

Minute of the 1st familiarization meeting from March 17, 2026

Cod CPV: 48422000-2; 72000000-5

March 17, 2026

mun. Chişinău

The presenters within the meeting:

| No. | Surname, Name | Position | Topic of the presentation |
|---|---------------|------------|--|
| 1. | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | Introductory remarks General presentation of the scope and objectives of the Transform NBM Project |
| 2. | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | The To Be Model of processes: business process management system, used standards, implemented internal controls |
| 3. | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | Monetary tools: scope, specific aspects. Foreign exchange operations: scope, specific aspects, project objectives |
| 4. | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | Procurements within the NBM: specific aspects |
| 5. | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | Financial Management: aspects relevant for the Core-banking and ERP systems |
| 6. | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | NBM's Information System: IT related aspects |
| Other responsible representatives of the NBM subdivisions attended the meeting | | | |

The National Bank of Moldova (NBM) confirmed 12 (twelve) registered participants (economic operators) to the familiarization meeting. A representative of a single company attended in person at the NBM headquarters.

Meeting Agenda:

1. Opening of the Familiarization meeting. Foreword.
2. General presentation of the scope and objectives of the Transform NBM Project.
3. The To Be Model of processes: business process management system, used standards, implemented internal controls.
4. Presentation of all business processes, part of the Transform NBM project scope, related to the Core-banking and ERP systems.
5. Presentation of the NBM Information system: IT related aspects.
6. Questions and answers. Concluding remarks.
7. The end of the meeting.

1. Opening of the Familiarization Meeting. Foreword

Speaker: [REDACTED]

Was presented:

- Greeting message for all the Participants at attending the meeting;
- The importance of the Transform NBM project;
- The purpose of the Familiarization Meeting;
- General information about the subject of the procurement procedure;
- Presentation of the agenda.

2. General presentation of the scope and objectives of the Transform NBM Project

Speaker: [REDACTED]

Was presented:

- Presentation of the Transform NBM project: principles, objectives, phases, project scope, out of scop, critical success factors, expectations.

Questions and Answers:

1. **Question: According to your presentation, you mentioned a project timeline of 2 years. Does this apply to both lots?**

Answer: Yes, the timeline estimated for the implementation of both lots is up two years, considering that both solutions will be implemented in parallel.

2. **Question: You mentioned the soak period. Could you please elaborate on what this period entails?**

Answer: The soak period it's like an experimental land, a stabilization phase that begins immediately after Go-Live acceptance. During this period, the system operates in real conditions with intensified support from the selected vendor. In this phase, all issues identified during the User Acceptance Testing (UAT) will be addressed and resolved. Additionally, this phase ensures that knowledge transfer is properly completed and that the system operates as expected. This stage, including its scope and activities, is described in the RFP.

3. **Question: To confirm our understanding, are you considering a total cost of ownership (TCO) over an eight-year period, consisting of two years for implementation, followed by one year of warranty and an additional five years of post-implementation support?**

Answer: Yes, approximately eight years. More precisely, the support period is six years starting from the Go-Live date. If we consider the full project timeline, including the implementation phase, the total duration is around eight years. Also, we would like to clarify regarding that the eight-year period refers to the total cost of ownership (TCO), including the estimated implementation period and one year of warranty period. Thus, for the project budget, we will consider only the implementation period plus the one-year warranty period. In this tender procedure, the contracted amount will cover just the implementation phase as well as one year of warranty services, and this will be reflected in the financial proposal. This topic will also be further detailed and clarified later, given its importance.

4. **Question: With regard to the RFP scope, could you please clarify whether it includes infrastructure components such as databases and web servers, in addition to the core banking (Lot 1) and ERP (Lot 2) systems?**

Answer: We will return to this topic later, as it is covered in detail in the upcoming presentation. I will address these specific aspects during that session.

3. To Be model of the processes: business process management system, used standards, implemented internal controls

Speaker: [REDACTED]

Was presented:

- The characteristics of business process management system within NBM;

- The elements of the business process management system within NBM;
- Project objectives.

Note: No questions were addressed.

