



Agenzia per l'Italia Digitale  
*Presidenza del Consiglio dei Ministri*



REALIZATION OF A RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECT  
(PRE-COMMERCIAL PROCUREMENT) ON "CLOUD FOR EUROPE"

---

# MINUTES OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE: PROVISIONAL AWARDING OF PHASE I FOR LOT 1

SESSION OF 24<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2015

TENDER NUMBER <5843932>

CUP <C58I13000210006>

CLOUD FOR EUROPE  
FP7-610650

This project has received funding from the European Union's  
Seventh Framework Program for research, technological development  
and demonstration under grant agreement no 610650.



## Table of Contents

<b>PRELIMINARY PROCEDURAL MATTERS</b> .....	4
1 TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	4
2 EVALUATION PROCESS ON PHASE I: PREVIOUS STEPS.....	5
3 EVALUATION PROCESS ON PHASE I: FINALISATION .....	6
4 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFERS .....	8
5 EVALUATION OF THE FINANCIAL OFFER.....	8
5.1 EVALUATION OF THE OVERALL TOTAL VALUE (OTV) .....	9
5.2 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE ESTIMATED FULL PRICE (EFP) .....	9
5.3 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE BREAKDOWN INTO COST CATEGORIES AND UNIT PRICES (BCUP) ...	10
6 VERIFICATION OF THE REGULARITY OF THE ANNEX F – DECLARATION OF SUBCONTRACTING (IF PRESENT) 10	
7 EVALUATION OF THE TOTAL OFFER.....	10
8 FINAL CLASSIFICATION .....	11
<b>PUBLIC SESSION OF THE FINAL EVALUATION ON PHASE 1 FOR LOT 1 – 24<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2015</b> .....	12
9 OPENING OF THE SESSION AND ATTENDANCE REGISTER.....	12
10 ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS .....	14
11 END OF EVALUATIONS PER BID .....	14
11.1 BID 1.1 – BP DELIVERY BV .....	14
11.1.1 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFER .....	14
11.2 BID 1.2 – TECNALIA CORPORACIÓN TECNOLÓGICA.....	16

---

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová), come the assent.

---

11.2.1	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFER .....	16
11.2.2	EVALUATION OF THE FINANCIAL OFFER.....	18
11.2.3	VERIFICATION THE REGULARITY OF THE ANNEX F – DECLARATION OF SUBCONTRACTING .....	19
11.3	BID 1.3 – ZIMORY GMBH.....	19
11.3.1	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFER .....	19
11.3.2	EVALUATION OF THE FINANCIAL OFFER.....	21
11.3.3	VERIFICATION THE REGULARITY OF THE ANNEX F – DECLARATION OF SUBCONTRACTING .....	22
11.4	BID 1.4 – SECONDA UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI NAPOLI – DIPARTIMENTO DI INGEGNERIA INDUSTRIALE E DELL’INFORMAZIONE .....	22
11.4.1	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFER .....	22
11.4.2	EVALUATION OF THE FINANCIAL OFFER.....	24
11.4.3	VERIFICATION THE REGULARITY OF THE ANNEX F – DECLARATION OF SUBCONTRACTING .....	25
11.5	BID 1.5 – CLOUD SECURITY ALLIANCE (EUROPE)’S TGO .....	25
11.5.1	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFER .....	25
11.5.2	EVALUATION OF THE FINANCIAL OFFER.....	27
11.5.3	VERIFICATION THE REGULARITY OF THE ANNEX F – DECLARATION OF SUBCONTRACTING .....	28
11.6	BID 1.6 – INTERWAY SRO’S TGO .....	28
11.6.1	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFER .....	28
11.6.2	EVALUATION OF THE FINANCIAL OFFER.....	30
11.6.3	VERIFICATION THE REGULARITY OF THE ANNEX F – DECLARATION OF SUBCONTRACTING .....	31
11.7	BID 1.7 – CAPGEMINI ITALIA SPA’S TGO.....	31
11.7.1	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFER .....	31
11.7.2	EVALUATION OF THE FINANCIAL OFFER.....	33
11.7.3	VERIFICATION THE REGULARITY OF THE ANNEX F – DECLARATION OF SUBCONTRACTING .....	34
11.8	BID 1.8 – SIELTE SPA’S TGO .....	34
11.8.1	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFER .....	34

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani***President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová), come the assent.

11.9	BID 1.9 – NEC ITALIA SPA.....	36
11.9.1	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFER .....	36
11.9.2	EVALUATION OF THE FINANCIAL OFFER.....	38
11.9.3	VERIFICATION THE REGULARITY OF THE ANNEX F – DECLARATION OF SUBCONTRACTING .....	39
11.10	BID 1.10 – HEWLETT PACKARD ITALIANA SRL.....	39
11.10.1	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFER .....	39
11.10.2	EVALUATION OF THE FINANCIAL OFFER.....	41
11.10.3	VERIFICATION THE REGULARITY OF THE ANNEX F – DECLARATION OF SUBCONTRACTING .....	42
11.11	BID 1.11 – IBM ITALIA SPA .....	42
11.11.1	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFER .....	42
11.11.2	EVALUATION OF THE FINANCIAL OFFER.....	44
11.11.3	VERIFICATION THE REGULARITY OF THE ANNEX F – DECLARATION OF SUBCONTRACTING .....	45
11.12	BID 1.12 – NTT DATA ITALIA SPA’S TGO .....	45
11.12.1	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFER .....	45
11.12.2	EVALUATION OF THE FINANCIAL OFFER.....	47
11.12.3	VERIFICATION THE REGULARITY OF THE ANNEX F – DECLARATION OF SUBCONTRACTING .....	48
11.13	BID 1.13 – PROLOGUE.....	48
11.13.1	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFER .....	48
11.13.2	EVALUATION OF THE FINANCIAL OFFER.....	50
11.13.3	VERIFICATION THE REGULARITY OF THE ANNEX F – DECLARATION OF SUBCONTRACTING .....	51
12	EVALUATION OF THE TOTAL OFFER.....	51
13	FINAL CLASSIFICATION .....	52
14	PROVISIONAL AWARDING, EXCLUSIONS AND CONCLUSION OF THE SESSION .....	53
	ANNEX 1 – ESTIMED FULL PRICE (EFP).....	56
	ANNEX 2 - BREAKDOWN INTO COST CATEGORIES AND UNIT PRICES (BCUP).....	56

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani***President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová), come the assent.

# PRELIMINARY PROCEDURAL MATTERS

## 1 TERMS OF REFERENCE

Under Section 13 of the *Tender Regulation - Annex I to Contract Notice n. 2014/S 241-424518 – version 21-02-2015 amendment* (hereinafter TR), the Lead Contracting Authority (Agenzia per l'Italia Digitale, AgID in the following) appoints:

“▪ An **Administrative Committee** for the selection of requests to participate or tenders based on exclusion and selection criteria. The Administrative Committee is composed by an odd number of evaluators, experts in procurement law, whereby each Contracting Authority listed in Paragraph 1.3 is entitled to appoint a national expert. At least one expert in Italian procurement law should compose this Committee. Evaluators shall open requests to participate and tenders. Only requests to participate or tenders that satisfy the provided requirements that are not excluded based on the exclusion criteria and that meet the selection criteria, shall be considered admissible for evaluation under the award criteria.

▪ **Technical Committee** for the evaluation of tenders based on the award criteria (one Technical Committee for each lot). Each technical Committee is composed by an odd number of evaluators, experts in the specific field covered by the scope of the contract, whereby each Contracting Authority is entitled to appoint a national expert per lot.”

The Administrative Committee has been established with the Determinazione n. 84/2015, 20<sup>th</sup> March 2015 of the General Director of AgID and then amended with the Determinazione n. 85/2015, 24<sup>th</sup> March 2015.

The composition of the Technical Committee has been proposed during the *General Assembly of Cloud for Europe Project*, which took place in Porto on March 18-19, 2015. Afterwards the Technical Committee have been appointed by Determinazione n. 118/2015, 21<sup>th</sup> April 2015 of the General Director of AgID, and then amended with the Determinazione n. 143/2015, 29<sup>th</sup> April 2015.

About the right to access to the technical offer the Paragraph 1.3 of the *Technical Offer Template amendment v1.1 21-02-15 - Annex III to Contract Notice n. 2014/S 241-424518* (hereinafter TOT) provides that:

*“In relation to the right of access to documents provided by articles 13 and 79, sub-sections 5-quarter of the Italian Code of public contract, where the information indicated in the technical offer and as justification of the same offer, constitute technical or commercial secrets, the tenderer shall give punctual evidence of such information, with a motivated and proven declaration of access.*

*In case the tenderer would not produce such declaration, or in case such declaration was not motivated nor proven, AGID will be released from the obligation of notification of any request of access pursuant to article 3 of DPR no. 184/2006. Furthermore, in the absence of such declaration, the technical offer will be considered fully accessible.”.*

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the member connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luis Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

According to Annex G, template of the financial offer for Lot 1 of the TR, the offers are irrevocable and binding until the 180<sup>o</sup> (one hundred eightieth) day after the deadline scheduled for the submission of offers.

## 2 EVALUATION PROCESS ON PHASE I: PREVIOUS STEPS

The proceeding is being performed according to tender documents, in particular to Paragraph 11.2 and Sections 13, 14 and 15 of the TR, and TOT.

1. Section 14 of TR, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> indentions, provides that:

*"[...] the Administrative Evaluation Committee, during the first open session, will open the received parcels and verify the completeness ad regularity of the administrative documentation submitted, and, if not, to the exclusion of the tenderer from the procedure."*

The tender opening session took place on 24<sup>th</sup>, 25<sup>th</sup>, 27<sup>th</sup> March 2015, as reported in the related document "**Minutes of the Administrative Committee: Opening Session**" of the 10<sup>th</sup> April 2015.

2. Section 14 of TR, 7<sup>th</sup> indentions, provides that:

*"During the first session, the Administrative Evaluation Committee will open the envelopes containing the technical offers, to verify their formal regularity, and to submit them in a separate envelope sealed in the course of the same meeting to the Technical Evaluation Committee, for the allocation of scores assignment for the awarding purposes."*

According to Section 7 of the "*Minutes of the Administrative Committee: Opening Session*", on 10<sup>th</sup> April 2015 the Administrative Committee resumed its work, checking the integrity of the files contained in CD-ROM or USB supports (containing the technical offers) for each parcel received for the submission of the offers.

Section 6 of the related document, named "**Minutes of the Administrative Committee: Technical Offers Checking Session**", provides that:

*"[...] the Administrative Committee gives a mandate to the Lead Contracting Authority to transmit technical offers to the Technical Committee so that they can start the technical evaluation."*

3. On 17<sup>th</sup> April 2015, according to Paragraph 6.2 of the "*Minutes of the Administrative Committee: Opening Session*", and to the provision established in the warning box of the Paragraph 9.4 of TR, the Lead Contracting Authority sent a letter to the bidders to request integrations of missing documentation.
4. On 23<sup>th</sup> April 2015 the Lead Contracting Authority uploaded the technical offers (in electronic format) for each Lot in the dedicated secure online AgID's platform (<https://cowork.agid.gov.it>).
5. On 24<sup>th</sup> April 2015 the Administrative Committee met to check the integrations sent by the bidders. In the related document "**Minutes of the Administrative Committee: Evaluation of the Required Integrations**" the Administrative Committee recognized that the integrative documentation is complete and fulfills the request for integration and

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the member connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luis Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

therefore, admitted the interested offers to the following technical evaluation step.

6. Section 14 of TR, 8<sup>th</sup> indention, provides that:

*"The Technical Evaluation Committee will evaluate each technical offer elements [...] and will prepare special reports that will be submitted to the Administrative Evaluation Committee at the end of the evaluation."*

The Technical Committee Lot 1 finished its work on 22<sup>th</sup> July 2015. The Special Report – **"Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: Evaluation of the Technical Offers and Final Scores Assignment"** – has been shared with all members of the Administrative Committee through the dedicated secure online AgID's platform (<https://cowork.agid.gov.it>).

7. On 22<sup>th</sup> July 2015 the Lead Contracting Authority sent to Tenderers the invitation letters to the public session of the 24<sup>th</sup> July 2015 for the provisional awarding of Phase I for Lot 1. The same letters specify an *errata corrigendum* related to the Tender Regulation, Paragraph 15.3 of TR: the wording "Technical Evaluation Committee " shall be read "Administrative Evaluation Committee ".

### 3 EVALUATION PROCESS ON PHASE I: FINALISATION

Section 14 of TR, 9<sup>th</sup> indention, provides that:

*"Following the evaluation of the technical offers, AGID will fix, well in advance, upon notice via email or fax, a specific public session in order to communicate the technical scores assigned to each tenderer, to open the envelopes containing the financial offers and to read the prices offered by each tenderer."*

Paragraph 15.3 of the TR provides that:

*"The Administrative Evaluation Committee will open the envelope containing the financial offer for those companies who reached, in the technical offer evaluation, the minimum scores provided in Table 3."*

Section 14 of TR, from 10<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> indentions, provides that:

*"The same session will proceed, then, with the score assignment by applying the formula specified in the following Paragraph 15.3, and by drawing up the tender ranking.*

*The final awarding of each lot, will be disposed for those tenderers who have submitted the most economically advantageous tender, that is, those who obtained the highest overall scores, for each lot, subsequent to the sum of the assigned total scores, resulting from the technical offer and the financial offer.*

*In case of offers with equal scores, there will be a random draw in a public session."*

Paragraph 15.5 of the TR provides that:

*"The output of the evaluation procedure is the list of offers that have reached the minimum technical score, ordered by score from the higher (rank first) to the lower.*

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the member connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luis Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

*The bidders will be awarded from the first in the list to the last one. Each bidder will be awarded with its offered price.*

*The list will be scrolled until one of the following situation occurs:*

*1. the maximum number of awarded bidders has been reached*

*OR*

*2. the residual amount of available resources for the first phase of the lot is less than the price offered by the Tenderer.”.*

Paragraph 11.3 of the TR, 2<sup>nd</sup> and last indentions, provides that:

*“If the company intends to subcontract part of the activities to be awarded, within the maximum limit of 30% of the contractual price, such company, when submitting its offer, shall declare the activities it intends to subcontract and the measure of subcontracting (in accordance with the module referred to in Annex F to this Tender Regulation).”*

*“The declaration of subcontracting, compliant with the indicated conditions, shall be inserted in the envelope containing the financial offer.”.*

Summarizing and taking in account the procedure described above, the Administrative Committee will perform the following steps:

- 1. acknowledgement of the technical evaluations of the offers by Technical Committee Lot 1;**
- 2. opening envelopes containing financial offers - only for bids reach the minimum scores established for technical criteria - so:**
  - a. assignment of the scoring at the *Overall Total Value***
  - b. acknowledgement of the *Estimated Full Price***
  - c. acknowledgement of the *Breakdown into Cost Categories and Unit Prices for each cost category***
  - d. verification the regularity of the *Annex F - Declaration of subcontracting (if present)***
- 3. assignment of the *Final Score*;**
- 4. drawing up the *Tender Ranking*.**

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the member connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luis Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.



