Annex 2 to the Terms of Reference

STRUCTURE AND REQUIREMENTS OF THE FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENT FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF CONSUMPTION POINTS (RNLC)

Pillar A of the assignment | Binding on the Contractor

This Annex forms an integral part of the Terms of Reference and is binding on the Contractor. The feasibility assessment of the RNLC shall follow the chapter structure set out below and shall address the analytical content required under each chapter. The lists of institutions, operators, systems and normative acts are minimum reference lists to be validated, completed and extended by the Contractor. Any departure from this structure shall be proposed at inception stage, justified and approved in writing by UNDP.

The assessment is deliberately a focused, decision-triggering exercise, to be delivered within the period established for Pillar A in Section G of the Terms of Reference. Its purpose is to place the Ministry of Energy, ANRE and CNED in a position to take four decisions that are currently blocked: who shall hold the Register, what it will cost to build, host and operate 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 be implemented. Analytical depth shall be concentrated on those four questions. Where the three-month window does not permit exhaustive evidence on a secondary matter, the limitation shall be stated expressly and the confidence of the affected conclusion qualified, assumption shall not be substituted for evidence.

The report shall be delivered in English, with an executive summary and the decision-facing sections in Romanian, and shall not exceed 60 pages excluding annexes. All matrices, inventories, models and profiling results shall be delivered in editable format so that the beneficiary institutions can re-run and update them.

Table of contents

1. INTRODUCTION 5
1.1. Abbreviations 5
1.2. Actors involved 5
2. CONTEXT, OBJECTIVES, SCOPE AND EXPECTED RESULTS 6
2.1. National context and policy anchoring 6
2.2. Purpose and objectives of the feasibility assessment 6
2.3. Boundaries of the assessment 6
2.4. Expected results 7
3. METHODOLOGY, SOURCES, SAMPLING, ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS 7
3.1. Methodology 7
3.2. Information sources 7
3.3. Sampling strategy and confidence 8
3.4. Assumptions and limitations 8
3.5. International benchmark and applicable lessons 8
4. "AS-IS" ANALYSIS 8
4.1. Actors and roles as they exist today 8
4.2. Inventory of registers, information systems, infrastructures and reference sources 9
4.3. Digital maturity and integration readiness of the network operators 9
4.4. "As-Is" processes for identifying and maintaining places of consumption 9
4.5. Data readiness diagnostic 9
4.6. Institutional capacity baseline 10
5. LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS 10
5.1. Applicable normative framework 10
5.2. Legal gap analysis – the object of registration and the identifier 10
5.3. Legal gap analysis – candidate institutional holders 11
5.4. Allocation of the statutory roles 12
5.5. Personal data protection, confidentiality and information security 12
5.6. Consolidated legal gap register 12
6. BUSINESS ANALYSIS, IDENTITY MODEL AND INTERACTION SCENARIOS 12
6.1. Operational definition of the place of consumption and object model 12
6.2. The unique code of the place of consumption 13
6.3. Priority use cases 13
6.4. Actor × scenario interaction matrix 13
6.5. Minimum logical data model 14
6.6. Functional delineation and source authority 14
6.7. Integration and interface requirements 14

7. INTERDEPENDENCE WITH THE PNME AND SINEE 14
7.1. Technical interdependence with the PNME 14
7.2. Technical and functional interdependence with SINEE 14
7.3. Architectural options for the RNLC–SINEE relationship 15
7.4. Avoidance of redundant capacity 15
8. REUSE OF GOVERNMENT PLATFORMS, HOSTING AND TECHNICAL ADMINISTRATION 15
8.1. Reuse assessment per Government platform and shared service 15
8.2. Hosting on the common Government technology platform and the role of the technical administrator 16
8.3. Coordination and approval gates 16
8.4. Cybersecurity, resilience and continuity 17
9. OPTIONS ANALYSIS AND MULTI-CRITERIA EVALUATION 17
9.1. Energy scope options 17
9.2. Institutional ownership options 17
9.3. Delivery and architecture options 17
9.4. Phasing options 17
9.5. Criteria, weightings and evaluation matrix 17
9.6. Recommended option, trade-offs and rejected options 18
10. COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS AND OBLIGATIONS OF THE FUTURE HOLDER 18
10.1. Capital cost 18
10.2. Operating cost and total cost of ownership 18
10.3. Integration and adaptation costs borne by participants 18
10.4. Benefits 18
10.5. Funding and sustainability 19
10.6. Statement of the obligations of the future holder 19
11. FEASIBILITY CONCLUSION AND READINESS GATES 19
12. MODULAR IMPLEMENTATION ROADMAP 19
13. LEGISLATIVE ROADMAP AND NORMATIVE OUTLINES 19
13.1. Legislative and normative roadmap 19
13.2. Annotated outline of the Concept of the information system 20
13.3. Annotated outline of the Regulation of the information resource 20
13.4. Annotated outline of the Technical Specification 20
14. INDICATORS, RISKS AND DEPENDENCIES 21
14.1. Performance and data-quality indicators 21
14.2. Risk register 21
14.3. Dependencies 21
15. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 22

The team shall in addition include named public procurement competence, which may be combined with the legal and Government information-technology governance role, covering procurement strategy for complex information technology contracts, the choice of procedure, the division into lots, qualification, selection and award criteria, life-cycle costing and contract-modification provisions. ..22

16. ANNEXES 22

1. INTRODUCTION

[The Contractor will set out the purpose of the assessment, the decisions it is intended to support, the reason a focused assessment concentrated on four decision-critical questions was commissioned, and the questions the report answers. The introduction will state expressly that the assessment was commissioned because the institutional, functional, legal and technical form of the RNLC was not settled by the Operating Concept, and that the report is intended to close that question rather than to confirm a preferred outcome.]

1.1. Abbreviations

[List of abbreviations used.]

1.2. Actors involved

[The Contractor will present the institutions, operators and other entities with a role in the establishment, operation, supply of data to, or use of the RNLC. For each, the current mandate and the basis of that mandate will be stated. Future roles will not be presumed here, they follow from Chapters 5 and 9. The list below is a minimum reference set to be validated and extended.]