Presentation of all NBM’s business processes which are included in the scope of Transform NBM project, related to the Core-banking and ERP systems

4. Monetary tools: scope, specific aspects. Foreign operations: area, specific, project objectives

Speaker: [REDACTED]

Was presented:

- Overview of market operations;
- Currency distribution, instrument types, and number of transactions;
- Foreign reserves management
- Risk Management;
- Investment Portfolio – Performance Measurement;
- Structure of tranches and limits/constraints;
- Monetary policy operations and other similar operations;
- Activities in 2024-2025;
- Characteristics of market operations;
- Settlement Division operations;
- IT solutions used.

Questions and Answers:

1. **Question: With regard to the securities portfolio, could you please clarify which types of financial instruments are being managed?**

Answer: The instruments are primarily fixed income securities (bonds), usually SSAs (Sovereign, Supranational, and Agency), mainly government bonds, along with some holdings in some agencies. Currently, there are no equity instruments (stocks) included in the reserves portfolio.

2. **Question: With regard to the portfolios you described, could you please confirm whether they are currently managed using Bloomberg?**

Answer: Yes, we are currently using the platform as a front-office tool. However, we are considering replacing the existing reporting solution (PAT2) and using Bloomberg Port Enterprise as a temporary alternative.

3. **Question: So, as part of this transformation, do you want to move away from Bloomberg Enterprise for portfolio management, is that correct?**

Answer: Yes, we are considering moving to Port Enterprise from existing PAT2, but we are not there yet. We are currently in the process. Depending on how well the new solution (core banking) will meet our expectations, we then stop using Bloomberg Port Enterprise.

4. **Question: For the auction management of government fixed income securities, are you currently using Bloomberg or another system, and do you plan to continue using the same solution?**

Answer: Yes. As mentioned, all auction operations currently organized by the central bank are conducted using Bloomberg, and we do not plan to change this. We will continue to use Bloomberg for organizing these auctions.

5. **Question: I have a question regarding how the requirements are labeled in the RFP as a “core banking system.” Based on the presentation, the requirements seem to cover front office, middle office, risk, and back office functionalities for reserve management and monetary policy operations. Could you please confirm whether this is the correct understanding? In other words,**

does the term “core banking system” in this context refer to a front-to-back solution covering these activities?

Answer: Yes, you are correct. We have introduced these requirements in the RFP, and the core banking concept in this context is indeed intended to cover the full front-to-back scope for both reserve management and monetary policy operations.

6. Question: Are you considering the ERP and the core banking system (CBS) as two separate lots and potentially two separate systems, given their different nature, or do you envision them as a single integrated solution?

Answer: They may be separate or different solutions, as they are typically provided by different vendors. However, some vendors offer pre-integrated solutions for both ERP and core banking (CBS). In this RFP, they are defined as separate lots, but proposals from a single vendor covering both lots will also be considered.

7. Question: Could you please provide the presentation slides that were shared earlier today?

Answer: Yes, of course. Additionally, we understand that not all representatives participating in this meeting may be directly involved in the review of the requirements. Therefore, once the presentation slides are shared, we kindly ask you to forward them to your colleagues who are involved in the tender and the functional assessment.

If any additional questions arise, please submit them **exclusively in writing through the MTender** electronic procurement platform, using the “**Clarifications**” section (<https://achizitii.md/en/public/tender/21567046/questions>).

5. Procurements within the NBM: specific aspects

Speaker: [REDACTED]

Was presented:

- Development of procurement plans;
- Correlation of the annual plan with the budget;
- Modification of procurement plans;
- List of procurements exempted;
- Monitoring the execution of procurement plan;
- Conducting procurement procedures;
- Procurement contracts/invoices;
- Reports;
- Archiving.

Questions and Answers:

Note: No questions were addressed.

6. Financial Management and Accounting: aspects relevant for the Core-banking and ERP systems

Speaker: [REDACTED]

Was presented:

- Budgeting process, distinctive aspects and objectives;
- Used tools;
- Financial accounting;
- Financial accounting: used IT solutions;
- Financial accounting: distinctive aspects;
- Financial accounting: objectives;
- Financial reporting;

- Cost and project accounting – ABC Method.

