, permissions, logging and audit, while source systems remain authoritative.
- Evaluate the options against a documented multi-criteria framework with explicit criteria, weightings and scores, and recommend a preferred option with its rationale, its mandatory preconditions and its residual risks.

- Define the conceptual operating model and a conceptual modular structure for the recommended option, establishing for each module its purpose, users, data, shared services, interfaces and external dependencies, and ensuring that no module duplicates data or functions already managed in SINEE, the RNLC or the operators' systems.
- Produce the feasibility-level cost, benefit and sustainability estimate, including capital and operating costs by category with explicit assumptions and ranges, the integration costs falling on each participant, the recurrent operating costs and their bearer, the total cost of ownership, the quantified and qualitative benefits, the funding options and the sustainability model.

Institutional, legal and data governance framework

- Inventory the applicable normative acts, clarify the mandates and roles of the institutions concerned as data owners, administrators and users, and conduct a legal gap analysis covering institutional mandates, the collection and provision of data, interoperability, confidentiality, publication and reuse, personal data protection, information security and reporting obligations, with concrete remedial options for each gap identified.
- The legal gap analysis under this Pillar shall cover, in the same manner and to the same depth as under Pillar A, the mandates of the Ministry of Energy, ANRE and CNED in relation to the holding, keeping, technical administration and use of the PNME, the statutory basis on which each operator and institution could be obliged to supply data to the platform, and the instrument by which that obligation would be created, the confidentiality and commercial-sensitivity constraints attaching to operator data and the mechanism for reconciling them with the platform's purposes, the relationship between platform outputs and official statistics, and the framework governing Government information technology, including hosting, interoperability, identifiers, the approval circuit and ICT procurement coordination. Remedial options shall be expressed as specific amendments to identified provisions, with the initiating authority and the approval circuit for each.
- Establish the functional and institutional delimitation of the PNME against SINEE, the RNLC and the operators' systems, and propose a conceptual data governance model together with the instruments that must be approved or signed before or in parallel with implementation, expressed as actionable tasks with responsible institutions and dependencies.

Roadmap, indicators, risks and consolidation

- Prepare a phased roadmap over one to three years, derived from the recommended option and the preconditions established, defining for each phase the objective, activities, deliverables, responsible institutions, dependencies, indicative costs, acceptance criteria and transition criteria, and stating the dependencies of the PNME on the RNLC and on the head-end and meter data management platforms under deployment.
- Provide an immediate-data phase based on available customer information, billing, meter-register, legacy-reading and building or energy performance certificate data after profiling and confirmation of lawful use, followed by progressive integration of validated interval data from operator head-end and meter data management systems. The smart-meter roll-out shall be treated as a scaling input, not as a prerequisite for creating the RNLC and PNME foundations.
- Define the performance indicators and the monitoring mechanism, and prepare the risk register with mitigation measures and a synthesis of the risks requiring mitigation before implementation begins.
- The PNME feasibility study shall support a formal implementation-readiness decision. The Contractor shall classify the recommended way forward as GO, CONDITIONAL GO or NO-GO for implementation procurement. GO means that the legal, institutional, data, source-system, cybersecurity, funding and operating preconditions for launching implementation procurement are met. CONDITIONAL GO means that the recommended option is feasible, but specified deficiencies must be remedied before operational launch or before defined modules are procured. NO-GO means that implementation procurement should not proceed at this stage. In a NO-GO case, the Contractor shall identify the remediation actions, responsible institutions, readiness gates and decision pathway for a later implementation decision.
- Consolidate the analysis into the feasibility study required by Annex 3, validate it with the stakeholders at a workshop, and deliver a hand-over and knowledge transfer session to the beneficiary institutions.

D.6 Coherence between the two pillars

- Address a single consolidated data and information request to each institution and operator, covering the requirements of both pillars, and reuse rather than repeat the evidence established under one pillar in the outputs of the other.
- Maintain one delineation between the RNLC, the PNME, SINEE and the operators' systems across both pillars. Where the PNME analysis produces a finding that revises the delineation established under Pillar A, that revision shall be reflected back into the Pillar A outputs before their final acceptance.
- Ensure that the roadmaps of the two pillars are mutually consistent in their sequencing, dependencies and assumptions about the availability of validated metering data, and that the cost estimates of the two do not double-count shared components, shared integrations or shared operating costs.
- Ensure that neither the RNLC nor the PNME duplicates the authoritative detailed measurement series, validation, estimation, correction and versioning functions of operator meter data management systems, and that neither creates an external operational command route to meters or distribution systems.
- Ensure that gender equality, accessibility and the "leave no one behind" principle are mainstreamed throughout both pillars, in particular in the treatment of energy-poor and vulnerable consumers in the use cases and in the assessment of the benefits.

E. Key deliverables, tasks and tentative timetable

The Contractor is expected to provide the following deliverables according to the schedule below. All deliverables are subject to the written acceptance of UNDP.

Each deliverable shall follow the structure set out in the annex applicable to its pillar: deliverables under Pillar A shall follow Annex 2 – Structure and requirements of the feasibility assessment of the National Register of Consumption Points (RNLC), and deliverables under Pillar B shall follow Annex 3 – Structure and requirements of the feasibility study for the implementation of the National Energy Management Platform (PNME).

Each deliverable shall be accompanied by an acceptance checklist that maps its content to the chapters of the applicable annex that the deliverable covers, and to the relevant requirements of these Terms of Reference. The checklist shall also record evidence traceability, stakeholder validation status, assumptions and limitations, unresolved data-access or legal constraints, the editable annexes delivered, the quality review completed, and the decision outputs required from UNDP or the beneficiary institutions. Where a chapter of the applicable annex is not addressed, or is addressed only in part, the checklist shall state the reason. UNDP may request revision where the checklist shows a departure from the structure of the applicable annex, missing evidence, unsupported conclusions, incomplete annexes or unresolved inconsistencies with earlier accepted deliverables.

All deliverables shall explicitly address the cross-cutting requirements set out in Section D, including the use of available data from the outset, scaling with smart metering, the four-object identity hierarchy, purpose-separated RNLC and PNME domains, authoritative source systems, bidirectional interface requirements, current EU interoperability references and the conditional, use-case-specific treatment of CIM.

Key deliverables – Pillar A (Rapid Feasibility assessment for RNLC)	Tentative deadline
Deliverable Group 1: Evidence base, institutional and legal baseline. Establish what already exists, replace the assumptions carried in the RNLC Concept with measured evidence drawn from the actual data and systems of the network operators and the relevant public registers, and settle the legal position of each candidate holder.	
D 1.1 Inception report setting out the methodology, analytical framework, the institutions and systems to be assessed, the interview and/or workshop protocol, the multi-criteria method to be applied in Group 2, the assumptions and limitations, and a work plan with milestones and dependencies. *Methodology, analytical framework, the institutions and systems to be assessed, the interview and/or workshop protocol, the multi-criteria method to be applied in Group 2, the benchmarking approach and the samples to be agreed at inception (in line with Section D.4 of the ToR), the assumptions and limitations, and a work plan with milestones and dependencies. Accompanied by the consolidated data and information request package for both pillars (in line with Section D.6 of the ToR), specifying the datasets, sample sizes, extraction formats, anonymisation arrangements and access modalities required for D 1.3, together with the draft data-sharing and confidentiality instruments needed to obtain them.* ***One inception report (max. 15 pages + annexes) and one consolidated data and information request package, agreed with UNDP and cleared for transmission to the institutions***	T0 + 2 weeks
D 1.2 As-Is baseline and DSO digital-maturity assessment: *Inventory of existing registers, systems, infrastructures and reference sources; digital-maturity and integration-readiness assessment of the DSOs;* *As-Is processes for identifying, recording, correcting and reconciling consumption points; institutional and legal baseline and legal gap analysis of the holder scenarios;* *RNLC–SINEE interdependence; structured interviews with each institution and operator individually (in line with Section D.4 of the ToR).* *Legal gap analysis covering the acts listed in Sections D.1 and D.4 of the ToR. Reuse of Government platforms and consultation of relevant stakeholders (in line with Section D.2 and D.4 of the ToR).* ***One As-Is baseline report with a system and dataset inventory in editable tabular format, a digital-maturity and integration-readiness assessment per operator, As-Is process diagrams for the critical flows, an institutional capacity assessment and a legal gap register***	T0 + 7 weeks
D 1.3 Data readiness diagnostic, profiling anonymised or pseudonymised samples of live data obtained from Premier Energy Distribution and RED-Nord and, where relevant, from the reference registers. *Profiling of anonymised or pseudonymised samples of live data from Premier Energy Distribution, RED-Nord and, where relevant, the reference registers, establishing measured values, not estimates; georeferencing and the use of coordinates as a matching key; conclusion on the initial constitution of the RNLC database, readiness gates, minimum data-quality thresholds and remediation per operator; delays in data-sharing and extraction recorded and reflected in the conclusions (in line with Section D.4 of the ToR).* ***One data readiness diagnostic report with the profiling results, the matching and reconciliation test results, the proposed readiness gates and measurable data-quality thresholds, and a remediation estimate per operator, profiling scripts and result tables provided in editable format***	T0 + 9 weeks