Public institutions and authorities:

- Ministry of Energy – public policy, strategic coordination, promotion of the normative framework, holder of SINEE under Government Decision No. 144/2025, authority responsible for the regulation and implementation of the RNLC under the Action Plan of the Programme approved by Government Decision No. 652/2025.
- National Agency for Energy Regulation (ANRE) – regulation and monitoring of the energy sectors, licensing, supplier-switching rules, monitoring of the RNLC action under the Programme.
- National Centre for Sustainable Energy (CNED) – energy efficiency, energy performance of buildings, renewable energy, keeper of SINEE.
- e-Governance Agency (AGE) – interoperability platform and Government shared services, holder and keeper of the Register of State Information Resources and Systems, prior coordination and conformity assessment of State information systems, coordination of ICT procurement.
- Information Technology and Cyber Security Service (STISC) – holder of the common Government technology platform (MCloud), technical administration and maintenance of State information systems.
- Public Services Agency and the Cadastral authority – the Real Estate Register, the State Register of Administrative-Territorial Units and Addresses, the State Register of Population and the State Register of Legal Units.
- Ministry of Labour and Social Protection – energy-vulnerability and social-protection mechanisms associated with a place of consumption.
- National Bureau of Statistics – the energy balance and official statistical series.
- National Centre for Personal Data Protection and the Cybersecurity Agency – supervisory authorities.

Energy operators:

- Electricity transmission and system operation – Î.S. Moldelectrica.
- Electricity distribution – ICS Premier Energy Distribution and RED-Nord S.A.
- Natural gas transmission, distribution and supply.
- District heating – the Chișinău and Bălți systems and other local operators.
- Electricity and natural gas suppliers, the electricity market operator, producers, including renewable producers, and prosumers.

2. CONTEXT, OBJECTIVES, SCOPE AND EXPECTED RESULTS

2.1. National context and policy anchoring

[The Contractor will describe the strategic and normative context, anchored in the Programme for the Digital Transformation of the Energy Sector 2026–2030 approved by Government Decision No. 652/2025, and in particular in measure 52 and action 1.1.1 of its Action Plan, which fix the indicative investment envelope, the delivery dates, the coverage targets and the institutional responsibilities for the RNLC. The section will state the coverage and operational targets set by the Programme and will assess, at the outset, whether they remain attainable.]

[The section will also record, and carry forward into Chapter 5, the divergence between measure 52 of that Programme – which describes the RNLC as associating each place of consumption with, among other elements, data about the consumer and a cadastral identifier and the position taken in 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. The divergence is not editorial: it determines the object of registration, the lawful basis for processing, the scope of the data protection impact assessment, the access model and the content of the future Regulation of the information resource.]

2.2. Purpose and objectives of the feasibility assessment

[The Contractor will state the purpose and objectives and will identify which decisions must be capable of being taken on the basis of the report. The objectives are, at a minimum:]

- to establish, on measured evidence, what already exists and what can be reused, extended or integrated before any new development is contemplated;
- to determine the institutional holder of the RNLC and the allocation of the statutory roles, and to identify every normative amendment required to give effect to that determination;
- to establish the estimated development cost and the obligations – institutional, technical, staffing and financial that hosting, implementation and maintenance would place on the future holder, supported by a cost-benefit analysis;
- to establish the technical interdependence of the RNLC with the PNME and with SINEE, and to exclude the creation of redundant capacity;
- to establish the modular implementation options and the corresponding roadmap;
- to determine the energy scope, that is whether the Register covers electricity only or extends to other energy vectors;
- to reach an explicit feasibility conclusion of GO, CONDITIONAL GO or NO-GO against defined readiness gates, capable of supporting a Government decision.

2.3. Boundaries of the assessment

[The Contractor will state what falls within and what falls outside the scope of the assessment. In scope: the As-Is baseline, the data readiness diagnostic on agreed samples, the legal and institutional analysis, the business analysis, identity model and interaction scenarios, the interdependence analysis with the PNME and SINEE, the reuse, hosting and technical administration analysis, the options analysis and multi-criteria evaluation, the cost-benefit analysis and the statement of the future holder's obligations, the feasibility conclusion, the modular roadmap, the legislative roadmap and the annotated normative outlines. Out of scope: the drafting of the Concept of the information system, of the Regulation of the information resource and of the Technical Specification, which will be procured separately on the basis of this assessment, detailed technical design, software development, full data migration, and the procurement of the solution.]

2.4. Expected results

[The Contractor will list the concrete outputs of the assessment and the success criteria against which they will be accepted. The outputs include, at a minimum: the inventory of registers, systems and reference sources, the digital-maturity and integration-readiness assessment per operator, the data readiness diagnostic with measured values, the consolidated legal gap register with the normative interventions required, the object model, identifier design note and minimum logical data model, the prioritised use-case catalogue, the actor × scenario interaction matrix, the RNLC : SINEE : PNME : operator-systems delineation matrix with source authority per attribute, the multi-criteria evaluation matrix, the costing model in editable spreadsheet format, the statement of the future holder's obligations, the feasibility conclusion with readiness gates, the modular roadmap, the legislative roadmap, and the annotated outlines of the three normative documents.]

3. METHODOLOGY, SOURCES, SAMPLING, ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

3.1. Methodology

[The Contractor will describe the methods applied: desk review of public and internal documentation, individual structured interviews with each institution and operator, working sessions and validation workshops, inventory of registers, systems and datasets, data profiling on agreed samples, business analysis of processes, use cases and information flows, legal gap analysis, multi-criteria options analysis, and cost-benefit analysis. The methodology will state how findings are traced to their evidence, so that every conclusion in the report can be followed back to an interview record, a profiling result or an identified provision.]

3.2. Information sources

[The Contractor will list the sources used. The following is a mandatory minimum set to be validated and extended: the Programme approved by Government Decision No. 652/2025 and its Action Plan, the Operating Concept of the RNLC, the report of the technical validation workshop of 22 July 2026, the prior internal working papers made available by UNDP, treated as inputs to be tested rather than conclusions to be confirmed, Government Decision No. 144/2025 and the technical documentation and technical designs of SINEE obtained from CNED, the normative framework governing State information resources, registers, interoperability, public services, personal data protection and cybersecurity, the Government decisions and technical documentation governing the common Government technology platform, the interoperability platform and the Government shared services, the customer, billing, meter-register, GIS and metering data of the distribution system operators, obtained as agreed samples, the reference registers of the Public Services Agency and the cadastral authority, and the published documentation of the comparable national arrangements selected for benchmarking.]