Questions and Answers:

1. **Question: Could you please clarify your expectations regarding localization? Specifically, should localization be completed before the final implementation and included in the overall budget, or will it be handled and paid separately during the project?**

Answer: Localization should be included within the overall budget submitted by the vendor. The total budget is expected to cover both system localization and any supporting documentation.

The specific localization requirements will be further identified during the analysis and design phase, based on national regulatory and operational needs. It is important to note that this is not a localization in the classical sense, but rather customization of the system to comply with local requirements, templates, and regulations.

2. **Question: To confirm our understanding: all localization requirements specific to the Republic of Moldova should be implemented within the project scope, completed before project closure, and included in the overall budget. Therefore, these aspects should not be priced separately and are expected to be delivered as part of the agreed scope. Is this correct?**

Answer: Yes, your understanding is correct. Localization is part of the customization and implementation services and must be included in the overall project budget.

However, this is not considered “classical localization,” where the vendor is solely responsible for analyzing legislation and translating it into system functionalities. In this case, the contracting authority will lead the analysis and design phase, defining the specific requirements, templates, and documents. The vendor will then implement these requirements as part of the overall solution.

3. **Question: Could you provide an example of a document or element that would require this type of localization?**

Answer: Yes, for example, a payment order must follow a standard format required by the National Bank of Moldova. Other examples include fiscal invoices and accounting registers, which must comply with national legislation and include mandatory elements such as debit, credit, and transaction descriptions.

Additionally, localization may involve specific attributes for certain operations. For instance, payment transactions may require classification codes for statistical reporting (e.g., balance of payments), and fiscal invoices may need to include fields related to withheld income tax for non-residents.

Overall, this type of localization refers to adapting system templates, documents, and attributes to meet local regulatory and reporting requirements that shall be provided during the implementation by NBM.

4. **Question: So, on slide 10 you say that General Ledger (GL) transactions should be reflected in real time. Does it refer to the slide #11 where you say that the Core banking system (CBS) integration with the GL should be there, whether the enterprise GL will be in the ERP or in the Core banking system (CBS)? Does it mean that you expect the transactions from the Core banking system (CBS) to flow in the enterprise GL if it's in the ERP in real time?**

Answer: Yes, transactions are expected to be reflected in real time or near real time (quasi real time). This means a minimal delay, typically a few minutes (e.g. 5 minutes) is acceptable, but not a delay until the end of the day.

5. **Question: Could you please indicate the average number of transactions processed daily in the core banking system?**

Answer: The number of transactions is relatively low. Detailed information on transaction volumes is provided in the Annex no.8 „NBM process volumetry” to the award documentation (RFP), which can be consulted also for licensing and scoping purposes. Overall, the transaction volume is quite small compared to typical commercial banking operations.

6. **Question: Is it OK with you if some parts of the some modules are implemented outside of ERP in a separate system, which is then highly integrated with ERP? To be more specific, I'm referring to the budgeting part. Where I saw a lot of specifics and maybe we will need something that will be done outside ERP. So, is it OK with you if we suggest a solution like that?**

Answer: We don't have a straight answer to your question, but the idea is that we are asking for a modular system. So, basically, we are looking for a kind of uniform technology stack. Actually, we don't want on the operational side to have a lot of burden managing the different stacks, different systems, but we don't have the kind of explicit constraint that this cannot be. Or it could be like an extension to the ERP, so it depends.

7. NBM's Information System: IT related aspects

Speaker: [REDACTED]

Was presented:

- The role of the IT Department (ITD);
- Quick facts regarding ICT environment;
- Scope Boundaries & Integration Mandate;
- License Types – Definitions & Coverage;
- License Delivery & Activation Rules;
- Licensing Model Requirements – What NBM Expects
- Solution Architecture – Mandatory Framework
- Availability, Resilience & Performance SLAs
- ESB – Enterprise Service Bus (CBS Vendor Obligation)
- Data Migration – Requirements & Vendor Responsibilities
- Stage Acceptance Gates, Early Demos & NBM Review Windows
- What Must Be Included in the Fixed Price
- TCO Model – Financial Evaluation Impact & Vendor Strategy;
- Top 10 Things Vendors Must Carefully Understand.