#### 4 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFERS

Section 14 of TR, 8<sup>th</sup> indentions, provides that:

*"The Technical Evaluation Committee will evaluate each technical offer elements [...] and will prepare special reports that will be submitted to the Administrative Evaluation Committee at the end of the evaluation."*

Paragraph 15.3 of the TR provides that:

*"The Administrative Evaluation Committee will open the envelope containing the financial offer for those companies who reached in the technical offer evaluation, the minimum scores provided in Table 3."*

#### 5 EVALUATION OF THE FINANCIAL OFFER

According to Paragraph 11.2 the Administrative Committee opens the envelope containing the Financial Offer which shall contain:

- the Overall Total Value (OTV), in Euro, identified for completing *Phase I - Solution Design*. The OTV is the price for the realization of research and development services, in accordance with the documents *Technical Specifications* and *Technical offer*. The *Overall Total Value* shall take in account the fact that part of the Intellectual Property Rights will be retained by the tenderer in accordance with the provisions of the Draft Framework Agreement. Increased offers compared to the maximum amounts will not be accepted. Maximum amounts are established, for the first phase, for Lot 1, in € 40.000,00 (forty thousand/00) [excluding VAT], partial or conditioned.
- the Estimated Full Price (EFP); the Estimated Full Price is the price that it would have been quoted if Intellectual Property Rights resulting from the execution of Phase I were fully retained by the Procuring Entity.
- a Breakdown into Cost Categories and Unit Prices for each cost category (BCUP) which contains:
  - the list of R&D resource categories (e.g. junior, senior researchers, developers, testers, etc.) that the tenderer plans to use for the execution of the services in Phase I. The list shall also contain resources for Phases II and III that are not expected to be used in Phase I;
  - the unit price for each resource category;
  - for each resource category, the minimum guaranteed quantity of resources for the execution of the services in Phase I.The list shall include only the resource categories that are inseparable from and indispensable to deliver the R&D services that are executed through the C4E contract.

In order to evaluate the Financial Offer the Administrative Committee, for each bid, opens the dedicate envelope and proceeds with the following steps:

- a. the assignment of the scoring at the *Overall Total Value*;

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the member connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luis Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

- b. the acknowledgement of the *Estimated Full Price*;
- c. the acknowledgement of the *Breakdown into Cost Categories and Unit Prices for each cost category*.

## 5.1 EVALUATION OF THE OVERALL TOTAL VALUE (OTV)

Paragraph 15.3 of TR provides that:

*"The Technical Evaluation Committee will open the envelope containing the financial offer for those companies who reached in the technical offer evaluation, the minimum scores provided in Table 3.*

*The score related to the "Financial Offer" criterion will be determined as follows:*

- *the maximum price allowed for the Lot is identified as (**Vmax**);*
- *Vo\_A is the financial offer related to the Research and development project;*
- *the financial score will be assigned to the financial offer Vo\_A according to the following formula:*

$$P_{fin\_A} = P_{max\_A} * \frac{V_{max} - Vo\_A}{V_{max}}$$

Where:

- **Pfin\_A** is the score assigned to the financial offer related to the research and development project;
- **Pmax\_A** is the maximum score to be assigned to the offer (**20 points**)".

## 5.2 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE ESTIMATED FULL PRICE (EFP)

In order for not to consider a PCP as State aid (according to Section 2.3, article 33, d), second indent, of the *Framework for state aid for research and development and innovation – C(2014) 3282 – hereinafter 2014 State aid framework for R&D&I* the price paid for the relevant services must fully reflect the market value of the benefits received by the public purchaser and the risks taken by the participating providers.

In order to avoid the State aid, the Lead Contracting Authority, with reference the Annex G, template of the financial offer for Lot 1 of the TR, requested tenderers to quote two prices:

- an *Overall Total Value* (OTV);
- an *Estimated Full Price* (EFP), with the *Breakdown into cost categories and unit prices for each cost category* (BCUP).

The Administrative Committee acknowledges the previous two prices and reports them in the Annex 1 of this document.

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the member connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luis Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

### 5.3 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE BREAKDOWN INTO COST CATEGORIES AND UNIT PRICES (BCUP)

According to Annex G, template of the financial offer for Lot 1 of the TR, each tenderer must submit two tables:

- one table for Phase I, containing:
  - the list of R&D resource categories (e.g. junior, senior researchers, developers, testers, etc.) that the tenderer plans to use for the execution of the services in Phase I;
  - the description of the unit (hour, day/person, number of...);
  - the unit price for each resource category;
  - for each resource category, the minimum guaranteed quantity of resources for the execution of the of the services in Phase I.
- one table for Phases II and III, containing:
  - the list of R&D resource categories (e.g. junior, senior researchers, developers, testers, etc.) that the tenderer plans to use for the execution of the services in Phase I;
  - the description of the unit (hour, day/person, number of...);
  - the unit price for each resource category.

The Administrative Committee acknowledges the BCUP and reports it in the Annex 2 of this document.

### 6 VERIFICATION OF THE REGULARITY OF THE ANNEX F – DECLARATION OF SUBCONTRACTING (IF PRESENT)

According to Paragraph 11.3 of TR and Annex F of TR, the *Declarations of subcontracting* that do not specify exactly which part of the activity the tenderer intends to subcontract, or do not give the quantitative indication required, will not be considered regular.

No authorization to subcontract will be released in case of irregular declaration, or in case the declaration is not present.

### 7 EVALUATION OF THE TOTAL OFFER

According to Paragraph 15.4 the "*final score*" is assigned to each offer as follows:

*"The final score will be assigned to each offer as follows:*

$$P_{tot\_A} = P_{tec\_A} + P_{fin\_A}$$

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the member connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luis Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

*The calculation for the assignment of all scores will take into account the first two decimals, without rounding”.*

## **8 FINAL CLASSIFICATION**

The Paragraph 15.5 of the TR provides that:

*“The output of the evaluation procedure is the list of offers that have reached the minimum technical score, ordered by score from the higher (rank first) to the lower.”.*

*The bidders will be awarded from the first in the list to the last one. Each bidder will be awarded with its offered price.*

*The list will be scrolled until one of the following situation occurs:*

*1. the maximum number of awarded bidders has been reached*

*OR*

*2. the residual amount of available resources for the first phase of the lot is less than the price offered by the Tenderer.”.*

---

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the member connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luis Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

---

# PUBLIC SESSION OF THE FINAL EVALUATION ON PHASE 1 FOR LOT 1 – 24<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2015

## 9 OPENING OF THE SESSION AND ATTENDANCE REGISTER

On Wednesday 24<sup>th</sup> July 2015, in the main office of the AgID, Viale Liszt 21, 00144 Rome, the Administrative Committee meets in public session to finalize the evaluation process for awarding of Phase I of the *Cloud for Europe Tender*, for Lot 1.

The President of the Committee starts the Session at 11.23 CEST and announces the substitution of Norien Kuiper with Valerio Giovannini as member of the Administrative Committee. The new member of the Administrative Committee has been appointed with Determinazione n. 39/2015, 23<sup>th</sup> July 2015.

All the members of the Administrative Committee attend the meeting, in presence or through video conferencing tool - as established with the above-mentioned Determinazione 84/2015 and Determinazione 85/2015.

Member	Appointed from Contracting Authority	Country	Role in the Administrative Committee	Presence or video conferencing
Marco Bani	Agency for Digital Italy	Italy	President and Secretary	presence
Valerio Giovannini	Agency for Digital Italy	Italy	Member	presence
Radu Boncea	Institutul National de Cercetare-Dezvoltare in Informatica	Romania	Member	video conferencing
Luís Horta	Entidade de Serviços Partilhados da Administração Pública, I.P.	Portugal	Member	video conferencing
Nadežda Nikšová	Ministerstvo Financií Slovenskej Republiky	Slovakia	Member	video conferencing

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**
*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

**For the members connected through video conferencing, the President of the Administrative Committee, collecting the assent or dissent of any component itself on the validity of the documentation submitted by the Bidders, will proceed to sign the submitted documents with the following sentence "for the member (s) (name and surname) connected through video conferencing, came the assent/dissent".**

The following persons attend the meeting, with the function of Technical Support to the Administrative Committee:

Name	Company	Role
Mauro Draoli	Agency for Digital Italy	Technical Support Team
Cristian Campagna	Ernst &Young Financial Business Advisors SPA	Technical Support Team
Gabriele Scalera	Ernst &Young Financial Business Advisors SPA	Technical Support Team

Being a session open to the public a person in charge of each competitor may attend, according to Section 14 of the TR. The following persons, identified through the exhibition of an original identification document or the written request, attend the meeting, in presence or in video conferencing:

Name	Company	Presence or video conferencing
Sara Andreazzoli	Liberologico SRL	video conferencing
Maximilian Ahrens	Zimory GMBH	video conferencing
Fausto Bianchi	NEC Italia SPA	presence
Giovanni De Paola	IBM Italia SPA	presence
Daniele Di Martino	Hewlett Packard Italiana SRL	presence
Valentino Di Toma	NTT Data Italia SPA	presence
Leire Orue Echevarria Arrieta	Tecnalia Corporación Tecnológica	video conferencing

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**
*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

Marisa Escalante Martinez	Tecnalia Corporación Tecnológica	video conferencing
Erick Fremont	Prologue	video conferencing
Paola Guidalotti	IBM Italia SPA	presence
Antonio Ledda	Sielte SPA	presence
Fausto Sforza	Capgemini Italia SPA	presence
Maurice Van Der Woude	BPdelivery BV	video conferencing

## 10 ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

The President takes in account that the Special Report drafted by Technical Committee for Lot 1 has been put at disposal of the members of the Administrative Committee through the dedicated secure online AgID's platform (<https://cowork.agid.gov.it>).

The Administrative Committee establishes to use of a secure photo tool to speed up the recording of the documents, and the sharing in real time of the photos between the members of the Administrative Committee, through the same secure on line platform used for sharing the Special Reports.

For the purposes of this Session the Administrative Committee is supported by the Technical Support Team.

## 11 END OF EVALUATIONS PER BID

### 11.1 BID 1.1 – BP DELIVERY BV

#### 11.1.1 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFER

The President verifies that all members of the Administrative Committee have inspected the Special Report drafted by Technical Committee Lot 1.

The table below reports the results of the technical score (*Ptec\_A*) assigned by Technical Committee Lot 1 to bid ID 1.1 submitted by *BP DELIVERY BV*, according to the document "*Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: evaluation of the technical offers and final scores assignment*":

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

1.1 - BPdelivery BV					
Criterion	Criterion short description	Bi	Qi (Phase I)	Bi*Qi	Minimum score reached (>50% of the Qi of C)
<b>C</b>	<b>Challenge</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>7,60</b>	<b>NO</b>
C1	Likelihood to meet the main challenges for the lot	0,36	5	1,80	
C2	Overall contribution to realize the Usage scenario described in Section 1.4 of the "Annex IV(A): Challenges and general requirements	0,36	2	0,72	
C3	Degree of fulfilment of the challenge	0,46	4	1,84	
C4	Innovation level (motivation by bidders)	0,36	9	3,24	
<b>I</b>	<b>Impact</b>		<b>25</b>	<b>11,79</b>	
I1	Impact on (digital) society, multiplier effects	0,46	7	3,22	
I2	Impact on government cloud adoption	0,50	7	3,50	
I3	Public sector service impact	0,43	5	2,15	
I4	Commercialisation and exploitation plan of IPR	0,46	2	0,92	
I5	Proposed sharing of risk and benefits	0,50	4	2,00	
<b>S</b>	<b>Security</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>6,46</b>	<b>NO</b>
S1	Risk assessment impact (C, I, A dimensions)	0,35	0	0,00	
S2	Risk analysis	0,50	5	2,50	
S3	Risk mitigation measures	0,56	4	2,24	
S4	System management security	0,00	0	0,00	
S5	Operational security, proposed certifications	0,43	4	1,72	
<b>Q</b>	<b>Quality</b>		<b>22</b>	<b>11,28</b>	<b>YES</b>
Q1	Portability, applicability in different architectures	0,50	9	4,50	
Q2	Bid document quality, focus on challenge and solution	0,56	5	2,80	
Q3	Quality of project plan, resources allocation, acceptance plan	0,53	2	1,06	
Q4	Alignment with EU standards and legislation	0,43	2	0,86	
Q5	Resilience and target service SLA	0,00	0	0,00	
Q6	Completeness of the proposed prototypes and pilot	0,50	2	1,00	
Q7	Early/continuous quality assurance	0,53	2	1,06	
Q8	Performance and end-user experience	0,00	0	0,00	
				<b>37,13</b>	
				<b>Ptec A=Σ(Bi*Qi)</b>	

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**
*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.