[The sources shall include the public procurement framework, which is in transition during the period of the assessment: Law No. 131/2015 on public procurement, applicable 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, procedures under way at that date being completed under the law in force when they were initiated, Government Decision No. 695/2025 approving the Regulation on the planning of public procurement, and Government Decision No. 544/2019, as amended, approving the Methodology for the coordination of procurement in the field of information and communication technology.]

3.3. Sampling strategy and confidence

[Because the assessment is compressed into the period established for Pillar A, profiling will be performed on representative anonymised or pseudonymised samples agreed with UNDP at inception rather than on full population extracts. The Contractor will state the sampling design, the sample sizes, the basis on which representativeness is claimed, and the confidence attaching to each measured value. Where a finding rests on a sample too small to support a firm conclusion, that shall be stated and the consequence for the feasibility conclusion identified. Findings resting on declared or estimated information shall be distinguished throughout from findings resting on measured data.]

3.4. Assumptions and limitations

[The Contractor will list the assumptions applied and the limitations encountered, including: which data could be obtained and in what form, which institutions or operators did not provide data or interviews, and the effect of that on the analysis, the extent to which integration can be automated as against periodic export, the availability of common identifiers, and security and confidentiality constraints and their effect on the architecture and the cost. Delays in concluding data-sharing arrangements or in extraction and anonymisation shall be recorded and reflected in the conclusions.]

3.5. International benchmark and applicable lessons

[The Contractor will benchmark comparable national arrangements, drawing transferable principles – role clarity, stable identifiers, application programming interfaces, permissions, audit and testing environments, and the separation of reference data from measurement data, rather than describing foreign models or proposing to copy an institutional template. The benchmark will cover at a minimum Norway's Elhub, Finland's Datahub, Denmark's DataHub, Estonia's Estfeed, Latvia's STEP, Lithuania's ESO Data Hub, the Czech EDC/OTE model, Slovenia's data-exchange and single-entry services, Belgium's Atrias and the Netherlands' EDSN and central connections register, and the United Kingdom's MPAN and MPRN identifiers. For each, the benchmark will state the size and maturity of the market concerned and will assess the transferability of the arrangement to a market of Moldova's size, liquidity and institutional structure. The section will conclude expressly on which functions of a mature data hub the RNLC should not attempt to reproduce at its initial stage, and why.]

[Comparative and benchmarking analysis is a core research method for this assignment and is not the responsibility of any single expert. The Contractor will 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, and every member of the team is expected to apply that judgement within their own area of responsibility.]

4. "AS-IS" ANALYSIS

[This chapter establishes, on verifiable grounds, what exists today: which registers, systems and reference sources are relevant to the identification of places of consumption, who holds them, what data they contain, at what quality, and through which processes places of consumption are currently identified, recorded, corrected and reconciled. Standardised templates will be used and the limitations expressly indicated.]

4.1. Actors and roles as they exist today

[For each institution and operator: the current mandate and its legal basis, the data and systems managed, the reporting and publication obligations, the role in existing information flows, and the institutional and technical capacity. Potential future roles are not presumed here.]

4.2. Inventory of registers, information systems, infrastructures and reference sources

[A tabular inventory covering, for each entry: the holding institution and the administrator, the purpose, the main functionalities, the categories of data managed, the update frequency, the level of granularity, the identifiers used, the format and standards, the method of access and data exchange, the level of quality and maturity, the restrictions on use, and the associated reporting obligations. The inventory will expressly include the Real Estate Register and the official address records, SINEE and its subsystems, the Government interoperability platform and the Government shared services, the enterprise resource planning, geographic information, 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. For each entry the assessment will state what could be reused, extended, integrated or must be kept separate.]

4.3. Digital maturity and integration readiness of the network operators

[A dedicated assessment of Premier Energy Distribution, RED-Nord and the natural gas distribution operators, covering customer information, geographic information, head-end and meter data management systems, metering infrastructure, identifiers, application programming interfaces and export facilities, bidirectional synchronisation, event handling, error correction, reconciliation, data quality, cybersecurity, staffing and integration capacity. The assessment will distinguish capabilities available now from those dependent on the head-end and meter data management roll-out. It will not stop at an inventory of systems: the question to be answered is whether each operator can reliably maintain and exchange RNLC data and sustain the required mappings over time, and at what cost to itself.]

4.4. “As-Is” processes for identifying and maintaining places of consumption

[Process diagrams for the critical flows – creation of a new connection, change of technical status, correction of a record, supplier switching, and reconciliation between operator records and reference registers, identifying duplications, manual interventions, bottlenecks and the points at which identity is currently lost or ambiguous.]

4.5. Data readiness diagnostic

[Measured values, not estimates, established by profiling the agreed samples, for at least: completeness, uniqueness and internal consistency of the point-of-delivery populations, duplicate and contradictory records, achievable cadastral-match and address-match rates, before and after normalisation, owner-tenant divergence between cadastral and contractual records, multiple consumption points sharing a single coordinate, building or parcel, bulk metering serving multiple consumption units, and the residual volume of cases that cannot be resolved automatically.]

[Geospatial attributes will be profiled separately. For each georeferenced record in the sample the diagnostic will classify the coordinate by: the object to which it refers, distinguishing at minimum the metering device, the connection point, the building, the building unit and the cadastral parcel, the source and method of acquisition, distinguishing field survey or satellite capture, digitisation from a map or plan, derivation from a postal address, and assignment of a parcel or building centroid, positional accuracy, stated in metres where known, the date of capture or last update, and the confidence or quality level assigned by the source system. Where an attribute is not held by the source system, its absence will be recorded as a finding and will not be inferred or substituted. The diagnostic will establish, rather than assume, whether coordinates can serve as a matching key.]

[The diagnostic will conclude on the feasibility, effort, cost and timescale of the initial constitution of the RNLC database, on the minimum data-quality thresholds to be met before any sector may be declared operational, and on the remediation required of each operator, costed and attributed.]

4.6. Institutional capacity baseline

[The mandates, competences, staffing, technical capacity, budgetary position and existing information-technology governance arrangements of the Ministry of Energy, ANRE and CNED, assessed against what the operation of a national reference register would require of each. The assessment will identify the capability gaps that would have to be closed and will cost them.]

5. LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS

[This chapter is one of the four decision-critical parts of the assessment. It determines whether, and on what conditions, the RNLC may lawfully be established and held by each candidate institution, and what would have to be amended in each case. Conclusions will be expressed at provision level, not as general observations.]