Key deliverables – Pillar A (Rapid Feasibility assessment for RNLC)	Tentative deadline
Deliverable Group 2: Business analysis, interaction scenarios, options and business case. Resolve the open design questions through business analysis, establish how each actor would interact with the Register, then compare the strategic options on a transparent and documented basis, including the four components agreed with the Ministry of Energy (institutional holder, cost and its bearer, interdependence with the PNME and SINEE, modular sequence).	
D 2.1 Business analysis and identity model: *Operational definition of the place of consumption for household consumers, non-household consumers and generating installations, and the four-object model; design of the unique code and comparison with GS1 GSRN; prioritised use cases and minimum logical data model; actor × scenario interaction matrix; functional delineation and integration specification; EU electricity-data interoperability references and treatment of CIM (in line with Section D.4 of the ToR). Use cases distinguished as current, near-term and future (in line with Section D). The delineation matrix shall include a source-authority and data-stewardship table for every core RNLC attribute and interface, identifying the system of record, data owner, authorised updater, data steward, validation rule, correction route, retention rule, audit requirement, legal basis and exchange mechanism (in line with Section D.3).* ***One business analysis report with the object model and entity-relationship diagrams, the identifier design note with lifecycle rules, a prioritised use-case catalogue, the minimum logical data model and an RNLC:SINEE:PNME:operator-systems delineation matrix***	T0 + 11 weeks
D 2.2 Options analysis and business case *Comparison on a documented multi-criteria framework (in line with the Section D.4 of the ToR) of: the energy scope – an electricity-only RNLC against a multi-energy RNLC, assessing the extension to natural gas, district heating, transmission-level and system data, and water, with the implications of each for the data model, actors, cost, complexity and phasing, and a reasoned recommendation on whether each falls within the mandatory scope or is a subsequent interoperability extension;* *the institutional ownership scenarios (in line with the Section D.4), assessed also on data governance, sustainability and relationship with market participants; the delivery approach – reuse or extension of existing infrastructures and registers against the development of new components, centralised, federated and hybrid architectures, and the integration approach for operators with mature and less mature system landscapes, including the three RNLC–SINEE architectural options (in line with the Section D.4).* *Cost-benefit case with min-max ranges, international benchmark and EU alignment assessment (in line with the Section D.4); benefits linked to realistic market milestones (in line with the Section D).* ***One options analysis and business case report, with the completed multi-criteria evaluation matrix and its justification, the costing model in editable spreadsheet format with all assumptions exposed, and the EU alignment assessment***	T0 + 12 weeks
Deliverable Group 3: Feasibility conclusion, roadmap and normative outline. Reach an explicit feasibility conclusion capable of supporting a Government decision, validate it with the stakeholders, and convert it into a sequenced legislative roadmap and the annotated outlines required to proceed to the drafting of the normative package.	
D 3.1 Rapid Feasibility assessment report: *GO / CONDITIONAL GO / NO-GO conclusion against the readiness gates and thresholds established under Deliverable 1.3; recommended option; target operating model and data governance framework; personal data protection and cybersecurity; phased roadmap with*	T0 + 13 weeks

Key deliverables – Pillar A (Rapid Feasibility assessment for RNLC)	Tentative deadline
minimum viable product, end-to-end pilot, preconditions and modular increments (in line with Sections D.3 and D.4 of the ToR). The RACI matrix shall distinguish the institutional holder, service operator, data administrator and technical administrator, and the data governance framework shall cover customer permission where applicable. Key performance and data-quality indicators with their definitions, sources, measurement frequency and indicative targets per phase, and a risk register with probability, impact, early warning indicators, owner and mitigation measures. The draft findings shall be presented at a validation workshop (in line with Section D.4) and issued to participants at least five working days before it. ***One feasibility assessment report (max. 60 pages + annexes), in English with an executive summary in Romanian, and one validation workshop delivered (presentation materials included)***	
D 3.2 Legislative roadmap and normative outlines for the establishment of the RNLC *Annotated outlines and drafting instructions, in Romanian, for the Concept, the Regulation and the Technical Specification (Caiet de sarcini); costed and sequenced legislative and normative roadmap; procurement strategy under Law No. 325/2025, life-cycle costing structure and market consultation measures; on NO-GO, a prioritised remediation plan and readiness gates; hand-over and knowledge transfer session (in line with Section D.4 of ToR, specifically "feasibility conclusion, roadmap and governmental package outline" subsection). Roadmap to model the coordination and approval gates (in line with Section D.2). Each outline shall also identify the open points that remain to be settled at drafting stage and the institution responsible for settling them; the three outlines shall be mutually consistent and accompanied by an indicative sequence and timeline for adoption. Conditional on a GO or CONDITIONAL GO under deliverable 3.1.* *Under a NO-GO conclusion, D 3.2 section of the ToR comprises the prioritised remediation plan, readiness gates and legislative roadmap (Section D.4) and remains payable upon acceptance. The drafting of the normative package itself is outside this assignment (in line with Section C of the ToR).* ***One package in Romanian comprising the annotated outlines and drafting instructions for the Concept, the Regulation and the Caiet de sarcini, the legislative and normative roadmap and the procurement strategy note (or, on a NO-GO conclusion, the remediation plan, readiness gates and legislative roadmap, and one knowledge transfer session delivered***	T0 + 15 weeks or 2 weeks after UNDP acceptance of D 3.1, whichever is later

Key deliverables – Pillar B (Feasibility study for PNME)	Tentative deadline
Deliverable Group 4: PNME inception and As-Is analysis of the energy data ecosystem (Establish, on measured evidence rather than assumption, what energy data exists in the country, who holds it, at what granularity and quality, under what access regime, through which reporting flows it currently moves, and whether each institution and operator is actually able to supply it.	
D 4.1 PNME inception note *To set out the methodology for each chapter of Annex 3 to the ToR (PNME Study structure template), the analytical framework, the institutions, operators, systems and datasets to be covered, the interview and workshop protocol, the multi-criteria method to be applied in D 5.2, the international benchmark selection and the criteria for it, and the assumptions and limitations, together with a work plan showing the dependencies on the deliverables of Pillar A.*	T0 + 3 weeks

Key deliverables – Pillar B (Feasibility study for PNME)	Tentative deadline
The data and information requirements of Pillar B shall be incorporated in the consolidated request package issued under D 1.1, so that no institution or operator is approached twice for the same material. ***One PNME inception note (max. 15 pages + annexes), agreed with UNDP***	
D 4.2 PNME As-Is analysis, covering Chapters 3 and 4 of Annex 3 to the ToR (*PNME Study structure template)*: *Actors and roles; inventory of systems, registers, platforms and datasets; reporting and use flows and statutory reporting obligations; data readiness assessment; international benchmark (in line with Section D.5 of the Tor). Process diagrams for the critical flows. Official statistics and energy-balance reconciliation analysis (in line with Section D.5), identifying for each relevant indicator or data series the statistical owner, administrative source, operator source, methodology, classification, unit, conversion factor, validation rule, publication status, update frequency and rule for resolving discrepancies between PNME outputs and official statistical series. Pillar A evidence reused, not repeated (in line with Section D.6), stating explicitly where findings extend or diverge from D 1.2 and D 1.3.* ***One PNME As-Is report with the system and dataset inventory in editable tabular format, As-Is process diagrams, the reporting obligations register, the data readiness assessment with a proposed set of measurable indicators, and the international benchmark note***	T0 + 5 months
Deliverable Group 5: PNME needs, options, business case and governance framework Derive verifiable requirements from the As-Is evidence, establish the interaction scenarios, compare the implementation options on a documented basis, cost them, and establish the institutional, legal and data governance framework the recommended option requires.	
D 5.1 PNME needs, priority use cases and integration requirements, covering Chapter 5 of the Annex 3 to the ToR (*PNME Study structure template)*: *Prioritised use cases; test of the primary PNME service scope; Article 22 EPBD capability requirements and traceability matrix; electricity-market monitoring capability; high-level information, technical and non-functional requirements prioritised on a must, should and could basis (in line with Section D.5). Use cases to include their dependencies and preconditions. Requirements to cover minimum data categories, granularity and update frequencies, quality and traceability rules, integration and interoperability requirements, security, availability, performance and audit, and the possibilities for reuse of existing services, data and infrastructures, stated in verifiable terms so that they can be used in Deliverable 5.2 to compare options, in Deliverable 5.3 to test the legal basis and in Deliverable 6.1 to define acceptance criteria.* ***One PNME needs and requirements report with a prioritised use-case catalogue in editable tabular format and a traceable requirements register***	T0 + 7 months
D 5.2 To-Be options, conceptual operating model and business case, covering Chapters 6 and 9 of Annex 3 to the ToR (*PNME Study structure template)* *At least three implementation options; shared technical foundation option; multi-criteria evaluation; conceptual operating model and modular structure; cost, benefit and sustainability estimate; no predetermined architecture and no duplication of SINEE, RNLC or operator data (in line with Sections D.3 and D.5). Each option described with the capabilities covered, the collection and integration approach, the implications for data quality and security, the dependencies and preconditions, the advantages, disadvantages and major risks, and the elements deferred to later stages; and analysed for the location of and responsibility for the data, the access and integration mechanisms, the latency and frequency of exchange, security,*	T0 + 9 months