<b>Legend</b>
<b>Bi</b> = average of the coefficient between 0 and 1, assigned by the members of the Technical Committee
<b>Qi</b> = weight (single weight) assigned to each sub-criterion in the Tender Regulation
<b>PTec_A</b> = score assigned to the technical offer.
If one of the calculated scores for C, S or Q are in <b>RED</b> then the minimum score of that Criterion is not met. In that case the bid is <b>NOT</b> eligible for the award of the framework contract! In that case the cell with total calculated score (Ptec_A) will turn <b>RED</b> . If all 3 minimum scores are met, the cells will be <b>GREEN</b> . Cell with total calculated score (Ptec_A) will also be <b>GREEN</b> .

The final result, as drafted in the "Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: evaluation of the technical offers and final scores assignment", is reported below:

Bid ID	Bidder	Ptec_A	Final Judgement
1.1	BPdelivery BV	<b>37,13</b>	It <b>does not reach</b> the minimum score provided for all three criteria: Challenge, Security and Quality. It only reaches the minimum score for Quality.

**Therefore the President, according to Paragraph 15.3 of TR, taking in account the final judgment of the Technical Committee Lot 1, and come the assent for the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová), establishes that the Administrative Committee WILL NOT OPEN the envelope containing the financial offer of the bid ID 1.1 submitted by **BP DELIVERY BV**.**

The participant connected through video conferencing representing of BPdelivery BV company, Maurice Van Der Woude, leaves the meeting.

## 11.2 BID 1.2 – TECNALIA CORPORACIÓN TECNOLÓGICA

### 11.2.1 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFER

The President verifies that all members of the Administrative Committee have inspected the Special Report drafted by Technical Committee Lot 1.

The table below reports the results of the technical score (*Ptec\_A*) assigned by Technical Committee Lot 1 to bid ID 1.2 submitted by *TECNALIA CORPORACIÓN TECNOLÓGICA*, according to the document "Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: evaluation of the technical offers and final scores assignment":

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

1.2 – Tecnalía Corporación Tecnológica					
Criterion	Criterion short description	Bi	Qi (Phase I)	Bi*Qi	Minimum score reached (>50% of the Qi of C)
<b>C</b>	<b>Challenge</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>13,88</b>	<b>YES</b>
C1	Likelihood to meet the main challenges for the lot	0,83	5	4,15	
C2	Overall contribution to realize the Usage scenario described in Section 1.4 of the "Annex IV(A): Challenges and general requirements	0,83	2	1,66	
C3	Degree of fulfilment of the challenge	0,60	4	2,40	
C4	Innovation level (motivation by bidders)	0,63	9	5,67	
<b>I</b>	<b>Impact</b>		<b>25</b>	<b>17,45</b>	
I1	Impact on (digital) society, multiplicator effects	0,83	7	5,81	
I2	Impact on government cloud adoption	0,70	7	4,90	
I3	Public sector service impact	0,66	5	3,30	
I4	Commercialisation and exploitation plan of IPR	0,66	2	1,32	
I5	Proposed sharing of risk and benefits	0,53	4	2,12	
<b>S</b>	<b>Security</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>10,08</b>	<b>YES</b>
S1	Risk assessment impact (C, I, A dimensions)	0,00	0	0,00	
S2	Risk analysis	0,80	5	4,00	
S3	Risk mitigation measures	0,86	4	3,44	
S4	System management security	0,00	0	0,00	
S5	Operational security, proposed certifications	0,66	4	2,64	
<b>Q</b>	<b>Quality</b>		<b>22</b>	<b>17,44</b>	<b>YES</b>
Q1	Portability, applicability in different architectures	0,76	9	6,84	
Q2	Bid document quality, focus on challenge and solution	0,86	5	4,30	
Q3	Quality of project plan, resources allocation, acceptance plan	0,80	2	1,60	
Q4	Alignment with EU standards and legislation	0,76	2	1,52	
Q5	Resilience and target service SLA	0,00	0	0,00	
Q6	Completeness of the proposed prototypes and pilot	0,76	2	1,52	
Q7	Early/continuous quality assurance	0,83	2	1,66	
Q8	Performance and end-user experience	0,00	0	0,00	
				<b>58,85</b>	
				<b>Ptec A=Σ(Bi*Qi)</b>	

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**
*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

<b>Legend</b>	
<b>Bi</b>	= average of the coefficient between 0 and 1, assigned by the members of the Technical Committee
<b>Qi</b>	= weight (single weight) assigned to each sub-criterion in the Tender Regulation
<b>PTec_A</b>	= score assigned to the technical offer.
If one of the calculated scores for C, S or Q are in <b>RED</b> then the minimum score of that Criterion is not met. In that case the bid is <b>NOT</b> eligible for the award of the framework contract! In that case the cell with total calculated score (Ptec_A) will turn <b>RED</b> . If all 3 minimum scores are met, the cells will be <b>GREEN</b> . Cell with total calculated score (Ptec_A) will also be <b>GREEN</b> .	

The final result, as drafted in the "Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: evaluation of the technical offers and final scores assignment", is reported below:

Bid ID	Bidder	Ptec_A	Final Judgement
1.2	Tecnalia Corporación Tecnológica	<b>58,85</b>	It <b>reaches the minimum scores provided</b> related to all three criteria: Challenge, Security and Quality.

**Therefore the President, according to Paragraph 15.3 of TR, taking in account the final judgment of the Technical Committee Lot 1, and come the assent for the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová), establishes that the Administrative Committee WILL OPEN the envelope containing the financial offer of the bid ID 1.2 submitted by **TECNALIA CORPORACIÓN TECNOLÓGICA**.**

### 11.2.2 EVALUATION OF THE FINANCIAL OFFER

The President verifies the integrity of the envelope containing the Financial Offer, opens it and publicly reads the two prices submitted *Overall Total Value* (OTV) and *Estimated Full Price* (EFP) and the *Breakdown into Cost Categories and Unite Price* (BCUP).

The President verifies:

- that the amount indicated - in both case - is the same in numbers and in words;
- that the OTV submitted do not exceed the maximum amount which is established, for the Phase I, for the Lot 1 in € 40.000,00 (thirty thousand/00) [excluding VAT].

At the same time the Technical Support records these values on dedicate table sheet and proceeds to photograph the documents and to sharing with the members of the Administrative Committee, through the dedicated secure online AgID's platform <https://cowork.agid.gov.it>.

#### 11.2.2.1 EVALUATION OF THE OVERALL TOTAL VALUE (OTV)

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

After completing the opening, President asks Technical Support to calculate the score ( $P_{fin\_A}$ ) of the price offered ( $OTV=V_{o\_A}$ ) by *TECNALIA CORPORACIÓN TECNOLÓGICA*. The following table contain the Financial Score related to the price offered for bid ID 1.2.

Bidder	$V_{o\_A}$	$V_{max}$	$P_{max\_A}$	$P_{fin\_A}$ = $P_{max\_A}*(V_{max}-V_{o\_A})/V_{max}$
1.2 - Tecnia Corporation Tecnológica	€ 38.640,00	€ 40.000	20	<b>0,68</b>

#### 11.2.2.2 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE ESTIMATED FULL PRICE (EFP)

The table with EFP and OTV is reported in Annex 1 of this document.

#### 11.2.2.3 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE BREAKDOWN INTO COST CATEGORIES AND UNIT PRICES (BCUP)

The two tables for each bid are reported in Annex 2 of this document.

### 11.2.3 VERIFICATION THE REGULARITY OF THE ANNEX F – DECLARATION OF SUBCONTRACTING

The Bidder did not submit the Annex F. The Administrative Committee establishes that the omission of the Annex F is equivalent to the submission of the Annex F containing the declaration of renunciation to the subcontracting.

## 11.3 BID 1.3 – ZIMORY GMBH

### 11.3.1 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFER

The President verifies that all members of the Administrative Committee have inspected the Special Report drafted by Technical Committee Lot 1.

The table below reports the results of the technical score ( $P_{tec\_A}$ ) assigned by Technical Committee Lot 1 to bid ID 1.3 submitted by *ZIMORY GMBH*, according to the document "*Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: evaluation of the technical offers and final scores assignment*":

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

1.3 - Zimory GmbH					
Criterion	Criterion short description	Bi	Qi (Phase I)	Bi*Qi	Minimum score reached (>50% of the Qi of C)
<b>C</b>	<b>Challenge</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>12,75</b>	<b>YES</b>
C1	Likelihood to meet the main challenges for the lot	0,66	5	3,30	
C2	Overall contribution to realize the Usage scenario described in Section 1.4 of the "Annex IV(A): Challenges and general requirements	0,63	2	1,26	
C3	Degree of fulfilment of the challenge	0,63	4	2,52	
C4	Innovation level (motivation by bidders)	0,63	9	5,67	
<b>I</b>	<b>Impact</b>		<b>25</b>	<b>15,92</b>	
I1	Impact on (digital) society, multiplier effects	0,70	7	4,90	
I2	Impact on government cloud adoption	0,76	7	5,32	
I3	Public sector service impact	0,76	5	3,80	
I4	Commercialisation and exploitation plan of IPR	0,43	2	0,86	
I5	Proposed sharing of risk and benefits	0,26	4	1,04	
<b>S</b>	<b>Security</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>8,42</b>	<b>YES</b>
S1	Risk assessment impact (C, I, A dimensions)	0,00	0	0,00	
S2	Risk analysis	0,86	5	4,30	
S3	Risk mitigation measures	0,53	4	2,12	
S4	System management security	0,00	0	0,00	
S5	Operational security, proposed certifications	0,50	4	2,00	
<b>Q</b>	<b>Quality</b>		<b>22</b>	<b>15,12</b>	<b>YES</b>
Q1	Portability, applicability in different architectures	0,73	9	6,57	
Q2	Bid document quality, focus on challenge and solution	0,73	5	3,65	
Q3	Quality of project plan, resources allocation, acceptance plan	0,60	2	1,20	
Q4	Alignment with EU standards and legislation	0,63	2	1,26	
Q5	Resilience and target service SLA	0,00	0	0,00	
Q6	Completeness of the proposed prototypes and pilot	0,66	2	1,32	
Q7	Early/continuous quality assurance	0,56	2	1,12	
Q8	Performance and end-user experience	0,00	0	0,00	
				<b>52,21</b>	
				<b>Ptec A=Σ(Bi*Qi)</b>	

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**
*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

<b>Legend</b>	
<b>Bi</b>	= average of the coefficient between 0 and 1, assigned by the members of the Technical Committee
<b>Qi</b>	= weight (single weight) assigned to each sub-criterion in the Tender Regulation
<b>PTec_A</b>	= score assigned to the technical offer.
If one of the calculated scores for C, S or Q are in <b>RED</b> then the minimum score of that Criterion is not met. In that case the bid is <b>NOT</b> eligible for the award of the framework contract! In that case the cell with total calculated score (Ptec_A) will turn <b>RED</b> . If all 3 minimum scores are met, the cells will be <b>GREEN</b> . Cell with total calculated score (Ptec_A) will also be <b>GREEN</b> .	

The final result, as drafted in the "Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: evaluation of the technical offers and final scores assignment", is reported below:

Bid ID	Bidder	Ptec_A	Final Judgement
1.3	Zimory GmbH	<b>52,21</b>	It <b>reaches the minimum scores provided</b> related to all three criteria: Challenge, Security and Quality.

**Therefore the President, according to Paragraph 15.3 of TR, taking in account the final judgment of the Technical Committee Lot 1, and come the assent for the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová), establishes that the Administrative Committee WILL OPEN the envelope containing the financial offer of the bid ID 1.3 submitted by ZIMORY GMBH.**

### 11.3.2 EVALUATION OF THE FINANCIAL OFFER

The President verifies the integrity of the envelope containing the Financial Offer, opens it and publicly reads the two prices submitted *Overall Total Value* (OTV) and *Estimated Full Price* (EFP) and the *Breakdown into Cost Categories and Unite Price* (BCUP).

The President verifies:

- that the amount indicated - in both case - is the same in numbers and in words;
- that the OTV submitted do not exceed the maximum amount which is established, for the Phase I, for the Lot 1 in € 40.000,00 (thirty thousand/00) [excluding VAT].

At the same time the Technical Support records these values on dedicate table sheet and proceeds to photograph the documents and to sharing with the members of the Administrative Committee, through the dedicated secure online AgID's platform (<https://cowork.agid.gov.it>).

#### 11.3.2.1 EVALUATION OF THE OVERALL TOTAL VALUE (OTV)

After completing the opening, President asks Technical Support to calculate the score ( $P_{fin\_A}$ ) of the price offered ( $OTV=Vo\_A$ ) by ZIMORY GMBH. The following table contain the Financial Score related to the price offered for bid ID 1.3.

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

Bidder	Vo_A	Vmax	Pmax_A	Pfin_A =Pmax_A*(Vmax-Vo_A)/Vmax
1.3 - Zimory GmbH	€ 39.990,00	€ 40.000	20	<b>0,00</b>

### 11.3.2.2 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE ESTIMATED FULL PRICE (EFP)

The table with EFP and OTV is reported in Annex 1 of this document.

### 11.3.2.3 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE BREAKDOWN INTO COST CATEGORIES AND UNIT PRICES (BCUP)

The two tables for each bid are reported in Annex 2 of this document.

### 11.3.3 VERIFICATION THE REGULARITY OF THE ANNEX F – DECLARATION OF SUBCONTRACTING

The Bidder submitted one Annex F to declare, in case of awarding, it will not subcontract any of activities covered by Tender Regulation.

The Administrative Committee checked the regularity of the submitted declaration.

## 11.4 BID 1.4 – SECONDA UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI NAPOLI – DIPARTIMENTO DI INGEGNERIA INDUSTRIALE E DELL'INFORMAZIONE

### 11.4.1 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFER

The President verifies that all members of the Administrative Committee have inspected the Special Report drafted by Technical Committee Lot 1.