5.1. Applicable normative framework

[An analysed, not copied, inventory of the applicable acts, covering three layers. First, the energy layer: Law No. 174/2017 on energy, the sectoral laws and the regulations approved by ANRE, including the supplier-switching rules and the obligations of licence holders. Second, the State information resources layer: Law No. 467/2003, in particular the roles of owner, holder, keeper, technical administrator and user, and the three mandatory documents, and Law No. 71/2007 on registers, in particular the principles governing the creation and keeping of registers, the subjects of the legal relations, the establishment of a register by Government decision and the prior approval of its regulation, the prohibition of repeated registration of an object already registered in another State register, the mandatory integration of State registers through unique identifiers and State classifiers, the immutability and non-reuse of the identifier, and the provision of register data through the interoperability platform. Third, the Government information-technology layer: the decisions governing the common Government technology platform, the transfer of technical administration and the consolidation of public-sector data centres, the interoperability platform and the Government shared services, the Register of State Information Resources and Systems, the coordination of information and communication technology procurement, the integrated Government portal and application and the Unitary Design Model, together with Law No. 142/2018, Law No. 234/2021, Law No. 133/2011 and Law No. 195/2024 and Law No. 48/2023. For each act the assessment will state the specific provision engaged and its consequence for the RNLC, a list reproduced without analysis will not be accepted.] Fourth, the public procurement layer: Law No. 131/2015 and Law No. 325/2025, the latter entering into force on 1 January 2027 and repealing the former, the Regulation on the planning of public procurement approved by Government Decision No. 695/2025, under which a procurement of any value may be initiated only after inclusion in the provisional or annual procurement plan and confirmation of the availability of funds, under which the 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 nor a procedure initiated on a plan modified after that date, save for autonomous public authorities and authorities not financed from the national public budget, and the Methodology for the coordination of information and communication technology procurement approved by Government Decision No. 544/2019, as amended, which applies irrespective of the type of procurement, the method and the source of financing and expressly extends to technical assistance projects implemented under donor or international organisation procedures where initiated and carried out by the entities it lists.

5.2. Legal gap analysis – the object of registration and the identifier

[The Contractor will resolve the divergence identified in Chapter 2 between measure 52 of the Programme and the Operating Concept as to whether the RNLC records data about the consumer and depends on a cadastral identifier. The analysis will state which reading is legally sustainable having regard to the prohibition of repeated registration and repeated accumulation of data on an object already registered in another State register, to the rule that natural and legal persons are identified exclusively by the State

personal and legal-entity identifiers, and to the data-minimisation requirements of the personal data protection framework. It will formulate the corresponding normative correction, whether by amendment of the Programme, by an interpretative provision in the establishing Government decision, or otherwise.]

[The analysis will further establish whether the assignment of a new sectoral identifier to a place of consumption is consistent with the requirement that register objects be identified using the State system of identifiers and with the prohibition on generating proprietary identifiers for natural and legal persons, and will state the basis on which the identifier of a place of consumption is distinguishable from an identifier of a person, a contract, a metering device or a cadastral object.]

5.3. Legal gap analysis – candidate institutional holders

[For each candidate the analysis will establish whether the institution may lawfully be designated holder of a State information resource of this nature, what would have to be amended for it to be so designated, and what the designation would require of it in practice. The analysis will be conducted to the same depth for each candidate, a candidate shall not be treated as the default and the others as alternatives.]

CNED scenario.

[Proceeding from Government Decision No. 1060/2023 on the organisation and functioning of the Centre, read with Law No. 139/2018 and Law No. 282/2023: whether the Centre's statutory mission and enumerated functions, confined to energy efficiency, renewable energy, financial assistance and financial guarantees, and expressly providing 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. The analysis will identify the amendments required to the Statute of the Centre, to its structure and staffing ceiling, to its tariff nomenclature and to any tangential act, will 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, will establish the consequences of the Centre's subordination for the applicability of the rules transferring technical administration and requiring hosting on the common Government technology platform, and will identify any inconsistency that would categorically preclude the role, in particular any conflict between the Centre's position as beneficiary and implementer of energy-efficiency financing programmes and its neutrality as holder of a register on which market participants depend.]

ANRE scenario.

[Proceeding from the Regulation on the organisation and functioning of the Agency approved by Parliament Decision No. 334/2018, read with Law No. 174/2017: whether the Agency's competences, those of a regulatory and monitoring authority, extending to the keeping of registers of licence holders but not, on their face, to the holding of a national reference register of places of consumption, accommodate the role, and what amendments to the Regulation, to Law No. 174/2017 and to tangential acts would be required. The analysis will 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 the rules transferring technical administration to the designated Government technical administrator, for the mandatory character of hosting on the common Government technology platform, and for the ability of the Government to impose obligations on the Agency by Government decision rather than by law, the funding of the Agency from regulatory charges, 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 tariff impact on final consumers, 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, whether such separation is achievable within the Agency's present structure, and how it would be audited.]

Ministry of Energy scenario.

[Whether the arrangement already applied to SINEE under Government Decision No. 144/2025, in which the Ministry is holder and a subordinated public institution is keeper, is available and appropriate for the RNLC. This scenario will be tested in full and not treated as residual. The analysis will note that the Action Plan of the Programme designates the Ministry of Energy as the authority responsible for the regulation and implementation of the RNLC, with ANRE responsible for monitoring, and will reconcile that designation with whichever model is ultimately recommended.]

Distributed scenario.

[At least one configuration in which the statutory roles are separated between institutions – for example the Ministry of Energy as holder, a subordinated public institution as keeper, the designated Government technical administrator as technical administrator, and the network operators as registrars for the data within their competence. The analysis will state the instrument by which each role would be conferred and the delimitation of attributions to be set out in the Regulation of the information resource.]

5.4. Allocation of the statutory roles

[For the recommended configuration and for each alternative, a role-allocation table covering holder, keeper, technical administrator, registrar and sub-registrar, data provider and data recipient, stating for each: the entity proposed, the legal basis on which the role would be conferred, the attributions carried, the attributions expressly excluded, the financial responsibility, the liability in the event of error, incident or breach, and the mechanism for resolving disputes between role-holders. The table will address expressly the position of the network operators as potential registrars, and the conditions on which registration functions may be delegated to a participant in data exchange.]