Key deliverables – Pillar B (Feasibility study for PNME)	Tentative deadline
confidentiality and traceability, cost, the capacity of the source systems, operational complexity and the scope for reusing existing infrastructures. Evaluation presented as a criteria × options matrix with the reasoning for each score. ***One options analysis, operating model and business case report, with the completed multi-criteria evaluation matrix and its justification, and the costing model in editable spreadsheet format with all assumptions exposed***	
D 5.3 Institutional, legal and data governance framework, covering Chapter 7 of Annex 3 to the ToR (*PNME Study structure template)* *Normative acts, mandates and roles; legal gap analysis; delimitation of the PNME against SINEE, the RNLC and the operators' systems; conceptual data governance model and required instruments; reconciliation with official statistics (in line with Section D.5 of the ToR); delineation consistent with Pillar A (in line with Section D.6). Mandates to include responsibilities for data quality, security, confidentiality and transparency; delimitation to compare purpose, users, processes, data categories, sources, functionalities and responsibilities. A source-authority and data-stewardship matrix covering every core PNME data product, shared reference entity and interface with the RNLC, SINEE and operators' systems, identifying for each item the authoritative source system, data owner, data steward, lawful basis, permitted users, update trigger, correction route, quality rule, retention rule, audit requirement, publication status and anonymisation or aggregation requirement (in line with Section D.3). A privacy, cybersecurity and operational-resilience annex covering data classification by dataset and use case, lawful basis and controllership or responsibility map, DPIA screening for high-risk data flows, re-identification risk assessment for aggregated or published outputs, access-control and segregation model, logging and audit model, incident notification and escalation model, backup, continuity and recovery requirements, supplier, hosting and cloud-risk assumptions, and minimum security controls by implementation option (in line with Section D.3).* ***One institutional, legal and data governance report, with the legal gap register, the PNME:SINEE:RNLC:operator-systems delimitation matrix, the RACI matrix for the recommended institutional model and the list of governance instruments required***	T0 + 9 months
Deliverable Group 6: Roadmap, indicators and consolidated feasibility study. Convert the analysis into a phased, costed and measurable implementation path, consolidate it into the study required by Annex 3, and validate it with the sector.	
D 6.1 Implementation roadmap, indicators and risk register, covering Chapters 8, 10 and 11 of Annex 3 to the ToR (*PNME Study structure template)* *Phased roadmap over one to three years; immediate-data phase; performance indicators and risk register; GO / CONDITIONAL GO / NO-GO implementation-readiness classification (in line with Section D.5 of the ToR); roadmap sequenced with the RNLC (in line with Section D.6). Roadmap to include the minimum viable product and the priority integrations. An institutional adoption and operating-transition plan, covering future process owners, internal staffing needs, training needs, support and escalation arrangements, change-control procedures, data-provider onboarding steps, user adoption measures, recurrent budget responsibilities and operational handover conditions for each phase. Each indicator with its definition and calculation formula, data source, measurement and reporting frequency, indicative targets per phase and the party responsible for collection and validation, together with the monitoring mechanism. Risk register covering data and quality, integration and technical, legal and confidentiality, governance and institutional capacity, financing and sustainability, and timeline and procurement risks, with for each the description, cause, probability and impact, severity,*	T0 + 10.5 months

Key deliverables – Pillar B (Feasibility study for PNME)	Tentative deadline
responsible institution or role, early warning indicators and preventive and corrective mitigation measures, and a synthesis of the top risks. ***One roadmap, indicator and risk deliverable, with the roadmap in editable tabular and graphical format, the indicator catalogue and the risk register***	
D 6.2 Consolidated PNME feasibility study, prepared in full accordance with the structure of Annex 3 to the ToR (*PNME Study structure template)* *Prepared in full accordance with the structure of Annex 3, comprising all its chapters, including the implementation-readiness classification under Chapter 12, and the annexes supporting traceability and verifiability – the system and dataset inventory, the As-Is process diagrams, the evaluation matrix with scoring and justifications, the cost assumptions and calculations, the list of normative acts analysed, the synthesis of interviews and workshops, the glossary and the templates used. Validation workshop and hand-over (in line with Section D.5); the draft is issued to participants at least five working days before the workshop and finalised on the basis of the consolidated comments.* ***One consolidated PNME feasibility study following the structure of Annex 3, with all annexes in editable format, one validation workshop delivered (presentation materials included), one knowledge transfer session delivered (materials included)***	T0 + 12 months

F. Confidentiality statement

Following the signing of the contract, individual/entity-level confidentiality or non-disclosure agreements shall, where required, be executed between the Contractor and each institution or operator providing data under this assignment. These agreements must be supplemented by duly signed confidentiality statements from the Contractor's experts. UNDP shall not be a party to such agreements. The Contractor shall process personal data received only for this assignment, in line with Moldovan data protection law, and shall return or securely delete it upon completion, confirming this in writing to UNDP.

G. Reporting instructions and institutional arrangements

The Contractor will report to the JET Component Manager and the JET Digital Integration Analyst on day-to-day activities and shall submit the deliverables in a timely manner. Deliverables shall be approved by the UNDP Project Manager/JET Portfolio manager and EECC Cluster Lead.

The Contractor shall nominate a single point of contact for the assignment and shall ensure the continuity of the key experts proposed, any replacement of a key expert requires the prior written approval of UNDP and a replacement whose qualifications, assessed against criteria 3.1 to 3.6 of the technical evaluation (Section 4), are at least equivalent to those of the expert being replaced.

For the avoidance of doubt, architecture and technology references in Annex 3 – including MCloud, data lake or data warehouse solutions, API gateways, CIM and named integration sequences that are illustrative hypotheses to be tested and not predetermined requirements. Where such examples conflict with the evidence-based, reuse-first and technology-neutral principles of these Terms of Reference, those principles shall prevail.

All deliverables shall be submitted in one electronic copy in editable electronic format, in English, except as follows: (a) the reports under D 3.1 and shall include an executive summary in Romanian; (b) the package under D 3.2 shall be delivered in Romanian in full, as specified in Section E. Any further translation into Romanian of materials for circulation to national institutions shall be agreed with UNDP at inception and reflected in the work plan.

All models, matrices, inventories and profiling results shall be delivered in a form that permits the beneficiary institutions to re-run and update them. Before submission of final deliverables, the Contractor will discuss the draft documents with the parties involved, so that the final products reflect their comments. The Contractor shall disclose any use of generative artificial intelligence tools in the production of the deliverables and remains fully responsible for the accuracy of their content.

UNDP has full ownership of the activity and of its final product. Thus, any public mention (including through social media) about the activity should state clearly that ownership. In addition, any public appearance or published work related to the activity should be coordinated and approved by UNDP in advance. Any visibility material or product produced for this assignment must be in the name of UNDP.

In order to safeguard the objectivity of the assessment and the integrity of the subsequent procurement, the Contractor, and any entity affiliated with or related to the Contractor, shall not participate, directly or indirectly, in the solicitation for the design, development or implementation of the RNLC or of the PNME arising from this assignment, and shall not hold any interest in a supplier of a solution that the assignment may recommend. The Contractor shall disclose any actual or potential conflict of interest to UNDP without delay. This exclusion is a contractual condition of the present assignment and is stricter than the treatment of prior involvement under Law No. 325/2025, which does not exclude automatically but requires the contracting authority to take measures securing equal treatment. The Contractor shall nevertheless identify, in its deliverables, the measures the future contracting authority must apply in respect of any other economic operator that contributed to the preparation of the award documentation, and the information that must be disclosed to other bidders, so that the subsequent procurement is not vitiated.

To optimize resources and time efficiency, the Contractor shall, where applicable, utilize online video-conferencing tools as needed. No missions outside the Republic of Moldova are required. Interviews and working sessions will be held in Chișinău or online; in-person engagement in Chișinău is expected during data collection and consultations. Any travel to and within the Republic of Moldova required for the performance of the assignment shall be arranged by the Contractor at no additional cost to UNDP and shall be included in the financial proposal.

UNDP and the Ministry of Energy shall issue the letters of introduction and the data requests within five working days of acceptance of the inception report, and shall convene the institutions concerned. The samples and interviews required for the Pillar A evidence base should be available no later than T0 + 5 weeks. Where they are not, the Contractor shall notify UNDP in writing without delay, shall proceed on the basis of documented interviews, metadata analysis and reduced samples, and shall state in the affected deliverables which findings rest on measured data and which rest on declared or estimated information, together with the effect of that limitation on the confidence of the feasibility conclusion.

H. Company qualifications, minimum key personnel requirements/qualifications and resourcing requirements

The Proposer shall provide a well-substantiated justification of the proposal in Form G: Format for Technical Proposal (Section 7), demonstrating its compliance with the Terms of Reference and the specific operational environment in which the services will be delivered. The proposal shall also include detailed information on the volume and type of resources allocated for the successful implementation of the assignment.