The table below reports the results of the technical score ( $P_{tec\_A}$ ) assigned by Technical Committee Lot 1 to bid ID 1.4 submitted by *SECONDA UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI NAPOLI – DIPARTIMENTO DI INGEGNERIA INDUSTRIALE E DELL'INFORMAZIONE*, according to the document "*Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: evaluation of the technical offers and final scores assignment*":

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

1.4 - Seconda Università degli Studi di Napoli – Dipartimento di Ingegneria Industriale e dell'Informazione					
Criterion	Criterion short description	Bi	Qi (Phase I)	Bi*Qi	Minimum score reached (>50% of the Qi of C)
<b>C</b>	<b>Challenge</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>12,92</b>	<b>YES</b>
C1	Likelihood to meet the main challenges for the lot	0,80	5	4,00	
C2	Overall contribution to realize the Usage scenario described in Section 1.4 of the "Annex IV(A): Challenges and general requirements	0,56	2	1,12	
C3	Degree of fulfilment of the challenge	0,60	4	2,40	
C4	Innovation level (motivation by bidders)	0,60	9	5,40	
<b>I</b>	<b>Impact</b>		<b>25</b>	<b>17,38</b>	
I1	Impact on (digital) society, multiplier effects	0,70	7	4,90	
I2	Impact on government cloud adoption	0,73	7	5,11	
I3	Public sector service impact	0,73	5	3,65	
I4	Commercialisation and exploitation plan of IPR	0,60	2	1,20	
I5	Proposed sharing of risk and benefits	0,63	4	2,52	
<b>S</b>	<b>Security</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>6,77</b>	<b>YES</b>
S1	Risk assessment impact (C, I, A dimensions)	0,00	0	0,00	
S2	Risk analysis	0,53	5	2,65	
S3	Risk mitigation measures	0,53	4	2,12	
S4	System management security	0,00	0	0,00	
S5	Operational security, proposed certifications	0,50	4	2,00	
<b>Q</b>	<b>Quality</b>		<b>22</b>	<b>13,11</b>	<b>YES</b>
Q1	Portability, applicability in different architectures	0,56	9	5,04	
Q2	Bid document quality, focus on challenge and solution	0,63	5	3,15	
Q3	Quality of project plan, resources allocation, acceptance plan	0,63	2	1,26	
Q4	Alignment with EU standards and legislation	0,50	2	1,00	
Q5	Resilience and target service SLA	0,00	0	0,00	
Q6	Completeness of the proposed prototypes and pilot	0,63	2	1,26	
Q7	Early/continuous quality assurance	0,70	2	1,40	
Q8	Performance and end-user experience	0,00	0	0,00	
				<b>50,18</b>	
				<b>Ptec A = <math>\sum(Bi*Qi)</math></b>	

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**
*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.



<b>Legend</b>	
<b>Bi</b>	= average of the coefficient between 0 and 1, assigned by the members of the Technical Committee
<b>Qi</b>	= weight (single weight) assigned to each sub-criterion in the Tender Regulation
<b>PTec_A</b>	= score assigned to the technical offer.
If one of the calculated scores for C, S or Q are in <b>RED</b> then the minimum score of that Criterion is not met. In that case the bid is <b>NOT</b> eligible for the award of the framework contract! In that case the cell with total calculated score (Ptec_A) will turn <b>RED</b> . If all 3 minimum scores are met, the cells will be <b>GREEN</b> . Cell with total calculated score (Ptec_A) will also be <b>GREEN</b> .	

The final result, as drafted in the "Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: evaluation of the technical offers and final scores assignment", is reported below:

Bid ID	Bidder	Ptec_A	Final Judgement
1.4	Seconda Università degli Studi di Napoli – Dipartimento di Ingegneria Industriale e dell'Informazione	<b>50,18</b>	It <b>reaches the minimum scores provided</b> related to all three criteria: Challenge, Security and Quality.

**Therefore the President, according to Paragraph 15.3 of TR, taking in account the final judgment of the Technical Committee Lot 1, and come the assent for the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová), establishes that the Administrative Committee WILL OPEN the envelope containing the financial offer of the bid ID 1.4 submitted by *SECONDA UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI NAPOLI – DIPARTIMENTO DI INGEGNERIA INDUSTRIALE E DELL'INFORMAZIONE*.**

#### 11.4.2 EVALUATION OF THE FINANCIAL OFFER

The President verifies the integrity of the envelope containing the Financial Offer, opens it and publicly reads the two prices submitted *Overall Total Value* (OTV) and *Estimated Full Price* (EFP) and the *Breakdown into Cost Categories and Unite Price* (BCUP).

The President verifies:

- that the amount indicated - in both case - is the same in numbers and in words;
- that the OTV submitted do not exceed the maximum amount which is established, for the Phase I, for the Lot 1 in € 40.000,00 (thirty thousand/00) [excluding VAT].

At the same time the Technical Support records these values on dedicate table sheet and proceeds to photograph the documents and to sharing with the members of the Administrative Committee, through the dedicated secure online AgID's platform <https://cowork.agid.gov.it>.

##### 11.4.2.1 EVALUATION OF THE OVERALL TOTAL VALUE (OTV)

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

After completing the opening, President asks Technical Support to calculate the score ( $P_{fin\_A}$ ) of the price offered ( $OTV=V_{o\_A}$ ) by 1.4 - *SECONDA UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI NAPOLI – DIPARTIMENTO DI INGEGNERIA INDUSTRIALE E DELL'INFORMAZIONE*. The following table contain the Financial Score related to the price offered for bid ID 1.4.

Bidder	Vo_A	Vmax	Pmax_A	Pfin_A = $P_{max\_A} * (V_{max} - V_{o\_A}) / V_{max}$
1.4 - Seconda Università degli Studi di Napoli – Dipartimento di Ingegneria Industriale e dell'Informazione	€ 30.000,00	€ 40.000	20	<b>5,00</b>

#### 11.4.2.2 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE ESTIMATED FULL PRICE (EFP)

The table with EFP and OTV is reported in Annex 1 of this document.

#### 11.4.2.3 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE BREAKDOWN INTO COST CATEGORIES AND UNIT PRICES (BCUP)

The two tables for each bid are reported in Annex 2 of this document.

#### 11.4.3 VERIFICATION THE REGULARITY OF THE ANNEX F – DECLARATION OF SUBCONTRACTING

The Bidder did not submit the Annex F. The Administrative Committee establishes that the omission of the Annex F is equivalent to the submission of the Annex F containing the declaration of renunciation to the subcontracting.

### 11.5 BID 1.5 – CLOUD SECURITY ALLIANCE (EUROPE)'S TGO

#### 11.5.1 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFER

The President verifies that all members of the Administrative Committee have inspected the Special Report drafted by Technical Committee Lot 1.

The table below reports the results of the technical score ( $P_{tec\_A}$ ) assigned by Technical Committee Lot 1 to bid ID 1.5 submitted by *CLOUD SECURITY ALLIANCE (EUROPE)'S TGO*, according to the document "*Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: evaluation of the technical offers and final scores assignment*":

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

1.5 - Cloud Security Alliance (Europe)'s TGO					
Criterion	Criterion short description	Bi	Qi (Phase I)	Bi*Qi	Minimum score reached (>50% of the Qi of C)
<b>C</b>	<b>Challenge</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>15,99</b>	<b>YES</b>
C1	Likelihood to meet the main challenges for the lot	0,83	5	4,15	
C2	Overall contribution to realize the Usage scenario described in Section 1.4 of the "Annex IV(A): Challenges and general requirements	0,80	2	1,60	
C3	Degree of fulfilment of the challenge	0,76	4	3,04	
C4	Innovation level (motivation by bidders)	0,80	9	7,20	
<b>I</b>	<b>Impact</b>		<b>25</b>	<b>19,03</b>	
I1	Impact on (digital) society, multiplier effects	0,73	7	5,11	
I2	Impact on government cloud adoption	0,80	7	5,60	
I3	Public sector service impact	0,80	5	4,00	
I4	Commercialisation and exploitation plan of IPR	0,70	2	1,40	
I5	Proposed sharing of risk and benefits	0,73	4	2,92	
<b>S</b>	<b>Security</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>9,64</b>	<b>YES</b>
S1	Risk assessment impact (C, I, A dimensions)	0,00	0	0,00	
S2	Risk analysis	0,76	5	3,80	
S3	Risk mitigation measures	0,76	4	3,04	
S4	System management security	0,00	0	0,00	
S5	Operational security, proposed certifications	0,70	4	2,80	
<b>Q</b>	<b>Quality</b>		<b>22</b>	<b>17,85</b>	<b>YES</b>
Q1	Portability, applicability in different architectures	0,83	9	7,47	
Q2	Bid document quality, focus on challenge and solution	0,80	5	4,00	
Q3	Quality of project plan, resources allocation, acceptance plan	0,80	2	1,60	
Q4	Alignment with EU standards and legislation	0,83	2	1,66	
Q5	Resilience and target service SLA	0,00	0	0,00	
Q6	Completeness of the proposed prototypes and pilot	0,83	2	1,66	
Q7	Early/continuous quality assurance	0,73	2	1,46	
Q8	Performance and end-user experience	0,00	0	0,00	
				<b>62,51</b>	
				<b>Ptec A=Σ(Bi*Qi)</b>	

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**
*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

<b>Legend</b>	
<b>Bi</b>	= average of the coefficient between 0 and 1, assigned by the members of the Technical Committee
<b>Qi</b>	= weight (single weight) assigned to each sub-criterion in the Tender Regulation
<b>PTec_A</b>	= score assigned to the technical offer.
If one of the calculated scores for C, S or Q are in <b>RED</b> then the minimum score of that Criterion is not met. In that case the bid is <b>NOT</b> eligible for the award of the framework contract! In that case the cell with total calculated score (Ptec_A) will turn <b>RED</b> . If all 3 minimum scores are met, the cells will be <b>GREEN</b> . Cell with total calculated score (Ptec_A) will also be <b>GREEN</b> .	

The final result, as drafted in the “Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: evaluation of the technical offers and final scores assignment”, is reported below:

Bid ID	Bidder	Ptec_A	Final Judgement
1.5	Temporary Grouping of Operators (TGO) between: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cloud Security Alliance (Europe)</li> <li>- Sixsq SARL</li> </ul>	62,51	It <b>reaches the minimum scores provided</b> related to all three criteria: Challenge, Security and Quality.

**Therefore the President, according to Paragraph 15.3 of TR, taking in account the final judgment of the Technical Committee Lot 1, and come the assent for the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová), establishes that the Administrative Committee WILL OPEN the envelope containing the financial offer of the bid ID 1.5 submitted by CLOUD SECURITY ALLIANCE (EUROPE)'S TGO.**

### 11.5.2 EVALUATION OF THE FINANCIAL OFFER

The President verifies the integrity of the envelope containing the Financial Offer, opens it and publicly reads the two prices submitted: *Overall Total Value* (OTV) and *Estimated Full Price* (EFP), and then reads the *Breakdown into Cost Categories and Unite Price* (BCUP).

The President verifies:

- that the amount indicated - in both case - is the same in numbers and in words;
- that the OTV submitted do not exceed the maximum amount which is established, for the Phase I, for Lot 1 in € 40.000,00 (forty thousand/00) [excluding VAT]

At the same time the Technical Support records these values on dedicated tables sheet and proceeds to photograph the documents and to sharing with the members of the Administrative Committee, through the dedicated secure online AgID's platform (<https://cowork.agid.gov.it>).

#### 11.5.2.1 EVALUATION OF THE OVERALL TOTAL VALUE (OTV)

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

After completing the opening, President asks Technical Support to calculate the score ( $P_{fin\_A}$ ) of the price offered ( $OTV=V_{o\_A}$ ) by *CLOUD SECURITY ALLIANCE (EUROPE)'S TGO*. The following table contain the Financial Score related to the price offered for bid ID 1.5.

Bidder	$V_{o\_A}$	$V_{max}$	$P_{max\_A}$	$P_{fin\_A}$ = $P_{max\_A} * (V_{max} - V_{o\_A}) / V_{max}$
1.5 - Cloud Security Alliance (Europe)'s TGO	€ 40.000,00	€ 40.000	20	<b>0,00</b>

#### 11.5.2.2 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE ESTIMATED FULL PRICE (EFP)

The table with EFP and OTV is reported in Annex 1 of this document.

#### 11.5.2.3 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE BREAKDOWN INTO COST CATEGORIES AND UNIT PRICES (BCUP)

The two tables for each bid are reported in Annex 2 of this document.

### 11.5.3 VERIFICATION THE REGULARITY OF THE ANNEX F – DECLARATION OF SUBCONTRACTING

The Bidder did not submit the Annex F. The Administrative Committee establishes that the omission of the Annex F is equivalent to the submission of the Annex F containing the declaration of renunciation to the subcontracting.

## 11.6 BID 1.6 – INTERWAY SRO'S TGO

### 11.6.1 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFER

The President verifies that all members of the Administrative Committee have inspected the Special Report drafted by Technical Committee Lot 1.