Questions and Answers:

1. **Question:** *When referring to databases, application servers, and load balancers to be provided by the vendor, how will the ongoing maintenance costs for these components be handled over time?*

Answer: The licenses should be delivered with one year of standard maintenance included. After this period, the responsibility for maintaining the licenses will be transferred to the National Bank of Moldova, and any further maintenance will be managed and procured on its behalf. The licenses need to be procured in the name of NBM.

2. **Question:** *Regarding the complementary licenses, could you please clarify the scope? Since infrastructure and operating systems are out of scope, does this mean that all other components—such as firewalls, switches, and routers—are included?*

Answer: No, not everything is included. By complementary licenses, we refer only to the components required to directly run the proposed solution, such as databases, application servers, and middleware. All infrastructure elements—such as firewalls, switches, routers, and similar components—are out of scope and will be provided by the National Bank of Moldova.

3. **Question:** *Can you please clarify the scope of complementary licenses? Specifically, if infrastructure and operating systems are excluded, does the scope only include application software components such as databases, application servers (e.g., JBoss, WebLogic), web servers (e.g., Apache), and enterprise middleware?*

Answer: Yes, that is correct. The complementary licenses refer to software components required to run the solution, such as databases, application servers, web servers, and middleware.

However, load balancers are also included in this scope, as their inclusion may depend on specific technical constraints. While the infrastructure elements themselves are provided by the National Bank of Moldova, certain software-based components like load balancers may be considered as part of the complementary licenses, depending on the vendor's proposed solution.

4. Question: We would kindly request that the scope of “etc.” be clearly defined in writing. Without a precise definition, there is a risk that different vendors may make different assumptions, which could lead to inconsistencies in the commercial proposals and make comparison more complex. Could you please provide a clarification to ensure all vendors are aligned?

Answer: Thank you for the question. We understand the concern and will review this query internally. We may issue a clarification regarding certain components, such as load balancers, as their inclusion in the scope may be reconsidered. If such a clarification question will be raised by the economic operators, we will come back with a formal clarification to ensure that all the vendors have a clear and consistent understanding of the scope.

5. Question: Could you please confirm your expectations regarding licensing and commercial terms? Specifically, is the Bank expecting perpetual (non-term) licenses for the proposed solution, or are time-bound/subscription-based licenses also acceptable? Additionally, does this requirement apply to all components, including complementary licenses?

Answer: No, the requirement does not apply to complementary licenses. The Bank is not imposing specific restrictions on the licensing model for complementary licenses, as these depend on the vendor and their licensing policies.

The restriction applies only to the solution licenses. In this case, the Bank is seeking a non-term (perpetual) licensing model for the main solution, while the complementary licenses can follow the vendor’s standard licensing approach.

6. Question: To clarify, for complementary licenses such as JBoss support—which typically follow a subscription-based annual fee model—are you expecting us to manage these costs, while for the main solution license you prefer a fixed, one-time license fee rather than a subscription?

Answer: Yes, we prefer a fixed license model for the main solution. However, for complementary licenses, a subscription-based model can also be accepted if there are no suitable alternatives.

7. Question: Why is the procurement including components such as Oracle licenses, application servers, and load balancers, given that the Bank may already hold existing Oracle licenses that could potentially be reused, for example after decommissioning previous systems? Would it make sense to exclude these components from the scope and avoid purchasing additional licenses within the limited budget?

Answer: The reasoning is that the Bank currently holds certain licenses (e.g., Oracle, Microsoft SQL), but these may not always be suitable for the required solution—for example, the existing licenses may be Standard Edition while Enterprise Edition is needed.

In addition, including these components in the RFP ensures that all bidders propose comparable solutions (“apples to apples”), which is essential for fair evaluation, especially given their significant impact on total cost.

However, the RFP also allows flexibility: if the Bank already possesses suitable licenses, the number of licenses can be adjusted accordingly to avoid duplication. This approach ensures both cost efficiency and consistent comparison across bids, while requiring vendors to propose an integrated solution covering the full technology stack.

8. Question: Regarding the bid submission, if we include pricing for solution licenses as well as Oracle licenses, how will this be handled during evaluation? In particular, if it turns out that the Bank already holds the required Oracle licenses, what will happen to the budget allocated for Oracle—will it be possible to reallocate that amount to other components, such as the solution license?