A breakdown of the working days allocated for each deliverable shall be submitted as part of the Technical Proposal (Form G), clearly explaining the role of the team members involved in producing the deliverable, and distinguishing the effort attributed to Pillar A from that attributed to Pillar B. This breakdown shall indicate working days only; no prices, rates or other financial information shall be included in the Technical Proposal, as such information shall be provided exclusively in Form K: Format for Financial Proposal. The assignment will require direct engagement with stakeholders in Chișinău, especially during the data collection and consultation phases, while allowing the remaining activities to be carried out remotely or from the Contractor's own premises.

The résumés submitted for the Key project personnel should be detailed and comprehensive, should be prepared using Form H: Format for CV of Proposed Key Personnel and shall be accompanied by Form I: Statement of Exclusivity and Availability, duly signed by each key expert. Specifically, résumés should include:

- Anticipated role and level of participation in the project;
- Previous experience relevant to the assigned role in the project;
- Education, training and certification details;
- Contact information (name, title, organization, mailing address, phone, and email) of a minimum of two business references;
- Linguistic skills.

The Proposer shall also disclose any ongoing or active contractual engagements that the proposed key experts have with UNDP.

In addition, the Proposer shall submit a written statement confirming that the proposed key personnel have no actual or potential personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest in relation to the envisaged contract. Any actual or potential conflicts of interest shall be disclosed for UNDP's assessment.

Proposers should describe, in detail, their previous corporate experience in similar assignments. This experience shall be presented in the Previous Relevant Experience table of Form F: Eligibility and Qualification and in Section 1 of Form G: Format for Technical Proposal. This section should include the corporate experience as well as the role of any subcontracted organization(s) indicated in the Bidder's proposal (Form G, item 1.2 and, for a Joint Venture/Consortium/Association, Form E: Joint Venture/Consortium/Association Information). Descriptions of subcontractor's staff members, if applicable, should follow the format utilized for the Proposer organization (Form H and Form I for subcontractor staff proposed as key personnel).

Furthermore, the Proposer shall provide a statement describing the experience of the bidding organization and each proposed key expert with the national information technology governance framework of the Republic of Moldova. For each assignment cited, the statement shall identify the client, period of engagement, deliverable produced, relevant normative instrument or coordination process, and a contact person for reference purposes.

During the assignment, the Contractor's team of experts should prove commitment to the core values of the United Nations, in particular, respecting differences of culture, gender, religion, ethnicity, nationality, language, age, HIV status, disability, and sexual orientation, or other status.

Proposers agree that experts will provide high-quality outputs and expertise and participate in the project at the level and duration specified. Should any changes be necessary in this regard, a formal request for the agreement of the UNDP Project team to allow substitutions shall be submitted.

UNDP may at any time request the withdrawal or replacement of any of the Service Provider personnel should non-performance happen. Replacement will be at the Service Provider expense.

Key personnel and estimated level of effort

The Contractor shall provide the following key personnel. The key personnel shall be presented in Section 3 of Form G: Format for Technical Proposal. Compliance with the requirements and qualifications to be scored set out for each role shall be evidenced in the CV of each expert submitted in Form H. The detailed requirements for each role and their scoring are set out in Section 4, criteria 3.1 to 3.6 of the technical evaluation. The requirements for proposed personnel correspond to the first scoring level of the relevant sub-criteria; a CV that does not meet a requirement receives 0 points for that sub-criterion and is not, on that ground alone, rejected.

The estimated workload per each proposed key personnel member is provided as a reference to guide bidders in understanding the expected level of effort. Proposers are encouraged to review these estimates and to propose adjustments to the number of working days and to personnel allocation, provided such changes are aligned with their technical approach and methodology. Proposers are encouraged to propose their own variation to ensure timely delivery and to maintain the quality of the outputs described above.

Role	Estimated quantity of working days needed
Team Leader / Project Manager	85
Energy sector expert	70
Data architecture and data governance expert	90
IT and e-government systems architecture expert	65
Financial and cost-benefit analysis expert	45
Legal and Government IT governance expert	50

Non-key personnel

Non-key personnel are optional. The Contractor may, at its discretion, propose additional specialists to support the delivery of the assignment – for example in cybersecurity and data protection, legal and regulatory analysis, public procurement, organisational readiness or stakeholder facilitation. Where non-key personnel are proposed, the technical proposal shall state the role and the indicative level of effort of each.

No minimum qualification requirement is set for non-key personnel, and their profiles are not evaluated or scored: the composition of any supporting team is a matter for the bidder's own judgement.

The potential non-key personnel roles listed above are indicative of the areas in which additional support has proved useful in comparable assignments, they are not requirements, and their absence is not a ground for disqualification or for a reduced technical score.

Responsibility for the quality and completeness of every deliverable rest with the Contractor and with the key personnel, irrespective of whether non-key personnel are engaged.

Annexes

The following annexes are attached to this Terms of Reference: Annexes 1 and 2 relate to Pillar A (RNLC), Annex 3 relates to Pillar B (PNME).

- Annex 1 – Operating Concept of the National Register of Consumption Points (RNLC), provided as background documentation. The Concept is provided so that bidders and the Contractor understand the conceptual principles already validated with the institutions. It is not binding as to the institutional holder, the ownership model, the identifier scheme or the architecture, each of which is reopened by these Terms of Reference and is to be determined by the assessment.
- Annex 2 – Structure and requirements of the feasibility assessment of the National Register of Consumption Points (RNLC), which forms an integral part of these Terms of Reference and is binding on the Contractor.
- Annex 3 – Structure and requirements of the feasibility study for the implementation of the National Energy Management Platform (PNME), which forms an integral part of these Terms of Reference and is binding on the Contractor.

SECTION 6: CONDITIONS OF CONTRACT AND CONTRACT FORMS

6.1 The types of Contract to be signed and the applicable UNDP Contract General Terms and Conditions, as specified in Data Sheet, can be accessed at **http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/procurement/business/how-we-buy.html**

6.2 Special Conditions of Contract

N/A

6.3 Contract Form

In the event of an award, the following sample Contract will be used: Contract for Goods and/or Services to UNDP. The conditions are available at: http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/procurement/business/how-we-buy.html

SECTION 7: PROPOSAL FORMS

Form A: Proposal Confirmation

Form B: Checklist

Form C: Technical Proposal Submission

Form D: Proposer Information

Form E: Joint Venture/Consortium/Association Information

Form F: Eligibility and Qualification

Form G: Format for Technical Proposal

Form H: Format for CV of proposed key personnel

Form I: Statement of Exclusivity and Availability

Form J: Financial Proposal Submission *[Form J is part of the Financial Proposal and shall be submitted directly in the system only in the "Commercial section" of the requirements. Please, ensure that no other documents are disclosing your financial proposal apart from Forms J and K. Non-compliance with this instruction may result in rejection of the proposal received.]*

Form K: Format for Financial Proposal *[Forms K is part of the Financial Proposal and shall be submitted directly in the system only in the "Commercial section" of the requirements. Please, ensure that no other documents are disclosing your financial proposal apart from Forms J and K. Non-compliance with this instruction may result in rejection of the proposal received.]*

FORM A: PROPOSAL CONFIRMATION

Please acknowledge receipt of this RFP, log in to the online portal and subscribe to this tender following the instructions in the system user guide. Please complete this form and attach as requested in the system.

To: Insert name of contact person Email: Insert contact person's email - do not enter secure proposal email address

From: Insert name of proposer

Subject RFP reference

Check the appropriate box	Description
☐	**YES**, we intend to submit a proposal.
☐	**NO**. We are unable to submit a competitive proposal for the requested services at the moment

If you selected NO above, please state the reason(s) below:

Check applicable	Description
☐	The requested services are not within our range of supply
☐	We are unable to submit a competitive proposal for the requested services at the moment
☐	The requested services are not available at the moment
☐	We cannot meet the requested terms of reference
☐	The information provided for proposal purposes is insufficient
☐	Your RFP is too complicated
☐	Insufficient time is allowed to prepare a proposal
☐	We cannot meet the delivery requirements
☐	We cannot adhere to your terms and conditions e.g. payment terms, request for performance security, etc.. Please provide details below.
☐	Sustainability criteria/requirements are too stringent (if applicable)
☐	We do not export
☐	We do not sell to the UN
☐	Your requirement is too small
☐	Our capacity is currently full
☐	We are closed during the holiday season
☐	We had to give priority to other clients' requests
☐	The person handling proposals is away from the office
☐	Other (please provide reasons below):
Further information: Click or tap here to enter text.	
☐	We would like to receive future RFPs for this type of services
☐	We don't want to receive RFPs for this type of services

Questions to the Supplier concerning the reasons for no proposal should be addressed to Click or tap here to enter text. phone Click or tap here to enter number., email Click or tap here to enter text..

FORM B: CHECKLIST

This form serves as a checklist for preparation of your Proposal. Please complete the returnable Proposal Forms in accordance with the instructions and return them as part of your Proposal submission: No alteration to the format of forms shall be permitted and no substitution shall be accepted.
Before submitting your Proposal, please ensure compliance with the instructions in Section 2: Instructions to Proposers and Section 3: Data Sheet.