The table below reports the results of the technical score ( $P_{tec\_A}$ ) assigned by Technical Committee Lot 1 to bid ID 1.6 submitted by *INTERWAY SRO'S TGO*, according to the document "*Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: evaluation of the technical offers and final scores assignment*":

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

1.6 - Interway SRO's TGO					
Criterion	Criterion short description	Bi	Qi (Phase I)	Bi*Qi	Minimum score rached (>50% of the Qi of C)
<b>C</b>	<b>Challenge</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>16,14</b>	<b>YES</b>
C1	Likelihood to meet the main challenges for the lot	0,90	5	4,50	
C2	Overall contribution to realize the Usage scenario described in Section 1.4 of the "Annex IV(A): Challenges and general requirements	0,76	2	1,52	
C3	Degree of fulfilment of the challenge	0,73	4	2,92	
C4	Innovation level (motivation by bidders)	0,80	9	7,20	
<b>I</b>	<b>Impact</b>		<b>25</b>	<b>16,74</b>	
I1	Impact on (digital) society, multiplicator effects	0,70	7	4,90	
I2	Impact on government cloud adoption	0,73	7	5,11	
I3	Public sector service impact	0,63	5	3,15	
I4	Commecialisation and exploitation plan of IPR	0,53	2	1,06	
I5	Proposed sharing of risk and benefits	0,63	4	2,52	
<b>S</b>	<b>Security</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>9,18</b>	<b>YES</b>
S1	Risk assessment impact (C, I, A dimensions)	0,00	0	0,00	
S2	Risk analysis	0,70	5	3,50	
S3	Risk mitigation measures	0,76	4	3,04	
S4	System management security	0,00	0	0,00	
S5	Operational security, proposed certifications	0,66	4	2,64	
<b>Q</b>	<b>Quality</b>		<b>22</b>	<b>16,58</b>	<b>YES</b>
Q1	Portability, applicability in different architectures	0,80	9	7,20	
Q2	Bid document quality, focus on challenge and solution	0,76	5	3,80	
Q3	Quality of project plan, resources allocation, acceptance plan	0,70	2	1,40	
Q4	Alignment with EU standards and legislation	0,70	2	1,40	
Q5	Resilience and target service SLA	0,00	0	0,00	
Q6	Completeness of the proposed prototypes and pilot	0,73	2	1,46	
Q7	Early/continuous quality assurance	0,66	2	1,32	
Q8	Performance and end-user experience	0,00	0	0,00	
				<b>58,64</b>	
				<b>Ptec A=Σ(Bi*Qi)</b>	

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**
*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

<b>Legend</b>	
<b>Bi</b>	= average of the coefficient between 0 and 1, assigned by the members of the Technical Committee
<b>Qi</b>	= weight (single weight) assigned to each sub-criterion in the Tender Regulation
<b>PTec_A</b>	= score assigned to the technical offer.
If one of the calculated scores for C, S or Q are in <b>RED</b> then the minimum score of that Criterion is not met. In that case the bid is <b>NOT</b> eligible for the award of the framework contract! In that case the cell with total calculated score (Ptec_A) will turn <b>RED</b> . If all 3 minimum scores are met, the cells will be <b>GREEN</b> . Cell with total calculated score (Ptec_A) will also be <b>GREEN</b> .	

The final result, as drafted in the "Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: evaluation of the technical offers and final scores assignment", is reported below:

Bid ID	Bidder	Ptec_A	Final Judgement
1.6	Temporary Grouping of Operators (TGO) between: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Interway SRO</li> <li>- Teamnet International SA</li> <li>- Liberologico SRL</li> <li>- Università degli Studi di Messina</li> </ul>	58,64	It <b>reaches the minimum scores provided</b> related to all three criteria: Challenge, Security and Quality.

**Therefore the President, according to Paragraph 15.3 of TR, taking in account the final judgment of the Technical Committee Lot 1, and come the assent for the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová), establishes that the Administrative Committee WILL OPEN the envelope containing the financial offer of the bid ID 1.6 submitted by INTERWAY SRO'S TGO.**

### 11.6.2 EVALUATION OF THE FINANCIAL OFFER

The President verifies the integrity of the envelope containing the Financial Offer, opens it and publicly reads the two prices submitted *Overall Total Value* (OTV) and *Estimated Full Price* (EFP) and the *Breakdown into Cost Categories and Unite Price* (BCUP).

The President verifies:

- that the amount indicated - in both case - is the same in numbers and in words;
- that the OTV submitted do not exceed the maximum amount which is established, for the Phase I, for Lot 1 in € 40.000,00 (forty thousand/00) [excluding VAT]

At the same time the Technical Support records these on dedicate table sheet and proceeds to photograph the documents and to sharing with the members of the Administrative Committee, through the dedicated secure online AgID's platform (<https://cowork.agid.gov.it>).

#### 11.6.2.1 EVALUATION OF THE OVERALL TOTAL VALUE (OTV)

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

After completing the opening, President asks Technical Support to calculate the score ( $P_{fin\_A}$ ) of the price offered ( $OTV=V_{o\_A}$ ) by 1.6 - INTERWAY SRO'S TGO. The following table contain the Financial Score related to the price offered for bid ID 2.3.

Bidder	Vo_A	Vmax	Pmax_A	Pfin_A = $P_{max\_A} * (V_{max} - V_{o\_A}) / V_{max}$
1.6 - Interway SRO's TGO	€ 39.900,00	€ 40.000	20	<b>0,05</b>

#### 11.6.2.2 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE ESTIMATED FULL PRICE (EFP)

The table with EFP and OTV is reported in Annex 1 of this document.

#### 11.6.2.3 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE BREAKDOWN INTO COST CATEGORIES AND UNIT PRICES (BCUP)

The two tables for each bid are reported in Annex 2 of this document.

#### 11.6.3 VERIFICATION THE REGULARITY OF THE ANNEX F – DECLARATION OF SUBCONTRACTING

The Bidder submitted four Annexes F, one per each companies of TGO, to declare that, in case of awarding, neither single operators nor TGO intend to subcontract any of activities covered by Tender Regulation.

The Administrative Committee checked the regularity of the submitted declarations.

### 11.7 BID 1.7 – CAPGEMINI ITALIA SPA'S TGO

#### 11.7.1 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFER

The President verifies that all members of the Administrative Committee have inspected the Special Report drafted by Technical Committee Lot 1.

The table below reports the results of the technical score ( $P_{tec\_A}$ ) assigned by Technical Committee Lot 1 to bid ID 1.7 submitted by CAPGEMINI ITALIA SPA'S TGO, according to the document "*Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: evaluation of the technical offers and final scores assignment*":

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.



1.7 - Cppgemini Italia SPA's TGO					
Criterion	Criterion short description	Bi	Qi (Phase I)	Bi*Qi	Minimum score rached (>50% of the Qi of C)
<b>C</b>	<b>Challenge</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>14,69</b>	<b>YES</b>
C1	Likelihood to meet the main challenges for the lot	0,76	5	3,80	
C2	Overall contribution to realize the Usage scenario described in Section 1.4 of the "Annex IV(A): Challenges and general requirements	0,76	2	1,52	
C3	Degree of fulfilment of the challenge	0,70	4	2,80	
C4	Innovation level (motivation by bidders)	0,73	9	6,57	
<b>I</b>	<b>Impact</b>		<b>25</b>	<b>18,72</b>	
I1	Impact on (digital) society, multiplier effects	0,76	7	5,32	
I2	Impact on government cloud adoption	0,76	7	5,32	
I3	Public sector service impact	0,86	5	4,30	
I4	Commercialisation and exploitation plan of IPR	0,63	2	1,26	
I5	Proposed sharing of risk and benefits	0,63	4	2,52	
<b>S</b>	<b>Security</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>9,21</b>	<b>YES</b>
S1	Risk assessment impact (C, I, A dimensions)	0,00	0	0,00	
S2	Risk analysis	0,73	5	3,65	
S3	Risk mitigation measures	0,73	4	2,92	
S4	System management security	0,00	0	0,00	
S5	Operational security, proposed certifications	0,66	4	2,64	
<b>Q</b>	<b>Quality</b>		<b>22</b>	<b>16,70</b>	<b>YES</b>
Q1	Portability, applicability in different architectures	0,73	9	6,57	
Q2	Bid document quality, focus on challenge and solution	0,83	5	4,15	
Q3	Quality of project plan, resources allocation, acceptance plan	0,66	2	1,32	
Q4	Alignment with EU standards and legislation	0,80	2	1,60	
Q5	Resilience and target service SLA	0,00	0	0,00	
Q6	Completeness of the proposed prototypes and pilot	0,73	2	1,46	
Q7	Early/continuous quality assurance	0,80	2	1,60	
Q8	Performance and end-user experience	0,00	0	0,00	
				<b>59,32</b>	
				<b>Ptec A=Σ(Bi*Qi)</b>	

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**
*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

<b>Legend</b>
<b>Bi</b> = average of the coefficient between 0 and 1, assigned by the members of the Technical Committee
<b>Qi</b> = weight (single weight) assigned to each sub-criterion in the Tender Regulation
<b>PTec_A</b> = score assigned to the technical offer.
If one of the calculated scores for C, S or Q are in <b>RED</b> then the minimum score of that Criterion is not met. In that case the bid is <b>NOT</b> eligible for the award of the framework contract! In that case the cell with total calculated score (Ptec_A) will turn <b>RED</b> . If all 3 minimum scores are met, the cells will be <b>GREEN</b> . Cell with total calculated score (Ptec_A) will also be <b>GREEN</b> .

The final result, as drafted in the “Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: evaluation of the technical offers and final scores assignment”, is reported below:

Bid ID	Bidder	Ptec_A	Final Judgement
1.7	Temporary Grouping of Operators (TGO) between: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Capgemini Italia SPA</li> <li>- Università del Salento</li> <li>- Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche – Istituto di Scienze e Tecnologie della Cognizione (CNR - ISTC)</li> </ul>	59,32	It <b>reaches the minimum scores provided</b> related to all three criteria: Challenge, Security and Quality.

**Therefore the President, according to Paragraph 15.3 of TR, taking in account the final judgment of the Technical Committee Lot 1, and come the assent for the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová), establishes that the Administrative Committee WILL OPEN the envelope containing the financial offer of the bid ID 1.7 submitted by **CAPGEMINI ITALIA SPA'S TGO**.**

### 11.7.2 EVALUATION OF THE FINANCIAL OFFER

The President verifies the integrity of the envelope containing the Financial Offer, opens it and publicly reads the two prices submitted *Overall Total Value* (OTV) and *Estimated Full Price* (EFP) and the *Breakdown into Cost Categories and Unite Price* (BCUP).

The President verifies:

- that the amount indicated - in both case - is the same in numbers and in words;
- that the OTV submitted do not exceed the maximum amount which is established, for the Phase I, for the Lot 1 in € 40.000,00 (thirty thousand/00) [excluding VAT].

At the same time the Technical Support records these values on dedicate table sheet and proceeds to photograph the documents and to sharing with the members of the Administrative Committee, through the dedicated secure online AgID's platform <https://cowork.agid.gov.it>.

#### 11.7.2.1 EVALUATION OF THE OVERALL TOTAL VALUE (OTV)

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

After completing the opening, President asks Technical Support to calculate the score ( $P_{fin\_A}$ ) of the price offered ( $OTV=V_{o\_A}$ ) by *CAPGEMINI ITALIA SPA'S TGO*. The following table contain the Financial Score related to the price offered for bid ID 1.7.

Bidder	$V_{o\_A}$	$V_{max}$	$P_{max\_A}$	$P_{fin\_A}$ = $P_{max\_A} * (V_{max} - V_{o\_A}) / V_{max}$
1.7 - Capgemini Italia SPA's TGO	€ 29.935,10	€ 40.000	20	<b>5,03</b>

#### 11.7.2.2 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE ESTIMATED FULL PRICE (EFP)

The table with EFP and OTV is reported in Annex 1 of this document.

#### 11.7.2.3 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE BREAKDOWN INTO COST CATEGORIES AND UNIT PRICES (BCUP)

The two tables for each bid are reported in Annex 2 of this document.

### 11.7.3 VERIFICATION THE REGULARITY OF THE ANNEX F – DECLARATION OF SUBCONTRACTING

The Bidder submitted one Annex F to declare, in case of awarding:

- that the single operators will not subcontract any of activities covered by Tender Regulation;
- that the TGO intends to subcontract, within the limits provided by article 118 of Code of public contract and further amendments, the activities listed in the same document.

The Administrative Committee checked the regularity of the submitted declaration.

## 11.8 BID 1.8 – SIELTE SPA'S TGO

### 11.8.1 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFER

The President verifies that all members of the Administrative Committee have inspected the Special Report drafted by Technical Committee Lot 1.

The table below reports the results of the technical score ( $P_{tec\_A}$ ) assigned by Technical Committee Lot 1 to bid ID 1.8 submitted by *SIELTE SPA'S TGO*, according to the document "*Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: evaluation of the technical offers and final scores assignment*":

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

1.8 - Siete SPA's TGO					
Criterion	Criterion short description	Bi	Qi (Phase I)	Bi*Qi	Minimum score rached (>50% of the Qi of C)
<b>C</b>	<b>Challenge</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>8,10</b>	<b>NO</b>
C1	Likelihood to meet the main challenges for the lot	0,53	5	2,65	
C2	Overall contribution to realize the Usage scenario described in Section 1.4 of the "Annex IV(A): Challenges and general requirements	0,33	2	0,66	
C3	Degree of fulfilment of the challenge	0,23	4	0,92	
C4	Innovation level (motivation by bidders)	0,43	9	3,87	
<b>I</b>	<b>Impact</b>		<b>25</b>	<b>13,06</b>	
I1	Impact on (digital) society, multiplier effects	0,53	7	3,71	
I2	Impact on government cloud adoption	0,53	7	3,71	
I3	Public sector service impact	0,56	5	2,80	
I4	Commercialisation and exploitation plan of IPR	0,50	2	1,00	
I5	Proposed sharing of risk and benefits	0,46	4	1,84	
<b>S</b>	<b>Security</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>6,64</b>	<b>YES</b>
S1	Risk assessment impact (C, I, A dimensions)	0,00	0	0,00	
S2	Risk analysis	0,56	5	2,80	
S3	Risk mitigation measures	0,56	4	2,24	
S4	System management security	0,00	0	0,00	
S5	Operational security, proposed certifications	0,40	4	1,60	
<b>Q</b>	<b>Quality</b>		<b>22</b>	<b>10,14</b>	<b>NO</b>
Q1	Portability, applicability in different architectures	0,43	9	3,87	
Q2	Bid document quality, focus on challenge and solution	0,63	5	3,15	
Q3	Quality of project plan, resources allocation, acceptance plan	0,60	2	1,20	
Q4	Alignment with EU standards and legislation	0,56	2	1,12	
Q5	Resilience and target service SLA	0,00	0	0,00	
Q6	Completeness of the proposed prototypes and pilot	0,20	2	0,40	
Q7	Early/continuous quality assurance	0,20	2	0,40	
Q8	Performance and end-user experience	0,00	0	0,00	
				<b>37,94</b>	
				<b>Ptec A=Σ(Bi*Qi)</b>	

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**
*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

<b>Legend</b>
<b>Bi</b> = average of the coefficient between 0 and 1, assigned by the members of the Technical Committee
<b>Qi</b> = weight (single weight) assigned to each sub-criterion in the Tender Regulation
<b>PTec_A</b> = score assigned to the technical offer.
If one of the calculated scores for C, S or Q are in <b>RED</b> then the minimum score of that Criterion is not met. In that case the bid is <b>NOT</b> eligible for the award of the framework contract! In that case the cell with total calculated score (Ptec_A) will turn <b>RED</b> . If all 3 minimum scores are met, the cells will be <b>GREEN</b> . Cell with total calculated score (Ptec_A) will also be <b>GREEN</b> .