5.5. Personal data protection, confidentiality and information security

[The categories of data proposed to be held, classified by sensitivity, the lawful basis for each processing operation and for each exchange, the allocation of controller and processor responsibilities across the role-holders, the re-identification risk arising from the correlation of structural attributes of a place of consumption, assessed on the actual attribute set proposed rather than in the abstract, the conclusion on whether a data protection impact assessment is required and, if so, its scope, the commercial confidentiality attaching to operator data and the mechanism for reconciling it with the Register's purposes, the cybersecurity classification of the Register and whether it should be treated as critical infrastructure, and the segregation of operational, analytical and public data layers. The analysis will confirm expressly that no service of the Register creates a command path to metering devices, head-end or meter data management systems, supervisory control systems or operator network-control systems.]

5.6. Consolidated legal gap register

[A single register, in editable tabular form, listing every gap identified across this chapter, with: the provision or absence of provision at issue, the nature of the gap, the institution affected, the severity and whether it is blocking or non-blocking, the remedial option or options, the instrument required, the initiating authority, the approval circuit, the realistic lead time, and the dependency on other interventions. This register is the input to the legislative roadmap in Chapter 13.]

6. BUSINESS ANALYSIS, IDENTITY MODEL AND INTERACTION SCENARIOS

6.1. Operational definition of the place of consumption and object model

[The operational definition of the place of consumption for household consumers, non-household consumers and generating installations, and its relationships with sub-locations, connection points, metering points,

meters, contracts, customers, buildings and cadastral objects. The building or unit, the accounting or market point, the metering point and the meter asset will be modelled as distinct objects with persistent, versioned relationships and effective dates. A place of consumption is not necessarily a building, and the unique code shall not be used as a building identifier or as a meter-asset identifier. Explicit rules will be set for the complex cases raised at the technical validation workshop of 22 July 2026, including: an industrial site served by two metering devices but constituting a single place of consumption, multi-storey residential blocks and the question whether the model must support a hierarchy of sub-places of consumption and, if so, the consequences for the identifier, the governance and the access rules, collective consumers and prosumers acting in a collective interest, generation and consumption at the same location, and bulk metering serving several consumption units. The recommendation of the technical validation workshop that the identity of a place of consumption should not depend on cadastral data will be addressed expressly, and the treatment of the address and the cadastral reference as descriptive attributes rather than as determinants of identity will be either adopted with reasons or departed from with reasons.]

6.2. The unique code of the place of consumption

[The design of the code: structure, lifecycle and non-reuse rules, treatment of time-aware relationships and effective dates, the alias and migration approach for identifiers already in use by the operators, and the integrity, generation and validation controls. The existing or proposed scheme will be compared with at least one internationally standardised opaque identifier option, including GS1 GSRN, and a transition will be assessed in which the current scheme is retained as a display or legacy alias mapped one-to-one to the canonical identifier. The comparison will address the consequences of embedding a territorial component in the code for the stability of the identifier following administrative-territorial reorganisation, and the consequences of a fixed-length numeric structure for the extension of the Register to other energy vectors. The recommendation shall not use one identifier for logically distinct objects.]

6.3. Priority use cases

[The use cases the Register is to serve, each with the process, actors, data required, authoritative source, legal basis, expected benefit, measurable indicator and the boundary of the Register's responsibility. The catalogue will cover at a minimum: supplier and contract switching; connection, disconnection and reconnection, the „Ajutor la Contor" programme and once-only pre-filling, so that a consumer applying annually is not required to re-enter the same structural data, beneficiary matching for energy-vulnerability support, the linkage to SINEE for building and energy-efficiency records, prosumers and collective arrangements, correction of a disputed record, and public verification of a code. Use cases will be distinguished as current, near-term and future, having regard to the present level of development and liquidity of the electricity and natural gas markets, and benefits will be linked to realistic market-development milestones rather than assumed from mature-market models.]

6.4. Actor × scenario interaction matrix

[This section closes the principal gap in the Operating Concept, which identifies the actors and their attributions but does not establish how each would actually interact with the Register in a given process. For each actor and each priority use case the matrix will 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.]

[The matrix will be delivered in editable tabular form and will be validated with each institution and operator individually before the validation workshop. 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 will be drafted to that standard.]

6.5. Minimum logical data model

[The minimum logical data model derived from the prioritised use cases, with entity-relationship diagrams, the attribute set per entity, cardinalities, effective dating and versioning, and the justification of each attribute by reference to an approved use case. Any attribute not justified by a use case will be excluded.]

6.6. Functional delineation and source authority

[The functional delineation between the RNLC, SINEE, the PNME and the operational and commercial systems of the operators, expressed as a matrix identifying, for every core attribute and interface: the system of record, the data owner, the authorised updater, the data steward, the validation rule, the correction route, the retention rule, the audit requirement, the legal basis, and the exchange mechanism. The delineation established here is binding on the PNME analysis under Pillar B and shall be maintained consistently across both pillars.]

6.7. Integration and interface requirements

[For every proposed integration: the system of record, data direction, trigger or frequency, latency, validation, acknowledgement, error handling, retry, reconciliation, versioning and audit requirements, and an identification of which exchanges must operate bidirectionally. The requirements will be expressed in a form that can be carried directly into the Technical Specification. Current European electricity-data interoperability work, including the harmonised market role model and the applicable style market profiles, will be used as reference material, the Common Information Model will not be prescribed at this stage, and its suitability will be assessed only when the detailed architecture and the concrete bidirectional interfaces are defined, with any recommendation identifying the exact standard family, profile, version, business process and conformity test.]

7. INTERDEPENDENCE WITH THE PNME AND SINEE

[This chapter is the second decision-critical part of the assessment. Its purpose is to establish, on evidence, what the RNLC actually depends on and what actually depends on the RNLC, and to exclude the creation of capacity that must be maintained but whose use is marginal or not understood.]

7.1. Technical interdependence with the PNME

[What the PNME would require from the RNLC and on what terms, what the RNLC would require from the PNME, if anything, which functions could be delivered by either and must therefore be allocated once, and what would be lost if one were built without the other. The analysis will state the sequencing consequence: whether the RNLC is a precondition of the PNME, a parallel development, or independent of it.]