Technical Proposal:

Have you duly completed all the Returnable Proposal Forms?	
▪ Form C: Technical Proposal Submission	☐
▪ Form D: Proposer information	☐
▪ Form E: Joint Venture/Consortium/Association Information	☐
▪ Form F: Eligibility and Qualification	☐
▪ Form G: Technical Proposal	☐
▪ Form H: CVs of proposed key personnel	☐
▪ Form I: Statements of exclusivity and availability for key personnel	☐
Have you provided the required documents to establish compliance with the evaluation criteria in Section 4?	☐
Have you provided the required documents in support of Form D: Proposer Information?	☐

Financial Proposal:

▪ Form J: Financial Proposal Submission	☐
▪ Form K: Financial Proposal	☐

Forms J and K, representing the Financial Proposal shall be submitted directly in the system only in the "Commercial section" of the requirements. Please, ensure that no other documents are disclosing your financial proposal apart from Forms J and K. Non-compliance with this instruction may result in rejection of the proposal received.

FORM C: TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

Name of Proposer:	Click or tap here to enter text.	Date:	Click or tap to enter a date.
RFP reference:	**RFP26/03219 Rapid Feasibility Assessment of the National Register of Consumption Points (RNLC) and Feasibility Study for the National Energy Management Platform (PNME)**		

We, the undersigned, offer to supply the services required for Click or tap here to enter text.in accordance with your Request for Proposals No. Click or tap here to enter text. We hereby submit our Proposal, which includes this Technical Proposal and our Financial Proposal uploaded separately under the commercial section in the system as instructed.

Proposer Declaration: on behalf of our firm, its affiliates, subsidiaries and employees, including any JV / Consortium / Association members or subcontractors or suppliers for any part of the contract.

Yes	No	
☐	☐	**Requirements and Terms and Conditions:** I/We have read and fully understand the RFP, including the RFP Information and Data Sheet, Terms of Reference, the General Conditions of Contract and any Special Conditions of Contract. I/we confirm that the proposer agrees to be bound by them.
☐	☐	I/We confirm that the proposer has the necessary capacity, capability and necessary licenses to fully meet or exceed the requirements and will be available to deliver throughout the relevant contract period.
☐	☐	**Ethics**: In submitting this proposal I/we warrant that the proposer: has not entered into any improper, illegal, collusive or anti-competitive arrangements with any competitor; has not directly or indirectly approached any representative of the buyer (other than the point of contact) to lobby or solicit information in relation to the RFP; has not attempted to influence, or provide any form of personal inducement, reward or benefit to any representative of the buyer.
☐	☐	I/We confirm to undertake not to engage in proscribed practices, or any other unethical practice, with the UN or any other party, and to conduct business in a manner that averts any financial, operational, reputational or other undue risk to the UN and we have read the United Nations Supplier Code of Conduct :https://www.un.org/Depts/ptd/about-us/un-supplier-code-conduct and acknowledge that it provides the minimum standards expected of suppliers to the UN.
☐	☐	**Conflict of interest:** I/We warrant that the proposer has no actual, potential or perceived conflict of Interest in submitting this proposal or entering into a contract to deliver the requirements. Where a conflict of interest arises during the RFP process the proposer will report it immediately to the Procuring Organisation's Point of Contact.
☐	☐	**Prohibitions and Sanctions:** I/We hereby declare that our firm, ultimate beneficial owners, affiliates or subsidiaries or employees, including any JV/Consortium members or subcontractors or suppliers for any part of the contract is not under procurement prohibition by the United Nations, including but not limited to prohibitions derived from the Compendium of United Nations Security Council Sanctions Lists and have not been suspended, debarred, sanctioned or otherwise identified as ineligible by any UN Organization or the World Bank Group or any other international Organization.
☐	☐	I/We do not employ, or anticipate employing, any person(s) who is, or has been a UN staff member within the last year, if said UN staff member has or had prior professional dealings with our firm in his/her capacity as UN staff member within the last three years of service with the UN (in accordance with UN post-employment restrictions published in ST/SGB/2006/15);
☐	☐	**Bankruptcy**: I/We have not declared bankruptcy, are not involved in bankruptcy or receivership proceedings, and there is no judgment or pending legal action against us that could impair our operations in the foreseeable future.
☐	☐	**Proposal Validity Period:** I/We confirm that this Proposal, including the price, remains open for acceptance for the proposal validity period.
☐	☐	I/We understand and recognize that you are not bound to accept any proposal you receive.
☐	☐	By signing this declaration, the signatory below represents, warrants and agrees that he/she has been authorised by the Organisation/s to make this declaration on its/their behalf.

Name: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

[*Stamp with official stamp of the Proposer*]

FORM D: PROPOSER INFORMATION

RFP Reference	**RFP26/03219 Rapid Feasibility Assessment of the National Register of Consumption Points (RNLC) and Feasibility Study for the National Energy Management Platform (PNME)**
Legal name of Proposer	Click or tap here to enter text.
Legal Address, City, Country	Click or tap here to enter text.
Website	Click or tap here to enter text.
Year of registration	Click or tap here to enter text.
Proposer's Authorized Representative information	Name and Title: Click or tap here to enter text. Telephone numbers: Click or tap here to enter text. Email: Click or tap here to enter text.
Legal structure	Choose an item.
No. of full-time employees	Click or tap here to enter number.
No. of staff involved in similar contracts	Click or tap here to enter number.
Are you a UNGM registered vendor?	☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, insert UNGM Vendor Number
Years of supplying to UN organisations	Click or tap here to enter text.
Are you a Click or tap here to enter text.**vendor?**	☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, insert Vendor Number
Countries of operation	Click or tap here to enter text.
Subsidiaries in the region (please indicate names of subsidiaries and addresses, if relevant to the proposal)	Click or tap here to enter text.
Commercial Representatives in the country: Name/Address/Phone (for international companies only)	Click or tap here to enter text.
Quality Assurance Certification (e.g. ISO 9000 or Equivalent) *(If yes, provide a Copy of the valid Certificate):*	Click or tap here to enter text.
Does your Company have a corporate environmental policy or environmental management system/accreditation such as ISO 14001 or ISO 14064 or equivalent? *(If yes, provide a Copy of the valid Certificate):*	Tick all that apply and **provide supporting documentation**: ☐ Corporate Environmental Policy ☐ ISO 14001 ☐ ISO 14064 ☐ Other, specify Click or tap here to enter text.

Does your organization demonstrate significant commitment to sustainability, including the following aspects that have been identified in the UN Sustainable Procurement Framework? • **Environmental: prevention of pollution, sustainable resources; climate change and mitigation and the protection of the environment, biodiversity.** • **Social: human rights and labour issues, gender equality, sustainable consumption, and social health and wellbeing.** • **Economic: whole life cycle costing, local communities and small or medium enterprises, and supply chain sustainability.**	Attach a formal statement that outlines your organisation's commitment to sustainability, where possible providing evidence of tangible results that demonstrate progress such as: Tick all that are attached: ☐ Formal statement ☐ Sustainability report ☐ UN Global Compact Communication on Progress ☐ Other, specify Click or tap here to enter text.
Is your company a member of the UN Global Compact?	Choose an item. If yes, please provide link to Global Compact profile: Click or tap here to enter text.
Bank Information	Bank Name: Click or tap here to enter text. Bank Address: Click or tap here to enter text. IBAN: Click or tap here to enter text. SWIFT/BIC: Click or tap here to enter text. Account Currency: Click or tap here to enter text. Bank Account Number: Click or tap here to enter text.
Contact person that Click or tap here to enter text. **may contact for requests for clarifications during Proposal evaluation**	Name and Title: Click or tap here to enter text. Telephone numbers: Click or tap here to enter text. Email: Click or tap here to enter text.

FORM E: JOINT VENTURE/CONSORTIUM/ASSOCIATION INFORMATION

Name of Proposer:	Click or tap here to enter text.	Date:	Click or tap to enter a date.
RFP reference:	**RFP26/03219 Rapid Feasibility Assessment of the National Register of Consumption Points (RNLC) and Feasibility Study for the National Energy Management Platform (PNME)**		

To be completed and returned with your Proposal if the Proposal is submitted as a Joint Venture/Consortium/Association.

No	**Name of Partner and contact information** *(address, telephone numbers, fax numbers, e-mail address)*	**Proposed proportion of responsibilities (in %) and type of services to be performed**
1	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.
2	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.
3	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.

Name of leading partner (with authority to bind the JV, Consortium, Association during the RFP process and, in the event a Contract is awarded, during contract execution)	Click or tap here to enter text.

We have attached a copy of the below referenced document signed by every partner, which details the likely legal structure of and the confirmation of joint and severable liability of the members of the said joint venture:

☐ Letter of intent to form a joint venture ***OR*** ☐ JV/Consortium/Association agreement

The recommended Contractor shall submit a duly notarized Joint Venture/Consortium/Association Agreement prior to contract signature.

We hereby confirm that if the contract is awarded, all parties of the Joint Venture/Consortium/Association shall be jointly and severally liable to Click or tap here to enter text for the fulfilment of the provisions of the Contract.