The final result, as drafted in the "Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: evaluation of the technical offers and final scores assignment", is reported below:

Bid ID	Bidder	Ptec_A	Final Judgement
1.8	Temporary Grouping of Operators (TGO) between: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sielte SPA</li> <li>- Università degli Studi di Bari</li> <li>- Università degli Studi di Catania</li> <li>- Fondazione Centro Europeo di Formazione, Ricerca, Ingegneria Sismica (EUCENTRE)</li> <li>- Etna Hitech SCPA</li> <li>- Cooperativa EDP La Traccia</li> <li>- ITSLAB SRL</li> </ul>	<b>37,94</b>	It <b>does not reach</b> the minimum score provided for all three criteria: Challenge, Security and Quality. It only reaches the minimum score for Security.

Therefore the President, according to Paragraph 15.3 of TR, taking in account the final judgment of the Technical Committee Lot 1, and come the assent for the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová), establishes that the Administrative Committee **WILL NOT OPEN** the envelope containing the financial offer of the bid ID 1.8 submitted by **SIELTE SPA'S TGO**.

## 11.9 BID 1.9 – NEC ITALIA SPA

### 11.9.1 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFER

The President verifies that all members of the Administrative Committee have inspected the Special Report drafted by Technical Committee Lot 1.

The table below reports the results of the technical score (*Ptec\_A*) assigned by Technical Committee Lot 1 to bid ID 1.9 submitted by *NEC ITALIA SPA*, according to the document "Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: evaluation of the technical offers and final scores assignment":

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

1.9 - NEC Italia SPA					
Criterion	Criterion short description	Bi	Qi (Phase I)	Bi*Qi	Minimum score reached (>50% of the Qi of C)
<b>C</b>	<b>Challenge</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>13,51</b>	<b>YES</b>
C1	Likelihood to meet the main challenges for the lot	0,73	5	3,65	
C2	Overall contribution to realize the Usage scenario described in Section 1.4 of the "Annex IV(A): Challenges and general requirements	0,70	2	1,40	
C3	Degree of fulfilment of the challenge	0,63	4	2,52	
C4	Innovation level (motivation by bidders)	0,66	9	5,94	
<b>I</b>	<b>Impact</b>		<b>25</b>	<b>16,79</b>	
I1	Impact on (digital) society, multiplier effects	0,63	7	4,41	
I2	Impact on government cloud adoption	0,66	7	4,62	
I3	Public sector service impact	0,66	5	3,30	
I4	Commercialisation and exploitation plan of IPR	0,63	2	1,26	
I5	Proposed sharing of risk and benefits	0,80	4	3,20	
<b>S</b>	<b>Security</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>7,44</b>	<b>YES</b>
S1	Risk assessment impact (C, I, A dimensions)	0,00	0	0,00	
S2	Risk analysis	0,56	5	2,80	
S3	Risk mitigation measures	0,60	4	2,40	
S4	System management security	0,00	0	0,00	
S5	Operational security, proposed certifications	0,56	4	2,24	
<b>Q</b>	<b>Quality</b>		<b>22</b>	<b>14,20</b>	<b>YES</b>
Q1	Portability, applicability in different architectures	0,60	9	5,40	
Q2	Bid document quality, focus on challenge and solution	0,70	5	3,50	
Q3	Quality of project plan, resources allocation, acceptance plan	0,76	2	1,52	
Q4	Alignment with EU standards and legislation	0,56	2	1,12	
Q5	Resilience and target service SLA	0,00	0	0,00	
Q6	Completeness of the proposed prototypes and pilot	0,63	2	1,26	
Q7	Early/continuous quality assurance	0,70	2	1,40	
Q8	Performance and end-user experience	0,00	0	0,00	
				<b>51,94</b>	
				<b>Ptec A=Σ(Bi*Qi)</b>	

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**
*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

<b>Legend</b>	
<b>Bi</b>	= average of the coefficient between 0 and 1, assigned by the members of the Technical Committee
<b>Qi</b>	= weight (single weight) assigned to each sub-criterion in the Tender Regulation
<b>PTec_A</b>	= score assigned to the technical offer.
If one of the calculated scores for C, S or Q are in <b>RED</b> then the minimum score of that Criterion is not met. In that case the bid is <b>NOT</b> eligible for the award of the framework contract! In that case the cell with total calculated score (Ptec_A) will turn <b>RED</b> . If all 3 minimum scores are met, the cells will be <b>GREEN</b> . Cell with total calculated score (Ptec_A) will also be <b>GREEN</b> .	

The final result, as drafted in the “Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: evaluation of the technical offers and final scores assignment”, is reported below:

Bid ID	Bidder	Ptec_A	Final Judgement
1.9	NEC Italia SPA	51,94	It <b>reaches the minimum scores provided</b> related to all three criteria: Challenge, Security and Quality.

**Therefore the President, according to Paragraph 15.3 of TR, taking in account the final judgment of the Technical Committee Lot 1, and come the assent for the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová), establishes that the Administrative Committee WILL OPEN the envelope containing the financial offer of the bid ID 1.9 submitted by NEC ITALIA SPA.**

### 11.9.2 EVALUATION OF THE FINANCIAL OFFER

The President verifies the integrity of the envelope containing the Financial Offer, opens it and publicly reads the two prices submitted *Overall Total Value* (OTV) and *Estimated Full Price* (EFP) and the *Breakdown into Cost Categories and Unite Price* (BCUP).

The President verifies:

- that the amount indicated - in both case - is the same in numbers and in words;
- that the OTV submitted do not exceed the maximum amount which is established, for the Phase I, for Lot 1 in € 40.000,00 (forty thousand/00) [excluding VAT]

At the same time the Technical Support records these values on dedicate table sheet and proceeds to photograph the documents and to sharing with the members of the Administrative Committee, through the dedicated secure online AgID’s platform (<https://cowork.agid.gov.it>).

#### 11.9.2.1 EVALUATION OF THE OVERALL TOTAL VALUE (OTV)

After completing the opening, President asks Technical Support to calculate the score (*Pfin\_A*) of the price offered ( $OTV=Vo_A$ ) by NEC ITALIA SPA. The following table contain the Financial Score related to the price offered for bid ID 1.9.

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

Bidder	Vo_A	Vmax	Pmax_A	Pfin_A =Pmax_A*(Vmax-Vo_A)/Vmax
1.9 - NEC Italia SPA	€ 34.109,00	€ 40.000	20	<b>2,94</b>

#### 11.9.2.2 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE ESTIMATED FULL PRICE (EFP)

The table with EFP and OTV is reported in Annex 1 of this document.

#### 11.9.2.3 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE BREAKDOWN INTO COST CATEGORIES AND UNIT PRICES (BCUP)

The two tables for each bid are reported in Annex 2 of this document

#### 11.9.3 VERIFICATION THE REGULARITY OF THE ANNEX F – DECLARATION OF SUBCONTRACTING

The Bidder did not submit the Annex F. The Administrative Committee establishes that the omission of the Annex F is equivalent to the submission of the Annex F containing the declaration of renunciation to the subcontracting.

### 11.10 BID 1.10 – HEWLETT PACKARD ITALIANA SRL

#### 11.10.1 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFER

The President verifies that all members of the Administrative Committee have inspected the Special Report drafted by Technical Committee Lot 1.

The table below reports the results of the technical score (*Ptec\_A*) assigned by Technical Committee Lot 1 to bid ID 1.10 submitted by *HEWLETT PACKARD ITALIANA SRL*, according to the document "*Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: evaluation of the technical offers and final scores assignment*":

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.



1.10 - Hewlett Packard Italiana SRL					
Criterion	Criterion short description	Bi	Qi (Phase I)	Bi*Qi	Minimum score reached (>50% of the Qi of C)
<b>C</b>	<b>Challenge</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>15,46</b>	<b>YES</b>
C1	Likelihood to meet the main challenges for the lot	0,86	5	4,30	
C2	Overall contribution to realize the Usage scenario described in Section 1.4 of the "Annex IV(A): Challenges and general requirements	0,70	2	1,40	
C3	Degree of fulfilment of the challenge	0,73	4	2,92	
C4	Innovation level (motivation by bidders)	0,76	9	6,84	
<b>I</b>	<b>Impact</b>		<b>25</b>	<b>19,99</b>	
I1	Impact on (digital) society, multiplicator effects	0,76	7	5,32	
I2	Impact on government cloud adoption	0,86	7	6,02	
I3	Public sector service impact	0,83	5	4,15	
I4	Commercialisation and exploitation plan of IPR	0,73	2	1,46	
I5	Proposed sharing of risk and benefits	0,76	4	3,04	
<b>S</b>	<b>Security</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>9,72</b>	<b>YES</b>
S1	Risk assessment impact (C, I, A dimensions)	0,00	0	0,00	
S2	Risk analysis	0,80	5	4,00	
S3	Risk mitigation measures	0,60	4	2,40	
S4	System management security	0,00	0	0,00	
S5	Operational security, proposed certifications	0,83	4	3,32	
<b>Q</b>	<b>Quality</b>		<b>22</b>	<b>12,93</b>	<b>YES</b>
Q1	Portability, applicability in different architectures	0,43	9	3,87	
Q2	Bid document quality, focus on challenge and solution	0,80	5	4,00	
Q3	Quality of project plan, resources allocation, acceptance plan	0,50	2	1,00	
Q4	Alignment with EU standards and legislation	0,53	2	1,06	
Q5	Resilience and target service SLA	0,00	0	0,00	
Q6	Completeness of the proposed prototypes and pilot	0,70	2	1,40	
Q7	Early/continuous quality assurance	0,80	2	1,60	
Q8	Performance and end-user experience	0,00	0	0,00	
				<b>58,10</b>	
				<b>Ptec. A = <math>\sum(Bi*Qi)</math></b>	

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**
*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

<b>Legend</b>	
<b>Bi</b>	= average of the coefficient between 0 and 1, assigned by the members of the Technical Committee
<b>Qi</b>	= weight (single weight) assigned to each sub-criterion in the Tender Regulation
<b>PTec_A</b>	= score assigned to the technical offer.
If one of the calculated scores for C, S or Q are in <b>RED</b> then the minimum score of that Criterion is not met. In that case the bid is <b>NOT</b> eligible for the award of the framework contract! In that case the cell with total calculated score (Ptec_A) will turn <b>RED</b> . If all 3 minimum scores are met, the cells will be <b>GREEN</b> . Cell with total calculated score (Ptec_A) will also be <b>GREEN</b> .	

The final result, as drafted in the "Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: evaluation of the technical offers and final scores assignment", is reported below:

Bid ID	Bidder	Ptec_A	Final Judgement
1.10	Hewlett Packard Italiana SRL	<b>58,10</b>	It <b>reaches the minimum scores provided</b> related to all three criteria: Challenge, Security and Quality.

**Therefore the President, according to Paragraph 15.3 of TR, taking in account the final judgment of the Technical Committee Lot 1, and come the assent for the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová), establishes that the Administrative Committee WILL OPEN the envelope containing the financial offer of the bid ID 1.10 submitted by HEWLETT PACKARD ITALIANA SRL.**

### 11.10.2 EVALUATION OF THE FINANCIAL OFFER

The President verifies the integrity of the envelope containing the Financial Offer, opens it and publicly reads the two prices submitted *Overall Total Value* (OTV) and *Estimated Full Price* (EFP) and the *Breakdown into Cost Categories and Unite Price* (BCUP).

The President verifies:

- that the amount indicated - in both case - is the same in numbers and in words;
- that the OTV submitted do not exceed the maximum amount which is established, for the Phase I, for Lot 1 in € 40.000,00 (forty thousand/00) [excluding VAT]

At the same time the Technical Support records these values on dedicate table sheet and proceeds to photograph the documents and to sharing with the members of the Administrative Committee, through the dedicated secure online AgID's platform (<https://cowork.agid.gov.it>).

#### 11.10.2.1 EVALUATION OF THE OVERALL TOTAL VALUE (OTV)

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

After completing the opening, President asks Technical Support to calculate the score ( $P_{fin\_A}$ ) of the price offered ( $OTV=V_{o\_A}$ ) by HEWLETT PACKARD ITALIANA SRL. The following table contain the Financial Score related to the price offered for bid ID 1.10.

Bidder	$V_{o\_A}$	$V_{max}$	$P_{max\_A}$	$P_{fin\_A}$ = $P_{max\_A} * (V_{max} - V_{o\_A}) / V_{max}$
1.10 - Hewlett Packard Italiana SRL	€ 40.000,00	€ 40.000	20	<b>0,00</b>

#### 11.10.2.2 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE ESTIMATED FULL PRICE (EFP)

The table with EFP and OTV is reported in Annex 1 of this document.

#### 11.10.2.3 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE BREAKDOWN INTO COST CATEGORIES AND UNIT PRICES (BCUP)

The two tables for each bid are reported in Annex 2 of this document.