7.2. Technical and functional interdependence with SINEE

[An evidence-based assessment conducted against the technical documentation and technical designs of SINEE obtained from CNED, whether completed or in progress. Each of the ten subsystems provided for by Government Decision No. 144/2025 – the public portal of the Centre, 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 geographic information platform, will be assessed to determine which could host, feed or serve part of the RNLC function, which could be reused as a shared

service, and which must remain separate. The assessment will extend to the SINEE integration microservice, to the SINEE object model, and in particular to 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 assessment will have regard to the state of development of the subsystem for the energy performance of buildings, for which a software developer has already been engaged, and to the effect of any change on that development.]

7.3. Architectural options for the RNLC–SINEE relationship

[The three options agreed at the technical validation workshop of 22 July 2026 will be compared on technical, institutional, financial and data-governance grounds: 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 will 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. Where the recommended option would alter the SINEE concept, its subsystem boundaries or its interfaces, the assessment will state expressly what must be communicated to CNED and when.]

7.4. Avoidance of redundant capacity

[An explicit statement, for the recommended option, of what would be duplicated if the RNLC were created alongside SINEE and the PNME, what would be lost if it were not created at all, and what recurrent cost each duplication would carry. Assertions that a shared identifier eliminates duplication will be tested against the actual attribute sets and processes concerned. Neither the RNLC nor the PNME shall duplicate the authoritative detailed measurement series, validation, estimation, correction and versioning functions of operator meter data management systems.]

8. REUSE OF GOVERNMENT PLATFORMS, HOSTING AND TECHNICAL ADMINISTRATION

8.1. Reuse assessment per Government platform and shared service

[For each functional requirement of the RNLC, whether the requirement is already met by an existing Government platform or shared service, and a written justification for any proposal to develop an equivalent function. The assessment will cover at a minimum: the common Government technology platform for hosting, the interoperability platform and its event service for data exchange and for event-driven, proactive processes, the Government authentication and access-control service, the Government electronic signature service, the Government journaling service for audit, the Government notification service, the document generation, hosting and sharing platform, the Government payment service where any charged service is contemplated, the Government service for the delegation of powers of representation, which is directly relevant to consumer-authorised third-party access to energy data and to representation in supplier-switching processes, the delivery service where physical delivery arises, the integrated Government portal and application together with the Unitary Design Model, which apply to any citizen- or business-facing interface including the public verification service, the Government wallet where a verifiable attestation is contemplated, the semantic catalogue for the registration of semantic assets, and the national open data portal for publishable datasets. Where reuse is not possible, the specific technical, legal or functional reason and the residual cost of the alternative will be stated.]

[The assessment will also confirm that the design does not fall into the recurring non-compliances identified by the e-Governance Agency in concepts submitted for coordination: parallel data-exchange channels

outside the interoperability platform, duplication of existing solutions where a Government service already provides the function, generation of proprietary identifiers for natural or legal persons, regulation of the information resource in the concept rather than in its regulation, hosting outside the common Government technology platform, and designation of the same entity as both holder and keeper without delimitation of the attributions prescribed by law.]

8.2. Hosting on the common Government technology platform and the role of the technical administrator

[The role the designated Government technical administrator would exercise in respect of the Register, and how that role differs depending on which institution is designated holder, having regard to the fact that the transfer of technical administration applies to public authorities and institutions subordinated to or founded by the Government whereas for administrative authorities autonomous of the Government the corresponding provision is expressed as a recommendation. The section will establish, following consultation with the technical administrator: the applicable infrastructure service catalogue, service levels and tariffs, the sizing of the environment against the data volumes, transaction rates and availability requirements derived from the use cases, the resulting recurrent hosting and technical administration cost of each option, the segregation of development, testing and production environments, and the backup, continuity and recovery arrangements available, together with any residual requirement not met by them, the technical compatibility requirements applicable to any equipment or software procured in support of the Register and the coordination procedure applicable to them, and the sequence and lead times of the coordination steps that must be completed before development may be procured. The recurrent costs so established will be carried into Chapter 10 and into the statement of the future holder's obligations, and will not be omitted as an unquantified assumption.]

8.3. Coordination and approval gates

[The coordination and approval steps that condition implementation, modelled as dated and sequenced gates with realistic lead times: registration of the intention to create the resource in the Register of State Information Resources and Systems and prior coordination with the e-Governance Agency; the rounds of examination and the issuance of the agency's opinion on the draft Concept and draft Regulation through that Register, followed by the meeting of secretaries general, inter-ministerial endorsement and expert examination, and approval by the Government, the coordination of information and communication technology budget proposals, procurement plans and procurement documentation, and the participation of the agency in the institutional working group for procurements above the applicable threshold, the coordination with the technical administrator where applicable, the conformity assessment of the information system, 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, will not be accepted.] The gates shall include, in addition: the endorsement by the e-Governance Agency of the information and communication technology budget proposal, without which the Ministry of Finance will not approve financing, the inclusion of the development procurement in the provisional or annual procurement plan of the contracting authority and the confirmation of the availability of funds, the approval and publication deadlines applicable to that plan, the prohibition on modifying it after 5 December of the budget year and on initiating a procedure on the basis of a plan modified after that date, together with the exemption 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 prior coordination with that Agency of the opportunity of the procurement and of the entire procurement documentation, and the participation of that Agency's designated representative in the procurement working group. 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.

8.4. Cybersecurity, resilience and continuity

[The cybersecurity classification of the Register, the minimum security controls by option, the segregation of operational, analytical and public data layers, authentication and authorisation, including multi-factor authentication for privileged roles, logging and audit, including the use of the Government journaling service, vulnerability management and security testing before release, monitoring and alerting, incident response and notification, and backup, continuity and recovery requirements with measurable objectives. The requirements will be expressed so that they can be carried into the Technical Specification and audited.]

9. OPTIONS ANALYSIS AND MULTI-CRITERIA EVALUATION

9.1. Energy scope options

[An electricity-only Register against a multi-energy Register, assessing the extension to natural gas, district heating, transmission-level and system data and, if the Government confirms a wider scope, water. For each the implications for the data model, the actors, the cost, the complexity and the phasing, and a reasoned recommendation on whether each vector falls within the mandatory scope or is a subsequent interoperability extension. The analysis will address expressly whether a sector-neutral core model should be adopted from the outset even if onboarding is phased, and what it would cost to retrofit such a model later if it is not.]