Name of partner: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Name of partner: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Name of partner: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Name of partner: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

FORM F: ELIGIBILITY AND QUALIFICATION

Name of Proposer:	Click or tap here to enter text.	Date:	Click or tap to enter a date.
RFP reference:	**RFP26/03219 Rapid Feasibility Assessment of the National Register of Consumption Points (RNLC) and Feasibility Study for the National Energy Management Platform (PNME)**		

If JV/Consortium/Association, to be completed by each partner.

History of Non- Performing Contracts

☐No non-performing contracts during the last 3 years			
☐ Contract(s) not performed in the last 3 years			
Year	**Non- performed portion of contract**	**Contract Identification**	**Total Contract Amount** (current value in US$)
		Name of Client: Address of Client: Reason(s) for non-performance:	

Litigation History (including pending litigation)

☐ No litigation history for the last 3 years			
☐ Litigation History as indicated below			
Year of dispute	**Amount in dispute** (USD)	**Contract Identification**	**Total Contract Amount** (USD)
		Name of Client: Address of Client: Matter in dispute: Party who initiated the dispute: Status of dispute: Party awarded if resolved:	

Previous Relevant Experience

Please list only previous similar assignments successfully completed in the last **7 (seven) years**.
List only those assignments for which the Proposer was legally contracted or sub-contracted by the Client as a company or was one of the Consortium/JV partners. Assignments completed by the Proposer's individual experts working privately or through other firms cannot be claimed as the relevant experience of the Proposer, or that of the Proposer's partners or sub-consultants, but can be claimed by the Experts themselves in their CVs. The Proposer should be prepared to substantiate the claimed experience by presenting copies of relevant documents and references if so requested.

Project name & Country of Assignment	**Client & Reference Contact Details**	**Contract Value *(insert currency)***	**Period of activity and status *(month, year)***	**Types of activities undertaken and role (Contractor, sub-contractor or consortium member)**

Proposers may also attach their own Project Data Sheets with more details for assignments above.

☐ Attached are the Statements of Satisfactory Performance from the Top 3 (three) Clients or more.

Financial Standing

Annual Turnover for the last 3 years	Year 2025	Currency	Amount
	Year 2024	Currency	Amount
	Year 2023	Currency	Amount
Latest Credit Rating (if any), indicate the source and date.			

Financial information (USD)	**Historic information for the last 3 years**		
	2023	2024	2025
	Information from Balance Sheet		
Total Assets (TA)			
Total Liabilities (TL)			
Current Assets (CA)			
Current Liabilities (CL)			
	Information from Income Statement		
Total / Gross Revenue (TR)			
Profits Before Taxes (PBT)			
Net Profit			
Current Ratio (current assets/current liabilities)			

☐ Attached are copies of the audited financial statements (balance sheets, including all related notes, and income statements) for the years required above complying with the following condition:

a) Must reflect the financial situation of the Proposer or party to a JV, and not sister or parent companies;
b) Historic financial statements must be audited by a certified public accountant;
c) Historic financial statements must correspond to accounting periods already completed and audited. No statements for partial periods shall be accepted.

FORM G: FORMAT FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

Name of Proposer:	Click or tap here to enter text.	Date:	Click or tap to enter a date.
RFP reference:	**RFP26/03219 Rapid Feasibility Assessment of the National Register of Consumption Points (RNLC) and Feasibility Study for the National Energy Management Platform (PNME)**		

The proposer's proposal must be organized to follow the format of this Technical Proposal Form. Where the proposer is presented with a requirement or asked to use a specific approach, the proposer must not only state its acceptance, but also describe, where appropriate, how it intends to comply. Where a descriptive response is requested, failure to provide the same will be viewed as non-responsive.

Section 1: Proposer's qualification, capacity and expertise

1.1.1 Brief description of the organization, including the year and country of incorporation, and types of activities undertaken. Provide references for relevant work, particularly public-sector analytical, feasibility or system-design assignments.

Where the proposal involves a consortium or subcontractors, describe the role, scope of work and level of effort of each partner or subcontractor, identify which entity will be responsible for each deliverable, and name the single point of contractual responsibility. Sole bidders should clearly state their responsibility for the entire assignment.

1.1.2 General organizational capability which is likely to affect implementation: management structure, financial stability and project financing capacity, and project management controls.

Describe the project management arrangements, including quality checks for each deliverable, reporting lines, the process for escalating issues and the procedure for managing changes. Provide examples or documents showing how these arrangements have been used in previous projects.

1.2 Relevance of specialized knowledge and experience. Provide a list of relevant assignments, indicating the client, period, scope, deliverables and the Proposer's role. The list should cover, as applicable:

- Experience with the information-technology governance framework of the Republic of Moldova, including State information systems or resources, technical specifications, registration or coordination with the e-Governance Agency, Government interoperability and shared services, or hosting on the common Government technology platform. Identify the specific activities performed and provide evidence of completion and client confirmation.
- Feasibility studies, assessments, business analyses or technical specifications for information systems, data hubs or data warehouses in the public or utilities sector.
- Assignments in the energy, utilities or other regulated network sectors involving sectoral data, metering, market processes or energy efficiency.
- Contracts with UNDP or other international development partners, including experience managing donor-funded contracts.

1.3.1 Quality assurance procedures and risk mitigation measures. Describe the quality checks planned for this assignment, including peer review, factual verification, checking that conclusions are supported by evidence, version control and client review and approval.

Provide a risk register covering both pillars, identifying the main risks, their likelihood and impact, the person responsible for managing each risk, and the planned mitigation measures. The register shall specifically address the risk of delays in obtaining data and access to institutions under Pillar A, including early data requests, formal access through beneficiary institutions, alternative sources of evidence, escalation arrangements and possible effects on the schedule.

1.3.2 Organisation Commitment to Sustainability. Provide evidence, as applicable, of compliance with ISO 14001, ISO 14064 or an equivalent standard; membership of the UN Global Compact; or other organisational commitments to sustainability, such as relevant internal policies or institutional memberships.

Section 2: Proposed Methodology, Approach and Implementation Plan

This section will be evaluated based on the proposer's demonstrated understanding of the assignment, the appropriateness of the proposed methodology and tools, the integration of innovative and value-added elements, the clarity and feasibility of the implementation plan, and the organization of roles within the proposed team. The evaluation will consider how comprehensively the proposer addresses the Terms of Reference (ToR) in a structured, logical, and results-oriented manner. Specific attention will be paid to the quality of the technical approach, innovation, risk management, resource planning, and operational readiness.

2.1 Understanding of the Assignment
Describe in detail your understanding of the assignment's objectives, scope, and challenges. Explain how your approach is tailored to the local context and demonstrate alignment with the ToR.
The proposal shall address the four key questions under Pillar A: the institutional holder, the cost and who bears it, the relationship with the PNME and SINEE, and the proposed modular sequence.
It shall also explain the implications of treating the RNLC and PNME as State information resources; the difference between measure 52 of Government Decision No. 652/2025 and the Operating Concept regarding the object of registration; and the distinct scope of Pillar B as a full feasibility study. Identify the main risks and explain how they will be addressed.

2.2 Appropriateness of the Technical Offer and Methodology
Present the proposed methodology and technical offer, clearly linking them to the ToR. Explain how your tools, techniques, and approach will effectively deliver the assignment. If adjustments are anticipated, describe how these will be managed. Emphasize the relevance, completeness, and adaptability of your methodology.

The methodology shall explain:

- How the legal and regulatory gaps will be assessed across the possible institutional holders.
- How the relationship with SINEE will be assessed against the CNED technical documentation.
- How the options will be compared, including the evaluation criteria, weighting and sensitivity analysis.
- How costs will be estimated, including hosting, technical administration and participant integration costs.
- How the possible reuse of Government shared services will be assessed.

The approach to obtaining, profiling and validating institutional and operator data shall explain how access will be obtained to customer, billing, meter-register and geospatial data, including the legal basis, data-sharing and confidentiality arrangements, and personal data safeguards.

Describe the sampling method and how representativeness will be assessed; the data-profiling methods and metrics to be reported; and the approach to matching addresses and cadastral data. Explain how findings based on measured data will be distinguished from those based on declared or estimated information, and how the confidence in the findings will be assessed. The approach shall be consistent with the Pillar A timeline and the Pillar B As-Is analysis.

A technical proposal (max. 20 pages) should be provided, setting out the proposed methodology for each pillar, the approach to obtaining and profiling operator data, the proposed multi-criteria evaluation method, the costing approach, the work plan with the allocation of working-days per deliverable and per expert, the team organization, the management of the dependencies between the two pillars, and the identified risks and their management.

A short methodological note (max. 3 pages) should be provided, on how the bidder proposes to construct and validate the actor × scenario interaction matrices for the RNLC and for the PNME. The note shall include the proposed interview protocol, a scenario template and worked example, preliminary actors and use cases with supporting explanations, and the validation process, including how agreement will be recorded, disagreements handled and non-responsive institutions addressed. It shall also describe the validation mechanism with each institution and operator individually.

Links to or descriptions of at least two relevant previous works, such as feasibility studies, assessments or technical specifications produced, subject to confidentiality restrictions.

A statement confirming the absence of any actual or potential conflict of interest in relation to the subsequent solicitation for the design, development or implementation of the RNLC or of the PNME.