Answer: You are not expected to purchase the licenses at the beginning of the project. The bid should include the pricing, but the actual procurement of these licenses will only be confirmed after the evaluation process.

In case it is determined that the Bank already has the required Oracle licenses, there will be a separate confirmation process, and the corresponding licenses will not be purchased. Therefore, the associated costs will not be incurred, and no funds will be spent on unnecessary licenses.

9. **Question:** *Could you clarify whether, for complementary licenses, vendors can provide sizing estimates at the bid stage (to define the required capacity for implementing the solution), while allowing the Bank to later assess its existing infrastructure and procure only the additional capacity needed during the final procurement stage, instead of including all complementary license costs directly in the solution proposal?*

Answer: The Bank (Contracting Authority) understands the suggestion and agrees that it can be further discussed. However, the preferred approach is to maintain an integrated procurement model, where the vendor provides a complete proposal, including complementary licenses.

Even if the vendor acts as a system integrator and not a direct distributor, they are expected to obtain firm quotations from third-party providers and include these in their bid. This is important because complementary licenses have a significant impact on the total cost of ownership (TCO), and the Bank aims to compare complete and consistent offers from all vendors.

10. **Question:** *How do you consider the ESB license? Is it treated as a solution license or as a complementary license?*

Answer: The ESB license is considered part of the solution license.

11. **Question:** *Could you please clarify whether proposals based on subscription models or time-limited licenses will be considered, or are such proposals not allowed under the requirement for solution licenses?*

Answer: Yes, such proposals are not allowed.

12. **Question:** *How will you consider proposals where the license is perpetual (one-time payment), but the maintenance or support component is provided as a mandatory, typically subscription-based service, as is common practice with most vendors?*

Answer: Such proposals are acceptable. The Bank is open to this model, as long as the maintenance and support services are included and properly reflected in the total cost of ownership (TCO).

However, the Bank wants to avoid situations where it could be unable to extend or maintain subscriptions due to external factors (e.g., geopolitical or vendor-related risks). Therefore, while subscription-based maintenance is acceptable, the solution must ensure continuity and long-term sustainability.

13. **Question:** *Do you confirm that you will accept proposals where maintenance or support services are included, even if discontinuing these services would result in certain limitations, such as lack of updates or support, while the solution itself remains usable?*

Answer: Yes, that is acceptable. In such cases, the limitation would refer to the absence of support services and updates, while the solution itself would still remain usable.

14. **Question:** *Some vendors may restrict access to development capabilities of the solution if the maintenance or service fees are not continued—for example, limiting the ability to make further modifications. Would such a limitation be acceptable to the Bank?*

Answer: Please note that such a limitation would not be acceptable to the Bank.

15. **Question:** *Could you please provide more details on how licensing costs should be presented? Specifically, we would like clarification on the following:*

- **A clear description of the proposed licensing model and justification of why it is the most optimal solution;**
- **A detailed breakdown of licensing costs (e.g., per user or per component), rather than only the total cost, to support scalability and future planning;**
- **For volume-based models, confirmation that transactions will not be blocked if usage exceeds predefined limits;**
- **In case of bids covering both lots, how shared licenses will be treated, and how duplicate license costs will be avoided or deducted?**

Answer: Vendors are expected to provide a clear description of the proposed licensing model, including justification of why it represents the most suitable and optimal option for the Bank.

A detailed breakdown of licensing costs is required, including cost components (e.g., per user, per module, or other relevant metrics), not only the total cost, to ensure transparency and to support future scalability considerations.

For volume-based models, the solution must not block or reject transactions if usage exceeds the initially defined limits. The system should remain operational, even if volumes increase beyond expectations.

Regarding shared licenses, in case a vendor submits proposals for both lots, each lot should initially be priced independently. However, if the same vendor is awarded both lots, shared licenses will be identified, and duplicate costs will be deducted accordingly from the total cost. This approach ensures fair and accurate evaluation of the total cost of ownership.

16. Question: In a shared licensing model, would shared cost deductions apply even if each lot requires its own separate capacity provisioning (e.g., compute, database, memory), or would the shared cost approach not apply in such cases?