9.2. Institutional ownership options

[The scenarios analysed in Chapter 5, compared on legal mandate, institutional autonomy, neutrality, operational and technical capacity, resources and budgetary sustainability, data governance, relationship with market participants, time required to adopt the necessary amendments, and the consequences for the participating operators.] The comparison shall include a public procurement dimension: the threshold applicable to each candidate as contracting authority, distinguishing the threshold applicable to central public authorities from that applicable to local public authorities and public-law legal persons, whether each is subject to the prohibition on modifying the procurement plan after 5 December, whether each falls within the scope of the Methodology for the coordination of information and communication technology procurement and is therefore subject to the opportunity and documentation coordination, to the participation of the e-Governance Agency in the working group and to 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 information technology procurements it has actually conducted.

9.3. Delivery and architecture options

[The reuse or extension of existing infrastructures and registers against the development of new components, centralised, federated and hybrid architectures, the integration approach for operators with mature and with less mature system landscapes, and the options for the relationship with SINEE analysed in Chapter 7.]

9.4. Phasing options

[Modular implementation expressed 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.]

9.5. Criteria, weightings and evaluation matrix

[A documented multi-criteria framework with explicit criteria, weightings and scores, presented as a criteria × options matrix with the reasoning for each score. Criteria will include at a minimum: legal feasibility and the volume of normative change required, institutional feasibility and capacity, data feasibility on the evidence of Chapter 4, technical feasibility and compliance with the Government architecture, cost, both

capital and recurrent, time to first operational capability, risk, neutrality and market acceptability, and alignment with the European acquis. Weightings will be justified and a sensitivity analysis performed to show whether the recommendation is robust to plausible changes in them.]

9.6. Recommended option, trade-offs and rejected options

[The recommended option for scope, ownership, architecture and phasing, with the trade-offs made explicit, the mandatory preconditions stated, the residual risks identified, and the rejected options and the reasons for their rejection recorded.]

10. COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS AND OBLIGATIONS OF THE FUTURE HOLDER

[This chapter is the third decision-critical part of the assessment. Its purpose is to allow the future holder to see, before it accepts the role, exactly what it is accepting.]

10.1. Capital cost

[Development, initial database constitution, data cleansing and remediation, integration per participating system, testing and acceptance, documentation and training, by option, with explicit assumptions, unit costs and minimum-maximum ranges, and with the cost drivers identified.]

10.2. Operating cost and total cost of ownership

[Recurrent hosting and technical administration cost established under Chapter 8, application maintenance and evolution, support and incident management, data-quality management, manual validation and exception handling, with the staffing implied, access administration, audit and security testing, and the institutional operating cost falling on the holder, which is to be treated as a principal item and not as a residual. The total cost of ownership will be presented over at least a ten-year horizon.] The total cost of ownership model shall be structured so that it can be reused directly as the life-cycle costing method in the subsequent award. Law No. 325/2025 permits the contracting authority to evaluate cost on a life-cycle basis and requires 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 model shall therefore expose the cost categories, the data inputs, the calculation method and the assumptions in a form a contracting authority could adopt, and shall state which elements would have to be settled before the method could be applied.

10.3. Integration and adaptation costs borne by participants

[The costs falling on Premier Energy Distribution, RED-Nord, the gas distribution operators, the transmission system operator, the suppliers and the institutional users, distinguishing one-off adaptation from recurrent cost, and stating the mechanism by which regulated participants would have those costs recognised.]

10.4. Benefits

[Quantified and qualitative benefits for institutions, market participants and consumers, including administrative-efficiency benefits, reduction in reconciliation effort, benefits to supplier switching and to market competition, benefits to energy-efficiency and social-protection processes, and benefits associated with European integration. Each quantified benefit will state its basis of calculation, its beneficiary and the milestone at which it begins to accrue. Benefits will not be assumed from mature-market models but will be linked to realistic market-development milestones and to expected adoption by market participants.]

10.5. Funding and sustainability

[The funding options for capital and for recurrent cost, having regard to the financing position recorded in the Programme, the sustainability model, including who finances the recurrent cost and through what budgetary or tariff mechanism, the risks attaching to dependence on external financing, and the measures required to secure continuity, including multi-annual budgeting and inclusion in the holder's budget planning.]

10.6. Statement of the obligations of the future holder

[A consolidated, itemised statement, addressed to the institution recommended as holder, of what the designation would require of it: the normative amendments to be initiated, the recurrent budget to be committed and the year from which, the staffing and competences to be established, the operational processes to be instituted, the service levels to be maintained, the reporting and audit obligations, the liabilities assumed, and the decisions that would have to be taken within the first twelve months. This statement is a required output of the assessment and shall be capable of being placed before the management of the institution concerned without further elaboration.]

11. FEASIBILITY CONCLUSION AND READINESS GATES

[An explicit feasibility conclusion of GO, CONDITIONAL GO or NO-GO, assessed against defined readiness gates and against the minimum data-quality thresholds established in Chapter 4. GO means that the minimum conditions are met and that an electricity-first Register can proceed to implementation or pilot. CONDITIONAL GO means that an electricity-first Register is feasible but that identified data-quality, system, legal, institutional or funding deficiencies must be remedied before operational launch, each deficiency being named, attributed and costed. NO-GO means that current data, system, legal, institutional or market readiness is insufficient, in which case the report will identify the remediation actions, the responsible institutions, the readiness gates and the decision pathway for a later determination. The conclusion will be reasoned and will state which findings it rests on and with what confidence.]

12. MODULAR IMPLEMENTATION ROADMAP

[A phased roadmap derived from the recommended option, defining for each phase the objective, the key activities, the deliverables, the responsible institutions, the dependencies, the indicative cost, the acceptance criteria and the criteria for transition to the next phase, together with the minimum viable product, the priority integrations and an end-to-end pilot across both electricity distribution system operators. The roadmap will be sequenced against the coordination and approval gates established in Chapter 8 and against the delivery dates and coverage targets fixed by the Action Plan of the Programme, and will state expressly where those targets are no longer attainable and what revision of the Programme would be required. It will identify the preconditions that must be satisfied before implementation may begin and will show, for each phase, what the institutions and operators must do and by when.]

13. LEGISLATIVE ROADMAP AND NORMATIVE OUTLINES

13.1. Legislative and normative roadmap

[Derived from the consolidated legal gap register, a costed and sequenced roadmap listing every act to be adopted or amended in order to establish the Register under the recommended model – primary legislation, Government decisions, the Statute of the institution designated as holder or keeper, sectoral regulations approved by ANRE and departmental acts, stating 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, and distinguishing 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.]