Describe the proposed knowledge-transfer and national capacity-building activities, identifying the beneficiary institutions and intended participants, the methodology, models and tools to be transferred, and how the sessions will be organised.

2.3 Innovation and Added Value
Explain how your proposal introduces innovative approaches, tools, or practices that enhance the assignment. Describe how these elements go beyond standard expectations, add efficiency, improve outcomes, or increase sustainability. Clearly articulate the added value your methodology brings in the specific context of this assignment.

2.4 Feasibility and Structure of the Implementation Plan
Provide a detailed, time-bound implementation plan, including sequencing of activities, key milestones, and interdependencies. Explain the operational logic behind your workplan and describe how it ensures timely and effective implementation. If possible, present the plan in Gantt chart format and include mechanisms for ongoing coordination, monitoring, and risk management.
The work plan shall be consistent with Section E of the ToR and shall include all deliverables, coordination and approval points, and realistic periods for review. It shall show how the two pillars will be implemented in parallel, how they are linked, and which activities depend on access to institutional data. Identify the main schedule risks and any planned buffers or alternative arrangements.
The plan shall demonstrate how Pillar A can be completed within approximately four months and Pillar B within twelve months.

2.5 Team Structure and Allocation of Person-Days
Describe the proposed distribution of tasks and roles within the project team. Clarify the allocation of person-days per expert by pillar, deliverable group and main task, including data collection and profiling, legal analysis, architecture and costing and explain how responsibilities are divided to ensure efficient execution. If applicable, elaborate on the coordination between team members, partners, or subcontractors.
Any differences from the indicative level of effort provided in Section 5, H, of the ToR shall be justified.
Any other comments or information regarding the project approach and methodology that will be adopted.

Section 3: Management Structure and Key Personnel
3.1 Describe the overall management approach toward planning and implementing the project. Include details of key personnel including their name and nationality, the Position they will assume and their role as per the ToR. Include an organization chart for the management of the project describing the relationship of key positions and designations. Provide a spreadsheet to show the activities of each personnel and the time allocated for his/her involvement in line with indicative workload for minimum experts in line with ToR.

3.2 For each of the key personnel, the Proposer shall provide: the CV using the format in Form H and the statement of exclusivity and availability using the format in Form I.
Additionally, the Proposer shall disclose any ongoing or active contractual engagements that the proposed key experts have with UNDP and provide the following:

- **A statement of the bidder's and each key expert's experience of the national information-technology governance framework of the Republic of Moldova, listing for each cited assignment the client, the period, the deliverable produced, the normative instrument or coordination process to which it related and a contact for reference purposes.**
- **A written statement certifying that the proposed key personnel have no personal, professional, or financial conflict of interest under the envisaged contract.**

FORM H: FORMAT FOR CV OF PROPOSED KEY PERSONNEL

Name of Proposer:	Click or tap here to enter text.	Date:	Click or tap to enter a date.
RFP reference:	**RFP26/03219 Rapid Feasibility Assessment of the National Register of Consumption Points (RNLC) and Feasibility Study for the National Energy Management Platform (PNME)**		

Position (as per ToR)		
Level of participation in the project		
Personnel Information	Name:	
	Nationality:	Date of birth:
	Language Proficiency:	
Present Employment	Name of employer:	Contact: (manager or HR)
	Address of employer:	
	Telephone:	Email:
	Job title:	Years with present employer:
Education / Qualifications	*Summarise college/university and other specialised education of personnel member, giving names of schools, dates attended, and degrees/qualifications obtained.*	
Professional Certifications	*Provide details of professional certifications relevant to the scope of services including name of institution and date of certification.*	
Linguistic skills		
References:	*Provide names, addresses, phone and email contact information for at least two (2) references*.	

Summarise professional experience over the last 20 years in reverse chronological order. Indicate particular technical and managerial experience relevant to the project.

From	**To**	**Company / Project / Position / Relevant technical and management experience**

I, the undersigned, certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, this CV is accurate.

Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Signature of Personnel

Date (Day/Month/Year)

FORM I: STATEMENT OF EXCLUSIVITY AND AVAILABILITY

Name of Proposer:	Click or tap here to enter text.	Date:	Click or tap to enter a date.
RFP reference:	**RFP26/03219 Rapid Feasibility Assessment of the National Register of Consumption Points (RNLC) and Feasibility Study for the National Energy Management Platform (PNME)**		

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that I agree to participate exclusively with the Proposer Click or tap here to enter text.in the above referenced RFP. I further declare that I am able and willing to work for the period(s) foreseen for the position for which my CV has been included if this proposal is successful, namely:

From	To
Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.
Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.
Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.

I confirm that I am not engaged in other projects in a position for which my services are required during the periods where my services are required under this RFP.
By making this declaration, I understand that I am not allowed to present myself as a candidate to any other proposer submitting a proposal for this RFP. I am fully aware that if I do so, I will be excluded from this RFP, the proposals may be rejected, and I may also be subject to exclusion from other UNDP's solicitation procedures and contracts.
Furthermore, should this proposal be successful, I am fully aware that if I am not available at the expected start date of my services for reasons other than ill-health or *force majeure*, I may be subject to exclusion from other Click or tap here to enter text. solicitation procedures and contracts and that the notification of award of contract to the Proposer may be rendered null and void.

Name: _____
Title: _____
Date: _____
Signature: _____

FORM J: FINANCIAL PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

Name of Proposer:	Click or tap here to enter text.	Date:	Click or tap to enter a date.
RFP reference:	**RFP26/03219 Rapid Feasibility Assessment of the National Register of Consumption Points (RNLC) and Feasibility Study for the National Energy Management Platform (PNME)**		

We, the undersigned, offer to provide the services indicated in our proposal and in accordance with your Request for Proposal. We are hereby submitting our Financial Proposal in the amount indicated herewith.

Our Proposal shall be valid and remain binding upon us for the period specified in the Data Sheet.

We understand that you are not bound to accept any Proposal that you receive.

Our attached Financial Proposal is for the sum of *[Insert amount in words and figures].* Please make sure the total matches with the total indicated in the deliverables section of the system (lines) and with the total deriving from the cost breakdown (form K).

FORM K: FORMAT FOR FINANCIAL PROPOSAL

Name of Proposer:	Click or tap here to enter text.	Date:	Click or tap to enter a date.
RFP reference:	**RFP26/03219 Rapid Feasibility Assessment of the National Register of Consumption Points (RNLC) and Feasibility Study for the National Energy Management Platform (PNME)**		

The proposer is required to prepare the Financial Proposal following the below format and upload it only in the Commercial section of Quantum, as indicated in the Data Sheet. **The inclusion of any financial information in the Technical Proposal shall lead to disqualification of the Proposer.** The Financial Proposal should align with the requirements of the Terms of Reference and the proposer's Technical Proposal.

Currency of the proposal: MDL (Moldovan Leu) for local suppliers and USD (US Dollars) for international or and local suppliers, VAT exclusive

IMPORTANT - Estimated Workload and Consistency of Proposals

The estimated workload per each proposed key personnel member is provided as a reference to guide bidders in understanding the expected level of effort. Proposers are encouraged to review these estimates and to propose adjustments to the number of working days and to personnel allocation, provided such changes are aligned with their technical approach and methodology. Proposers are encouraged to propose their own variation to ensure timely delivery and to maintain the quality of the outputs described above.

The number of working days proposed for each key personnel member in the technical proposal shall be consistent with the number of working days included in the financial offer.

Role	**Estimated quantity of working days needed**
Team Leader / Project Manager	85
Energy sector expert	70
Data architecture and data governance expert	90
IT and e-government systems architecture expert	65
Financial and cost-benefit analysis expert	45
Legal and Government IT governance expert	50

Table: Breakdown of Price per Type of Cost

PILAR A

Deliverable Group 1: Evidence base, institutional and legal baseline Establish what already exists, replace the assumptions carried in the RNLC Concept with measured evidence drawn from the actual data and systems of the network operators and the relevant public registers, and settle the legal position of each candidate holder.									
Deliverable / Activity description	**Professional Fees**				**Other Costs**				**Total Amount per deliverable** (subtotal 1 + sub-total 2)
	Position	**Daily fee Rate**	**No. of Working Days**	**Total Amount**	**Description**	**Q-ty**	**Price**	**Total**	
Deliverable 1.1. Inception report	Team Leader / Project Manager				Travel (if any)				
	Energy sector expert				Local transportation costs (if any)				
	Data architecture and data governance expert				Communication Expenses				
	IT and e-government systems architecture expert				Other costs (please specify)				
	Financial and cost-benefit analysis expert								
	Legal and Government IT governance expert								
			Sub-total 1				**Sub-total 2**		
								Total Deliverable 1.1:	
Deliverable 1.2. As-Is baseline and DSO digital-maturity assessment	Team Leader / Project Manager				Travel				
	Energy sector expert				Subsistence allowance				
	Data architecture and data governance expert				Local transportation costs				
	IT and e-government systems architecture expert				Communication				
	Financial and cost-benefit analysis expert				Other costs (specify)				
	Legal and Government IT governance expert								
			Sub-total 1				**Sub-total 2**		

	Total Deliverable 1.2:								
Deliverable 1.3. Data readiness diagnostic, profiling anonymised or pseudonymised samples	Team Leader / Project Manager				Travel (if any)				
	Energy sector expert				Local transportation costs (if any)				
	Data architecture and data governance expert				Communication Expenses				
	IT and e-government systems architecture expert				Other costs (please specify)				
	Financial and cost-benefit analysis expert								
	Legal and Government IT governance expert								
		Sub-total 1				**Sub-total 2**			
	Total Deliverable 1.3:								
	TOTAL Deliverable Group 1:								

Deliverable Group 2: Business analysis, interaction scenarios, options and business case.
Resolve the open design questions through business analysis, establish how each actor would interact with the Register, then compare the strategic options on a transparent and documented basis, including the four components agreed with the Ministry of Energy (institutional holder, cost and its bearer, interdependence with the PNME and SINEE, modular sequence).