### 11.10.3 VERIFICATION THE REGULARITY OF THE ANNEX F – DECLARATION OF SUBCONTRACTING

The Bidder submitted one Annex F to declare, in case of awarding, it intends to subcontract, within the limits provided by article 118 of Code of public contract and further amendments, the activities listed in the same document.

The Administrative Committee checked the regularity of the submitted declaration.

## 11.11 BID 1.11 – IBM ITALIA SPA

### 11.11.1 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFER

The President verifies that all members of the Administrative Committee have inspected the Special Report drafted by Technical Committee Lot 1.

The table below reports the results of the technical score ( $P_{tec\_A}$ ) assigned by Technical Committee Lot 1 to bid ID 1.11 submitted by IBM ITALIA SPA, according to the document "*Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: evaluation of the technical offers and final scores assignment*":

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

1.11 - IBM Italia SPA					
Criterion	Criterion short description	Bi	Qi (Phase I)	Bi*Qi	Minimum score reached (>50% of the Qi of C)
<b>C</b>	<b>Challenge</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>13,98</b>	<b>YES</b>
C1	Likelihood to meet the main challenges for the lot	0,80	5	4,00	
C2	Overall contribution to realize the Usage scenario described in Section 1.4 of the "Annex IV(A): Challenges and general requirements	0,76	2	1,52	
C3	Degree of fulfilment of the challenge	0,63	4	2,52	
C4	Innovation level (motivation by bidders)	0,66	9	5,94	
<b>I</b>	<b>Impact</b>		<b>25</b>	<b>16,72</b>	
I1	Impact on (digital) society, multiplier effects	0,76	7	5,32	
I2	Impact on government cloud adoption	0,80	7	5,60	
I3	Public sector service impact	0,76	5	3,80	
I4	Commercialisation and exploitation plan of IPR	0,60	2	1,20	
I5	Proposed sharing of risk and benefits	0,20	4	0,80	
<b>S</b>	<b>Security</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>8,38</b>	<b>YES</b>
S1	Risk assessment impact (C, I, A dimensions)	0,00	0	0,00	
S2	Risk analysis	0,70	5	3,50	
S3	Risk mitigation measures	0,66	4	2,64	
S4	System management security	0,00	0	0,00	
S5	Operational security, proposed certifications	0,56	4	2,24	
<b>Q</b>	<b>Quality</b>		<b>22</b>	<b>15,38</b>	<b>YES</b>
Q1	Portability, applicability in different architectures	0,70	9	6,30	
Q2	Bid document quality, focus on challenge and solution	0,70	5	3,50	
Q3	Quality of project plan, resources allocation, acceptance plan	0,80	2	1,60	
Q4	Alignment with EU standards and legislation	0,63	2	1,26	
Q5	Resilience and target service SLA	0,00	0	0,00	
Q6	Completeness of the proposed prototypes and pilot	0,66	2	1,32	
Q7	Early/continuous quality assurance	0,70	2	1,40	
Q8	Performance and end-user experience	0,00	0	0,00	
				<b>54,46</b>	
				<b>Ptec A = <math>\sum(Bi*Qi)</math></b>	

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**
*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

<b>Legend</b>	
<b>Bi</b>	= average of the coefficient between 0 and 1, assigned by the members of the Technical Committee
<b>Qi</b>	= weight (single weight) assigned to each sub-criterion in the Tender Regulation
<b>PTec_A</b>	= score assigned to the technical offer.
If one of the calculated scores for C, S or Q are in <b>RED</b> then the minimum score of that Criterion is not met. In that case the bid is <b>NOT</b> eligible for the award of the framework contract! In that case the cell with total calculated score (Ptec_A) will turn <b>RED</b> . If all 3 minimum scores are met, the cells will be <b>GREEN</b> . Cell with total calculated score (Ptec_A) will also be <b>GREEN</b> .	

The final result, as drafted in the “Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: evaluation of the technical offers and final scores assignment”, is reported below:

Bid ID	Bidder	Ptec_A	Final Judgement
1.11	IBM Italia SPA	54,46	It <b>reaches the minimum scores provided</b> related to all three criteria: Challenge, Security and Quality.

**Therefore the President, according to Paragraph 15.3 of TR, taking in account the final judgment of the Technical Committee Lot 1, and come the assent for the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová), establishes that the Administrative Committee WILL OPEN the envelope containing the financial offer of the bid ID 1.11 submitted by IBM ITALIA SPA.**

### 11.11.2 EVALUATION OF THE FINANCIAL OFFER

The President verifies the integrity of the envelope containing the Financial Offer, opens it and publicly reads the two prices submitted *Overall Total Value* (OTV) and *Estimated Full Price* (EFP) and the *Breakdown into Cost Categories and Unite Price* (BCUP).

The President verifies:

- that the amount indicated - in both case - is the same in numbers and in words;
- that the OTV submitted do not exceed the maximum amount which is established, for the Phase I, for Lot 1 in € 40.000,00 (forty thousand/00) [excluding VAT]

At the same time the Technical Support records these values on dedicate table sheet and proceeds to photograph the documents and to sharing with the members of the Administrative Committee, through the dedicated secure online AgID’s platform (<https://cowork.agid.gov.it>).

#### 11.11.2.1 EVALUATION OF THE OVERALL TOTAL VALUE (OTV)

After completing the opening, President asks Technical Support to calculate the score (*Pfin\_A*) of the price offered ( $OTV=Vo_A$ ) by IBM ITALIA SPA. The following table contain the Financial Score related to the price offered for bid ID 1.11.

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

Bidder	Vo_A	Vmax	Pmax_A	Pfin_A =Pmax_A*(Vmax- Vo_A)/Vmax
1.11 - IBM Italia SPA	€ 36.000,00	€ 40.000	20	<b>2,00</b>

#### 11.11.2.2 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE ESTIMATED FULL PRICE (EFP)

The table with EFP and OTV is reported in Annex 1 of this document.

#### 11.11.2.3 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE BREAKDOWN INTO COST CATEGORIES AND UNIT PRICES (BCUP)

The two tables for each bid are reported in Annex 2 of this document.

#### 11.11.3 VERIFICATION THE REGULARITY OF THE ANNEX F – DECLARATION OF SUBCONTRACTING

The Bidder submitted one Annex F to declare, in case of awarding, it intends to subcontract, within the limits provided by article 118 of Code of public contract and further amendments, the activities listed in the same document.

The Administrative Committee checked the regularity of the submitted declaration.

### 11.12 BID 1.12 – NTT DATA ITALIA SPA'S TGO

#### 11.12.1 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFER

The President verifies that all members of the Administrative Committee have inspected the Special Report drafted by Technical Committee Lot 1.

The table below reports the results of the technical score ( $P_{tec\_A}$ ) assigned by Technical Committee Lot 1 to bid ID 1.12 submitted by *NTT DATA ITALIA SPA'S TGO*, according to the document "*Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: evaluation of the technical offers and final scores assignment*":

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

1.12 - NTT Data Italia SPA's TGO					
Criterion	Criterion short description	Bi	Qi (Phase I)	Bi*Qi	Minimum score reached (>50% of the Qi of C)
<b>C</b>	<b>Challenge</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>15,81</b>	<b>YES</b>
C1	Likelihood to meet the main challenges for the lot	0,83	5	4,15	
C2	Overall contribution to realize the Usage scenario described in Section 1.4 of the "Annex IV(A): Challenges and general requirements	0,83	2	1,66	
C3	Degree of fulfilment of the challenge	0,70	4	2,80	
C4	Innovation level (motivation by bidders)	0,80	9	7,20	
<b>I</b>	<b>Impact</b>		<b>25</b>	<b>19,19</b>	
I1	Impact on (digital) society, multiplier effects	0,76	7	5,32	
I2	Impact on government cloud adoption	0,83	7	5,81	
I3	Public sector service impact	0,80	5	4,00	
I4	Commercialisation and exploitation plan of IPR	0,63	2	1,26	
I5	Proposed sharing of risk and benefits	0,70	4	2,80	
<b>S</b>	<b>Security</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>10,42</b>	<b>YES</b>
S1	Risk assessment impact (C, I, A dimensions)	0,00	0	0,00	
S2	Risk analysis	0,86	5	4,30	
S3	Risk mitigation measures	0,83	4	3,32	
S4	System management security	0,00	0	0,00	
S5	Operational security, proposed certifications	0,70	4	2,80	
<b>Q</b>	<b>Quality</b>		<b>22</b>	<b>16,40</b>	<b>YES</b>
Q1	Portability, applicability in different architectures	0,66	9	5,94	
Q2	Bid document quality, focus on challenge and solution	0,86	5	4,30	
Q3	Quality of project plan, resources allocation, acceptance plan	0,83	2	1,66	
Q4	Alignment with EU standards and legislation	0,76	2	1,52	
Q5	Resilience and target service SLA	0,00	0	0,00	
Q6	Completeness of the proposed prototypes and pilot	0,76	2	1,52	
Q7	Early/continuous quality assurance	0,73	2	1,46	
Q8	Performance and end-user experience	0,00	0	0,00	
				<b>61,82</b>	
				<b>Ptec A = <math>\sum(Bi*Qi)</math></b>	

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**
*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

<b>Legend</b>
<b>Bi</b> = average of the coefficient between 0 and 1, assigned by the members of the Technical Committee
<b>Qi</b> = weight (single weight) assigned to each sub-criterion in the Tender Regulation
<b>PTec_A</b> = score assigned to the technical offer.
If one of the calculated scores for C, S or Q are in <b>RED</b> then the minimum score of that Criterion is not met. In that case the bid is <b>NOT</b> eligible for the award of the framework contract! In that case the cell with total calculated score (Ptec_A) will turn <b>RED</b> . If all 3 minimum scores are met, the cells will be <b>GREEN</b> . Cell with total calculated score (Ptec_A) will also be <b>GREEN</b> .

The final result, as drafted in the "Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: evaluation of the technical offers and final scores assignment", is reported below:

Bid ID	Bidder	Ptec_A	Final Judgement
1.12	Temporary Grouping of Operators (TGO) between: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NTT Data Italia SPA</li> <li>- Centro Interdipartimentale di Ricerca in Storia del Diritto, Filosofia e Sociologia del Diritto e Informatica Giuridica dell'Università di Bologna (CIRSFID)</li> <li>- Università degli Studi di Roma Tor Vergata</li> </ul>	61,82	It <b>reaches the minimum scores provided</b> related to all three criteria: Challenge, Security and Quality.

Therefore the President, according to Paragraph 15.3 of TR, taking in account the final judgment of the Technical Committee Lot 1, and come the assent for the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová), establishes that the Administrative Committee **WILL OPEN** the envelope containing the financial offer of the bid ID 1.12 submitted by NTT DATA ITALIA SPA'S TGO.

### 11.12.2 EVALUATION OF THE FINANCIAL OFFER

The President verifies the integrity of the envelope containing the Financial Offer, opens it and publicly reads the two prices submitted *Overall Total Value (OTV)* and *Estimated Full Price (EFP)* and the *Breakdown into Cost Categories and Unite Price (BCUP)*.

The President verifies:

- that the amount indicated - in both case - is the same in numbers and in words;
- that the OTV submitted do not exceed the maximum amount which is established, for the Phase I, for Lot 1 in € 40.000,00 (forty thousand/00) [excluding VAT]

At the same time the Technical Support records these values on dedicate table sheet and proceeds to photograph the documents and to sharing with the members of the Administrative Committee, through the dedicated secure online AgID's platform (<https://cowork.agid.gov.it>).

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.



### 11.12.2.1 EVALUATION OF THE OVERALL TOTAL VALUE (OTV)

After completing the opening, President asks Technical Support to calculate the score ( $P_{fin\_A}$ ) of the price offered ( $OTV=V_{o\_A}$ ) by *NTT DATA ITALIA SPA'S TGO*. The following table contain the Financial Score related to the price offered for bid ID 1.12.

Bidder	$V_{o\_A}$	Vmax	$P_{max\_A}$	$P_{fin\_A}$ = $P_{max\_A} \cdot (V_{max} - V_{o\_A}) / V_{max}$
1.12 - NTT Data Italia SPA's TGO	€ 38.000,00	€ 40.000	20	<b>1,00</b>

### 11.12.2.2 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE ESTIMATED FULL PRICE (EFP)

The table with EFP and OTV is reported in Annex 1 of this document.

### 11.12.2.3 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE BREAKDOWN INTO COST CATEGORIES AND UNIT PRICES (BCUP)

The two tables for each bid are reported in Annex 2 of this document.

## 11.12.3 VERIFICATION THE REGULARITY OF THE ANNEX F – DECLARATION OF SUBCONTRACTING

The Bidder submitted three Annexes F, one per each companies of TGO:

- *NTT DATA*, as a single operator, declares that, in case of awarding, intends to subcontract, within the limits provided by article 118 of Code of public contract and further amendments, the activities listed in the same document;
- *CIRSFID*, as a single operator, declares that, in case of awarding, intends to subcontract, within the limits provided by article 118 of Code of public contract and further amendments, the activities listed in the same document;
- *UNIVERSITÀ DI TOR VERGATA*, as the single operator, declares that, in case of awarding, will not subcontract any of activities covered by Tender Regulation;
- all declare that, in case of awarding, the TGO intends to subcontract, within the limits provided by article 118 of Code of public contract and further amendments, the activities listed in the same document.

The Administrative Committee checked the regularity of the submitted declarations.

## 11.13 BID 1.13 – PROLOGUE

### 11.13.1 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL OFFER

The President verifies that all members of the Administrative Committee have inspected the Special Report drafted by Technical Committee Lot 1.