13.2. Annotated outline of the Concept of the information system

[Structured in accordance with the mandatory chapter structure applicable to concepts of State information systems – introduction, general provisions, legal and normative space, functional space, organisational structure, documents of the system, information space, technological space, information security, and conclusion, identifying for each chapter the substantive conclusions of the assessment that must be carried into it, the open points remaining to be settled at drafting stage and the institution responsible for settling them. The outline will observe the delimitation between what belongs in the Concept and what belongs in the Regulation of the information resource.]

13.3. Annotated outline of the Regulation of the information resource

[Covering the rights and obligations of the subjects of the legal relations, the manner of keeping the resource, the procedures for registration, modification, completion and removal of data, the procedure for interaction with data providers, the data-quality assurance, monitoring and audit arrangements, the conditions and procedures for access to and provision of data, and the retention and archiving rules.]

13.4. Annotated outline of the Technical Specification

[Vendor-neutral and free of any dependency on a specific supplier or technology stack, covering the scope, the functional and non-functional requirement areas, the data model and identifier rules, the interface and interoperability requirements per participating system, the data migration and initial database constitution requirements, the security, personal data protection, logging and auditability requirements, the hosting, source code, documentation, intellectual property and exit arrangements, the testing and acceptance criteria and gates, the phasing, deliverables and payment structure, the qualification requirements for bidders and the technical evaluation criteria and weighting, and an indicative budget.]

13.5. Procurement strategy for the development of the RNLC

[Because the development procurement cannot realistically be initiated before 1 January 2027, it will be governed by Law No. 325/2025 and not by Law No. 131/2015. Every procurement-facing output of this assessment shall be constructed on that law, and the Contractor shall state expressly where it considers a provision of the repealed law to remain relevant.]

[The section shall establish: the estimated value of the contract, calculated in accordance with the rules 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 central public authorities from local public authorities and public-law legal persons, and the consequence of that distinction, the procedure recommended, assessed against open tender, restricted tender, competitive negotiation, competitive dialogue, innovation partnership and the framework agreement, having regard to the availability of the more interactive procedures where requirements cannot be met without adapting readily available solutions or where technical specifications cannot be defined with sufficient precision at the outset, and to the rule that competitive dialogue is 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 increments recommended under Chapter 12 (Modular implementation 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.]

[The section shall establish whether and how the Methodology for the coordination of information and communication technology procurement applies under each institutional scenario, according to whether the

contracting authority would be the Ministry of Energy, CNED, ANRE or a development partner acting on their behalf. Having regard to the indicative envelope recorded in the Action Plan of the Programme approved by Government Decision No. 652/2025, the development procurement falls within the highest risk category of that Methodology, which entails prior coordination of the opportunity of the procurement and of the entire procurement documentation with the e-Governance Agency, the mandatory participation of that Agency's designated representative in the procurement working group throughout the procedure including the evaluation of offers, final validation and approval of the evaluation and procurement documentation, joint monitoring of contract execution against deviations in time, budget, scope and planned benefits, and the recording of the deliverables – source code, complete technical documentation and user and administration guides, including through the repository administered by that Agency. Those obligations, together with the requirement to use the reference technical specifications approved for that purpose, shall be reflected in the annotated outline of the Technical Specification under section 13.4.]

[The section shall set out the measures required in respect of market consultation and the prior involvement of candidates. The 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 contributed to the preparation of the award documentation is not automatically excluded but that appropriate measures must be taken to secure equal treatment, exclusion being available only where no other means suffices and after that person has had the opportunity to demonstrate that its involvement does not distort competition. Because the outputs of this assessment will be carried into the future award documentation, the section shall identify the specific measures to be applied and the information to be disclosed to other bidders, so that the subsequent procurement is not vitiated. This is without prejudice to the exclusion of the Contractor itself from that procurement, which is a contractual condition of the present assignment.]

[The drafting of the three documents is not part of this assignment. The outlines are to be of a standard that permits a subsequent assignment to complete them without revisiting the analysis.]

14. INDICATORS, RISKS AND DEPENDENCIES

14.1. Performance and data-quality indicators

[Indicators covering coverage, quality, use and impact, with for each the definition and calculation formula, the data source, the measurement and reporting frequency, indicative targets per phase consistent with the targets set by the Programme, and the party responsible for collection and validation, together with the monitoring mechanism through which values are collected, reviewed and acted upon.]

14.2. Risk register

[Risks covering data and quality, integration and technical, legal and confidentiality, governance and institutional capacity, financing and sustainability, procurement and timeline, and adoption by market participants, with for each the description, cause, probability and impact, severity, responsible institution or role, early warning indicators and preventive and corrective mitigation measures, together with a synthesis of the risks requiring mitigation before implementation begins.]

14.3. Dependencies

[The external dependencies affecting delivery – decisions, agreements, availability of source systems, the head-end and meter data management roll-out, the development of SINEE, and resources, with the conditions for fulfilment, the responsible party and the effect of delay on the roadmap and on the cost.]

15. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

[A synthesis by area – data, legal and institutional, architecture and integration, interdependence with the PNME and SINEE, cost and sustainability, capacity, risk, followed by the final recommendation with its justification, the mandatory preconditions for implementation, and an action plan for the three to six months following acceptance of the report, identifying for each action the responsible institution, the deadline and the decision required. The chapter will state expressly what the Ministry of Energy, ANRE and CNED are each being asked to decide, and by when.]

The team shall in addition include named public procurement competence, which may be combined with the legal and Government information-technology governance role, covering procurement strategy for complex information technology contracts, the choice of procedure, the division into lots, qualification, selection and award criteria, life-cycle costing and contract-modification provisions.

16. ANNEXES

[Annexes supporting the traceability and verifiability of the assessment, referenced explicitly in the relevant chapters and delivered in editable format. At a minimum: the inventory of registers, systems and reference sources, the digital-maturity and integration-readiness assessment per operator, the data profiling scripts, result tables and sampling documentation, the As-Is process diagrams, the object model and entity-relationship diagrams, the identifier design note, the prioritised use-case catalogue, the actor × scenario interaction matrix, the delineation and source-authority matrix, the consolidated legal gap register, the multi-criteria evaluation matrix with scoring and justifications, the costing model with all assumptions exposed, the statement of the obligations of the future holder, the legislative roadmap, the annotated normative outlines, the risk register, the synthesis of interviews and workshops with participants and conclusions, the glossary, and the templates used.]