Answer: Correct. If each lot requires separate capacity provisioning, then the shared cost model would not apply in that context.

17. Question: Could you please clarify whether vendors are expected to submit a combined commercial offer for both lots, or should separate commercial proposals be provided for each lot? Additionally, is it acceptable to indicate shared costs between the lots within the proposal?

Answer: Vendors are required to provide separate commercial proposals for each lot. However, you may indicate any shared costs within your bid, as this information will be taken into account in the total cost of ownership (TCO) evaluation.

18. Question: From an implementation perspective, are you considering selecting different vendors for each lot (e.g., Lot 1 from one vendor and Lot 2 from another), or do you prefer a single vendor delivering both lots, especially considering potential efficiencies in implementation (e.g., program management, governance)?

Answer: The Bank (NBM) is open to both scenarios and will select the best combination of vendors for the two lots. However, proposals that include both lots as a pre-integrated solution from a single vendor will receive additional evaluation points, as this approach offers advantages in terms of integration and overall management.

19. Question: Given that you mentioned Azure and a cloud-ready architecture with microservices, could you please clarify whether the solution can be deployed using a microservices approach, and whether the deployment is expected to be on a public cloud (e.g., Azure) or within your private cloud environment?

Answer: Yes, a service-oriented or microservices-based deployment is acceptable. However, the solution is expected to be deployed in a private cloud environment, not on a public cloud like Azure. At the same time, the architecture should be cloud-ready, meaning it should be open and flexible enough to support potential cloud deployments in the future. If additional capabilities are required to support such an architecture, they can be implemented as part of the project.

20. Question: Considering that pricing for components such as databases and application servers may differ significantly between cloud-based (microservices) architectures and conventional deployments, could you clarify how vendors should approach commercial proposals? Specifically, is it acceptable to submit alternative options (e.g., both microservices-based and conventional architectures) to ensure a fair comparison?

Answer: The baseline requirement, as specified in the RFP, is for vendors to submit proposals based on a conventional deployment (standard architecture).

21. Question: Given that the solution will be implemented on-premises and the bank will own and be responsible for the infrastructure (hardware and system software), how should the recovery objectives (e.g., recovery time objective / data loss tolerance) be understood?

More specifically:

- *If the vendor is responsible only for the application, while the bank manages the infrastructure,*
- *How do these recovery requirements apply in practice?*
- *Are these requirements expected from the vendor's solution, or from the infrastructure side?*

Answer: The recovery requirements (e.g., allowing up to 5 minutes of data loss) apply only at the application level, not at the infrastructure level.

This means:

- The requirements relate to application mechanisms and potentially complementary software (e.g., database capabilities).
- The system does not require synchronous (real-time) replication between sites.
- Asynchronous synchronization is acceptable, meaning some delay (up to 5 minutes) is allowed.
- These requirements may also influence the type of licenses/solutions proposed (e.g., standard vs. enterprise database features).

22. Question: *You mentioned that report generation should not impact operational activities and referred to using a separate database for reporting. Is having a separate reporting database mandatory?*

Answer: There is no explicit mandatory requirement stating that a separate database must be used. However:

- The expectation is that reporting and operational workloads should be separated.
- This is because using the same database could negatively impact operational performance.
- Therefore, it is strongly presumed and expected that:
 - One database (or instance) will be optimized for transactions (operational use)
 - Another will be optimized for analytics/reporting.

23. Question: *Who is responsible for certifying the quality of the data during the project?*

Answer: The responsibility is shared, but clearly divided:

The vendor will:

- Lead the process during the analysis and design phase
- Define the data model
- Support data mapping and migration activities
- Help assess whether the data quality is sufficient for the target system

The bank (NBM) will:

- Remain the owner of the data
- Be ultimately responsible for the actual quality and correctness of the data
- Validate and confirm that the data is accurate and suitable

8. Questions and answers. Concluding remarks.

Speaker: 

1. Question: *Regarding the eligibility criteria, vendors are required to have reference experience with a central bank, commercial bank, or systemically important institution in Europe/EU.*

- *Is this requirement mandatory?*
- *Also, does this reference need to be specifically with a central bank, or can it also be with a commercial bank?*

Answer: Yes, this is a mandatory requirement for lot I - CBS.