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

The table below reports the results of the technical score ( $P_{tec\_A}$ ) assigned by Technical Committee Lot 1 to bid ID 1.13 submitted by PROLOGUE, according to the document "Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: evaluation of the technical offers and final scores assignment":

1.13 - Prologue					
Criterion	Criterion short description	Bi	Qi (Phase I)	Bi*Qi	Minimum score reached (>50% of the Qi of C)
<b>C</b>	<b>Challenge</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>13,71</b>	<b>YES</b>
C1	Likelihood to meet the main challenges for the lot	0,66	5	3,30	
C2	Overall contribution to realize the Usage scenario described in Section 1.4 of the "Annex IV(A): Challenges and general requirements	0,66	2	1,32	
C3	Degree of fulfilment of the challenge	0,63	4	2,52	
C4	Innovation level (motivation by bidders)	0,73	9	6,57	
<b>I</b>	<b>Impact</b>		<b>25</b>	<b>17,76</b>	
I1	Impact on (digital) society, multiplicator effects	0,80	7	5,60	
I2	Impact on government cloud adoption	0,70	7	4,90	
I3	Public sector service impact	0,70	5	3,50	
I4	Commercialisation and exploitation plan of IPR	0,56	2	1,12	
I5	Proposed sharing of risk and benefits	0,66	4	2,64	
<b>S</b>	<b>Security</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>8,94</b>	<b>YES</b>
S1	Risk assessment impact (C, I, A dimensions)	0,00	0	0,00	
S2	Risk analysis	0,70	5	3,50	
S3	Risk mitigation measures	0,73	4	2,92	
S4	System management security	0,00	0	0,00	
S5	Operational security, proposed certifications	0,63	4	2,52	
<b>Q</b>	<b>Quality</b>		<b>22</b>	<b>15,50</b>	<b>YES</b>
Q1	Portability, applicability in different architectures	0,76	9	6,84	
Q2	Bid document quality, focus on challenge and solution	0,70	5	3,50	
Q3	Quality of project plan, resources allocation, acceptance plan	0,63	2	1,26	
Q4	Alignment with EU standards and legislation	0,66	2	1,32	
Q5	Resilience and target service SLA	0,00	0	0,00	
Q6	Completeness of the proposed prototypes and pilot	0,66	2	1,32	
Q7	Early/continuous quality assurance	0,63	2	1,26	
Q8	Performance and end-user experience	0,00	0	0,00	
				<b>55,91</b>	
				<b><math>P_{tec\_A} = \sum(Bi*Qi)</math></b>	

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**
*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

<b>Legend</b>	
<b>Bi</b>	= average of the coefficient between 0 and 1, assigned by the members of the Technical Committee
<b>Qi</b>	= weight (single weight) assigned to each sub-criterion in the Tender Regulation
<b>PTec_A</b>	= score assigned to the technical offer.
If one of the calculated scores for C, S or Q are in <b>RED</b> then the minimum score of that Criterion is not met. In that case the bid is <b>NOT</b> eligible for the award of the framework contract! In that case the cell with total calculated score (Ptec_A) will turn <b>RED</b> . If all 3 minimum scores are met, the cells will be <b>GREEN</b> . Cell with total calculated score (Ptec_A) will also be <b>GREEN</b> .	

The final result, as drafted in the "Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: evaluation of the technical offers and final scores assignment", is reported below:

Bid ID	Bidder	Ptec_A	Final Judgement
1.13	Prologue	55,91	It <b>reaches the minimum scores provided</b> related to all three criteria: Challenge, Security and Quality.

**Therefore the President, according to Paragraph 15.3 of TR, taking in account the final judgment of the Technical Committee Lot 1, and come the assent for the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová), establishes that the Administrative Committee WILL OPEN the envelope containing the financial offer of the bid ID 1.13 submitted by PROLOGUE.**

### 11.13.2 EVALUATION OF THE FINANCIAL OFFER

The President verifies the integrity of the envelope containing the Financial Offer, opens it and publicly reads the two prices submitted Overall Total Value (OTV) and Estimated Full Price (EFP) and the Breakdown into Cost Categories and Unite Price (BCUP).

The President verifies:

- that the amount indicated - in both case - is the same in numbers and in words;
- that the OTV submitted do not exceed the maximum amount which is established, for the Phase I, for Lot 1 in € 40.000,00 (forty thousand/00) [excluding VAT]

At the same time the Technical Support records these values on dedicate table sheet and proceeds to photograph the documents and to sharing with the members of the Administrative Committee, through the dedicated secure online AgID's platform (<https://cowork.agid.gov.it>).

#### 11.13.2.1 EVALUATION OF THE OVERALL TOTAL VALUE (OTV)

After completing the opening, President asks Technical Support to calculate the score ( $P_{fin\_A}$ ) of the price offered ( $OTV=V_{o\_A}$ ) by PROLOGUE. The following table contain the Financial Score related to the price offered for bid ID 1.13.

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

Bidder	Vo_A	Vmax	Pmax_A	Pfin_A =Pmax_A*(Vmax-Vo_A)/Vmax
1.13 - Prologue	€ 39.889,28	€ 40.000	20	<b>0,05</b>

#### 11.13.2.2 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE ESTIMATED FULL PRICE (EFP)

The table with EFP and OTV is reported in Annex 1 of this document.

#### 11.13.2.3 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE BREAKDOWN INTO COST CATEGORIES AND UNIT PRICES (BCUP)

The two tables for each bid are reported in Annex 2 of this document

#### 11.13.3 VERIFICATION THE REGULARITY OF THE ANNEX F – DECLARATION OF SUBCONTRACTING

The Bidder did not submit the Annex F. The Administrative Committee establishes that the omission of the Annex F is equivalent to the submission of the Annex F containing the declaration of renunciation to the subcontracting.

## 12 EVALUATION OF THE TOTAL OFFER

The President asks Technical Support to calculate the Final Score ( $P_{tot\_A}$ ), on the basis of the previous data on technical and financial scores and according to formula in Section **Errorre. L'origine riferimento non è stata trovata.** of this document.

The following table contains the final evaluation of the offers related to Lot 1:

Lot 1			
Bidder ID	Pfin_A	Ptec_A	Ptot_A =Ptec_A+Pfin_A
1.2 - Tecnalía Corporación Tecnológica	0,68	58,85	<b>59,53</b>
1.3 - Zimory GmbH	0,00	52,21	<b>52,21</b>
1.4 - Seconda Università degli Studi di Napoli – Dipartimento di Ingegneria Industriale e dell'Informazione	5,00	50,18	<b>55,18</b>
1.5 - Cloud Security Alliance (Europe)'s TGO	0,00	62,51	<b>62,51</b>
1.6 - Interway SRO's TGO	0,05	58,64	<b>58,69</b>
1.7 - Capgemini Italia SPA's TGO	5,03	59,32	<b>64,35</b>

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

1.9 - NEC Italia SPA	2,94	51,94	<b>54,88</b>
1.10 - Hewlett Packard Italiana SRL	0,00	58,10	<b>58,10</b>
1.11 - IBM Italia SPA	2,00	54,46	<b>56,46</b>
1.12 - NTT Data Italia SPA's TGO	1,00	61,82	<b>62,82</b>
1.13 - Prologue	0,05	55,91	<b>55,96</b>

### 13 FINAL CLASSIFICATION

The President asks Technical Support to draw up the Tender Ranking on the basis of final scores calculated in the previous section and according to the procedure established in Paragraph 15.5, 1<sup>st</sup> indent, of TR.

The table below contains the Tender Ranking to Phase I. According to the procedure established in Paragraph 15.5, 3<sup>rd</sup> indent, of TR, the list has been scrolled down until the residual amount of financial resources for the first phase of the lot is less than the price offered by the Bidder.

Lot 1			
Ranking	Bidder	Ptot_A (from highest to lowest)	Residual amount of resources (initial amount = € 222.000)
1 <sup>st</sup>	1.7 - Capgemini Italia SPA's TGO	64,35	€ 192.064,90
2 <sup>nd</sup>	1.12 - NTT Data Italia SPA's TGO	62,82	€ 154.064,90
3 <sup>rd</sup>	1.5 - Cloud Security Alliance (Europe)'s TGO	62,51	€ 114.064,90
4 <sup>th</sup>	1.2 – Tecnalia Corporación Tecnológica	59,53	€ 75.424,90
5 <sup>th</sup>	1.6 - Interway SRO's TGO	58,69	€ 35.524,90
6 <sup>th</sup>	1.10 - Hewlett Packard Italiana SRL	58,10	-€ 4.475,10
7 <sup>th</sup>	1.11 - IBM Italia SPA	56,46	-
8 <sup>th</sup>	1.13 - Prologue	55,96	-
9 <sup>th</sup>	1.4 - Seconda Università degli Studi di Napoli – Dipartimento di Ingegneria Industriale e dell'Informazione	55,18	-
10 <sup>th</sup>	1.9 - NEC Italia SPA	54,88	-
11 <sup>th</sup>	1.3 - Zimory GMBH	52,21	-

According to Paragraph 15.5, 3<sup>th</sup> indent of TR, the contract can be awarded to the top rank five Bidders listed in the previous table at their offered price.

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

The Administrative Commission shows the results of the final evaluation to the attendees.

## 14 PROVISIONAL AWARDING, EXCLUSIONS AND CONCLUSION OF THE SESSION

The President, taking in account the whole process of evaluation, and according to the following documents of evaluation:

- "Minutes of the Administrative Committee: Opening Session",
- "Minutes of the Administrative Committee: Technical Offers Checking Session",
- "Minutes of the Administrative Committee: Evaluation of the Required Integrations",
- "Special Report of the Technical Committee Lot 1: Evaluation of the Technical Offers and Final Scores Assignment",

come the assent of the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová), declares:

- a. to **provisional award the framework contract** related to Lot 1: "Federated Certified Service Brokerage (FCSB)" of the tender "REALIZATION OF A RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (PRE-COMMERCIAL PROCUREMENT) ON "CLOUD FOR EUROPE" and the execution of Phase I at their offered price to the bidders listed in the following:

Lot 1			
Ranking	ID	Bidder	Ptot_A (from highest to lowest)
1 <sup>st</sup>	1.7	Temporary Grouping of Operators (TGO): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Capgemini Italia SPA</li> <li>- Università del Salento</li> <li>- Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche – Istituto di Scienze e Tecnologie della Cognizione (CNR - ISTC)</li> </ul>	64,35
2 <sup>nd</sup>	1.12	Temporary Grouping of Operators (TGO): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NTT Data Italia SPA</li> <li>- Centro Interdipartimentale di Ricerca in Storia del Diritto, Filosofia e Sociologia del Diritto e Informatica Giuridica dell'Università di Bologna (CIRSFID)</li> <li>- Università degli Studi di Roma Tor Vergata</li> </ul>	62,82
3 <sup>rd</sup>	1.5	Temporary Grouping of Operators (TGO): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cloud Security Alliance (Europe)</li> </ul>	62,51

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

		- Sixsq SARL	
<b>4<sup>th</sup></b>	1.2	Tecnalía Corporación Tecnológica	<b>59,53</b>
<b>5<sup>th</sup></b>	1.6	Temporary Grouping of Operators (TGO): - Interway SRO - Teamnet International SA - Liberologico SRL - Università degli Studi di Messina	<b>58,69</b>

- b. that the **Bidders listed in the following table are eligible** for the award of the Framework contract Lot 1: “Federated Certified Service Brokerage (FCSB)” of the tender “REALIZATION OF A RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (PRE-COMMERCIAL PROCUREMENT) ON “CLOUD FOR EUROPE”;

Ranking	ID	Bidder	<b>Ptot_A</b> (from highest to lowest)
<b>6<sup>th</sup></b>	1.10	Hewlett Packard Italiana SRL	<b>58,10</b>
<b>7<sup>th</sup></b>	1.11	IBM Italia SPA	<b>56,46</b>
<b>8<sup>th</sup></b>	1.13	Prologue	<b>55,96</b>
<b>9<sup>th</sup></b>	1.4	Seconda Università degli Studi di Napoli – Dipartimento di Ingegneria Industriale e dell’Informazione	<b>55,18</b>
<b>10<sup>th</sup></b>	1.9	NEC Italia SPA	<b>54,88</b>
<b>11<sup>th</sup></b>	1.3	Zimory GMBH	<b>52,21</b>

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**
*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

- c. that the **Bidders listed in the following table are not eligible** for the award of the Framework contract Lot 1: "Federated Certified Service Brokerage (FCSB)" of the tender "REALIZATION OF A RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (PRE-COMMERCIAL PROCUREMENT) ON "CLOUD FOR EUROPE",

Lot 1		
ID	Bidder	Motivation of the exclusion
1.1	BPdelivery BV	It <b>does not reach</b> the minimum score provided for all three criteria: Challenge, Security and Quality. It only reaches the minimum score for Quality.
1.8	Temporary Grouping of Operators (TGO): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sielte SPA</li> <li>- Università degli Studi di Bari</li> <li>- Università degli Studi di Catania</li> <li>- Fondazione Centro Europeo di Formazione, Ricerca, Ingegneria Sismica (EUCENTRE)</li> <li>- Etna Hitech SCPA</li> <li>- Cooperativa EDP La Traccia</li> <li>- ITSLAB SRL</li> </ul>	It <b>does not reach</b> the minimum score provided for all three criteria: Challenge, Security and Quality. It only reaches the minimum score for Security.

The session ends at 12.46 CEST.

In order to ensure the fulfilment of the *Cloud for Europe Project* and the administrative proceedings, the present minutes are transmitted to the Procurers Steering Committee and to the General Director of AgID.

07/08/2015

**Valerio Giovannini**

*Member in presence of the Administrative Committee*

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*  
 For the members connected through video conferencing  
 (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the  
 assent.



## ANNEX 1 – ESTIMED FULL PRICE (EFP)

*Omissis*

## ANNEX 2 - BREAKDOWN INTO COST CATEGORIES AND UNIT PRICES (BCUP)

*Omissis*

---

07/08/2015

**Marco Bani**

*President and Secretary of the Administrative Committee*

For the members connected through video conferencing (Radu Boncea, Luís Horta, Nadežda Nikšová) come the assent.

---