Deliverable / Activity description	**Professional Fees**				**Other Costs**				**Total Amount per deliverable** (subtotal 1 + sub-total 2)
	Position	**Daily fee Rate**	**No. of Working Days**	**Total Amount**	**Description**	**Q-ty**	**Price**	**Total**	
Deliverable 2.1. Business analysis and identity model	Team Leader / Project Manager				Travel (if any)				
	Energy sector expert				Local transportation costs (if any)				
	Data architecture and data governance expert				Communication Expenses				
	IT and e-government systems architecture expert				Other costs (please specify)				
	Financial and cost-benefit analysis expert								
	Legal and Government IT governance expert								
		Sub-total 1				**Sub-total 2**			
	Total Deliverable 2.1:								

Deliverable 2.2. Options analysis and business case	Team Leader / Project Manager				Travel				
	Energy sector expert				Subsistence allowance				
	Data architecture and data governance expert				Local transportation costs				
	IT and e-government systems architecture expert				Communication				
	Financial and cost-benefit analysis expert				Other costs (specify)				
	Legal and Government IT governance expert								
			Sub-total 1				**Sub-total 2**		
								Total Deliverable 2.2:	
								TOTAL Deliverable Group 2:	

Deliverable Group 3: Feasibility conclusion, roadmap and normative outline.
Reach an explicit feasibility conclusion capable of supporting a Government decision, validate it with the stakeholders, and convert it into a sequenced legislative roadmap and the annotated outlines required to proceed to the drafting of the normative package.

Deliverable / Activity description	**Professional Fees**				**Other Costs**				**Total Amount per deliverable** (subtotal 1 + sub-total 2)
	Position	**Daily fee Rate**	**No. of Working Days**	**Total Amount**	**Description**	**Q-ty**	**Price**	**Total**	
Deliverable 3.1. Rapid Feasibility assessment report	Team Leader / Project Manager				Travel (if any)				
	Energy sector expert				Local transportation costs (if any)				
	Data architecture and data governance expert				Communication Expenses				
	IT and e-government systems architecture expert				Other costs (please specify)				
	Financial and cost-benefit analysis expert								
	Legal and Government IT governance expert								
			Sub-total 1				**Sub-total 2**		
								Total Deliverable 3.1:	
Deliverable 3.2.	Team Leader / Project Manager				Travel				

Legislative roadmap and normative outlines for the establishment of the RNLC	Energy sector expert				Subsistence allowance				
	Data architecture and data governance expert				Local transportation costs				
	IT and e-government systems architecture expert				Communication				
	Financial and cost-benefit analysis expert				Other costs (specify)				
	Legal and Government IT governance expert								
		Sub-total 1				**Sub-total 2**			
	Total Deliverable 3.2:								
	TOTAL Deliverable Group 3:								
	TOTAL PILAR A:								

PILAR B

Deliverable Group 4: PNME inception and As-Is analysis of the energy data ecosystem Establish, on measured evidence rather than assumption, what energy data exists in the country, who holds it, at what granularity and quality, under what access regime, through which reporting flows it currently moves, and whether each institution and operator is actually able to supply it.									
Deliverable / Activity description	**Professional Fees**				**Other Costs**				**Total Amount per deliverable** (subtotal 1 + sub-total 2)
	Position	**Daily fee Rate**	**No. of Working Days**	**Total Amount**	**Description**	**Q-ty**	**Price**	**Total**	
Deliverable 4.1. PNME inception note	Team Leader / Project Manager				Travel (if any)				
	Energy sector expert				Local transportation costs (if any)				
	Data architecture and data governance expert				Communication Expenses				
	IT and e-government systems architecture expert				Other costs (please specify)				
	Financial and cost-benefit analysis expert								
	Legal and Government IT governance expert								

		Sub-total 1				**Sub-total 2**		
	Total Deliverable 4.1:							
Deliverable 4.2. PNME As-Is analysis	Team Leader / Project Manager				Travel			
	Energy sector expert				Subsistence allowance			
	Data architecture and data governance expert				Local transportation costs			
	IT and e-government systems architecture expert				Communication			
	Financial and cost-benefit analysis expert				Other costs (specify)			
	Legal and Government IT governance expert							
		Sub-total 1				**Sub-total 2**		
	Total Deliverable 4.2:							
	TOTAL Deliverable group 4:							

Deliverable Group 5: PNME needs, options, business case and governance framework
Derive verifiable requirements from the As-Is evidence, establish interaction scenarios, compare the implementation options on a documented basis, cost them, and establish the institutional, legal and data governance framework the recommended option requires.

Deliverable / Activity description	**Professional Fees**				**Other Costs**				**Total Amount per deliverable** (subtotal 1 + sub-total 2)
	Position	**Daily fee Rate**	**No. of Working Days**	**Total Amount**	**Description**	**Q-ty**	**Price**	**Total**	
Deliverable 5.1. PNME needs, priority use cases and integration requirements	Team Leader / Project Manager				Travel (if any)				
	Energy sector expert				Local transportation costs (if any)				
	Data architecture and data governance expert				Communication Expenses				
	IT and e-government systems architecture expert				Other costs (please specify)				
	Financial and cost-benefit analysis expert								
	Legal and Government IT governance expert								
		Sub-total 1				**Sub-total 2**			

									Total Deliverable 5.1:
Deliverable 5.2. To-Be options, conceptual operating model and business case	Team Leader / Project Manager				Travel				
	Energy sector expert				Subsistence allowance				
	Data architecture and data governance expert				Local transportation costs				
	IT and e-government systems architecture expert				Communication				
	Financial and cost-benefit analysis expert				Other costs (specify)				
	Legal and Government IT governance expert								
			Sub-total 1				**Sub-total 2**		
									Total Deliverable 5.2:
Deliverable 5.3. Institutional, legal and data governance framework	Team Leader / Project Manager				Travel (if any)				
	Energy sector expert				Local transportation costs (if any)				
	Data architecture and data governance expert				Communication Expenses				
	IT and e-government systems architecture expert				Other costs (please specify)				
	Financial and cost-benefit analysis expert								
	Legal and Government IT governance expert								
			Sub-total 1				**Sub-total 2**		
									Total Deliverable 5.3:
									TOTAL Deliverable Group 5:

Deliverable Group 6: Roadmap, indicators and consolidated feasibility study.
Convert the analysis into a phased, costed and measurable implementation path, consolidate it into the study required by Annex 3, and validate it with the sector.

Deliverable / Activity description	**Professional Fees**				**Other Costs**				**Total Amount per deliverable** (subtotal 1 + sub-total 2)
	Position	**Daily fee Rate**	**No. of Working Days**	**Total Amount**	**Description**	**Q-ty**	**Price**	**Total**	

Deliverable 6.1. Implementation roadmap, indicators and risk register	Team Leader / Project Manager				Travel (if any)				
	Energy sector expert				Local transportation costs (if any)				
	Data architecture and data governance expert				Communication Expenses				
	IT and e-government systems architecture expert				Other costs (please specify)				
	Financial and cost-benefit analysis expert								
	Legal and Government IT governance expert								
			Sub-total 1				**Sub-total 2**		
Deliverable 6.2. Consolidated PNME feasibility study	Team Leader / Project Manager				Travel				
	Energy sector expert				Subsistence allowance				
	Data architecture and data governance expert				Local transportation costs				
	IT and e-government systems architecture expert				Communication				
	Financial and cost-benefit analysis expert				Other costs (specify)				
	Legal and Government IT governance expert								
			Sub-total 1				**Sub-total 2**		
									TOTAL Deliverable Group 6:
									TOTAL PILAR B:

TOTAL PILAR A (Deliverable Groups 1 + 2 + 3)	
TOTAL PILAR B (Deliverable Groups 4 + 5 + 6)	
TOTAL PRICE OF THE FINANCIAL PROPOSAL (PILAR A + PILAR B)	

* Please adjust the table as per your technical proposal. You may add/delete any budget sub-categories which are relevant to your technical proposal.

** Please include the respective amounts in the Total Budget of the Proposal. **Applicable taxes and social benefits should be included in the unit price proposed.**

I, the undersigned, certify that I am duly authorized by Click or tap here to enter text. to sign this bid and bind Click or tap here to enter text.should Click or tap here to enter text.accept this bid:

Name : _____

Title : _____

Date : _____

Signature : _____