- The requirement is important due to the bank's EU integration objectives.
- The reference can be:
 - A central bank, or
 - A commercial bank (or similar systemically important institution) within the EU.

- Additionally, having experience specifically with central banks (especially systemically important ones) may bring extra evaluation points, but the baseline requirement remains mandatory.

2. Question: Considering that within the European Union there is a limited number of central banks (primarily in countries such as France, Italy, Germany, and Spain), and that their scope differs significantly from that of commercial banks, is it practical to require vendors to provide references specifically from central banks? Would it not be more realistic to accept references from commercial banks, especially given that the scope of core banking differs from ERP and may create inconsistencies between the lots?

Answer: The requirement for relevant experience is not strictly limited to central banks, although such experience is considered valuable. We acknowledge that there are relatively few implementation projects involving central banks, due to their specific characteristics and requirements.

Therefore, the scope of this requirement has been broadened to also include systemically important financial institutions, which are more numerous within the European Union and operate under the same EU regulations and standards. This approach ensures that vendors and their proposed solutions comply with the applicable regulatory and operational requirements.

In summary:

- For core banking, the requirement remains mandatory, but it is not restricted solely to central banks; it also includes systemically important banks.
- For the ERP component, the requirement is more flexible and may include relevant experience with other types of organizations, such as banks or insurance companies.

3. Question: After this meeting, what is the correct process for submitting clarification questions? Will there be a separate email address or platform where we should send our questions, or should we use the same email through which we received the meeting invitation? Additionally, how will we access the appropriate platform or link for submitting these questions?

Answer: All clarification questions must be submitted exclusively through the MTender platform after the meeting. They should not be sent via email, as this is a requirement of the legal and procedural framework governing the process.

Responses to the questions will also be provided directly on the same platform, ensuring transparency and that all participants have access to the information.

The access link to the platform has already been included in the emails sent previously - <https://achizitii.md/en/public/tender/21567046/questions>. If needed, the link can be resent to ensure that all participants can easily access the platform and submit their questions correctly.

4. Question: As this process may be challenging for external participants, would it be possible to organize a dedicated session to walk us through the steps in detail, explain how the process works, and clarify what actions need to be taken, especially in relation to the tender formalization process?

Answer: Yes, a 2nd Familiarization meeting will be held by us. So, please send the invitation to your colleagues who will be responsible for the tender formalization process.

During this next meeting, we will provide a step-by-step explanation of how to use the MTender procurement platform, as well as detailed guidance on all requirements related to vendor formalization. The session will be focused specifically on supporting you through the beginning of the process and ensuring clarity on all necessary steps.

The next meeting is scheduled for April 3rd, and we kindly ask you to forward the invitation to the relevant colleagues who will be involved in managing the bid submission process.

10. End of the meeting

Speaker: 

Was presented:

- Guidelines and recommendations on how to address clarification questions were shared.
- Message of gratitude to the participants for attending the meeting.

Guidelines and recommendations on how to address clarification questions:

All participants have access to the MTender platform, where they can submit questions, review clarifications, and view responses provided during the procedure. All communication through the platform is transparent and accessible to every bidder.

In order to submit a bid, economic operators must first sign an agreement with the platform operator. Please note that for foreign vendors, this process may take up to two weeks. Therefore, it is strongly recommended to initiate this procedure well in advance of the submission deadline to avoid any delays. Bidders are advised not to wait until the end of the bidding period to complete the required formalities related to platform access and registration.

Additionally, a user guide for the MTender platform will be provided. Currently it is available in Romanian, and it will be translated into English to support international participants.

Further information regarding the use of the MTender platform is available in the Request for Proposals (RFP), specifically in the Participation Notice, section 39.4. This section includes instructions as well as direct links to the platform and to the clarification field (section).

For ease of reference, these materials will also be shared separately with participants, including an English translation.

Economic operators are strongly encouraged to submit all questions directly through the MTender platform, using the designated clarification section, to ensure proper tracking, transparency, and equal access to information for all participants.