

ANNEX I – CONSOLIDATED EVALUATION OF OFFERS

EVALUATION OF THE OFFERS SUBMITTED BY BOOKING PLATFORM OPERATORS FOLLOWING THE OPEN CALL FOR THE SELECTION OF THE CAPACITY BOOKING PLATFORM TO BE USED AT THE 'MALLNOW' INTERCONNECTION POINT AND THE 'GCP' VIRTUAL INTERCONNECTION POINT

The Agency received the following three offers:

- Fri 07/06/2019 10:01 PRISMA European Capacity Platform GmbH ('PRISMA');
- Fri 07/06/2019 10:26 RBP – Regional Booking Platform – FGSZ Ltd ('RBP');
- Fri 07/06/2019 10:27 GAZ-SYSTEM Auctions Platform – GAZ-SYSTEM S.A ('GSA').

1. FORMAL COMPLETENESS

After receipt of the above-mentioned offers, the Agency verified, for each offer, the formal submission of the documents indicated in Section 4.1 of the Open Call for the selection of the capacity booking platform to be used at the 'Mallnow' interconnection point and 'GCP' virtual interconnection point (hereinafter referred to as the 'Open Call').

Following the above-mentioned verification, the Agency concluded that the above-mentioned offers were to be considered formally complete.

2. MINIMUM CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

2.1 MINIMUM CRITERIA LISTED IN ANNEX 2 OF THE OPEN CALL

The Agency assessed further the fulfilment of the minimum criteria contained in Annex 2 of the Open Call, consisting of 22 legal features. The legal features were subdivided into two categories:

- a) features stemming from Union law (rows 1-18; hereinafter referred to as "EU legal requirements") — to be fulfilled by the operator on the date of submission of the offer;
- b) features stemming from national legislation (rows 19-22; hereinafter referred to as "national requirements") — to be fulfilled by the operator within three (3) months from the conclusion of the service contract with the TSOs concerned.

PRISMA provided the required declaration on honour on the fulfilment of the EU legal requirements and the national requirements, duly dated and signed by its legal representative¹, providing sufficient reassurance about i) the fulfilment of the obligations stemming from Union law applicable to the offering of bundled gas transmission capacity pursuant to the CAM NC and ii) those under German national law.

GSA provided the required declaration on honour on the fulfilment of the EU legal requirements and the national requirements, duly dated and signed by its legal representative², providing sufficient reassurance about i) the fulfilment of the obligations stemming from Union law applicable to the offering of bundled gas transmission capacity pursuant to the NC CAM and ii) a commitment to fulfil the obligations under the German national law within a maximum period of three months, as of the date of signature of the agreement between the selected capacity booking platform and the TSO concerned.

RBP provided the required declaration on honour on the fulfilment of the EU legal requirements and the national requirements, duly dated and signed by its legal representative³, providing sufficient reassurance about i) the fulfilment of the obligations stemming from Union law applicable to the offering of bundled gas transmission capacity pursuant to the NC CAM and ii) a

¹ Signed and dated on 6 June 2019

² Signed and dated on 5 June 2019

³ Signed and dated on 31 May 2019

commitment to fulfil the obligations under the German national law within a maximum period of three months, as of the date of signature of the agreement between the selected capacity booking platform and the TSO concerned.

2.2 MINIMUM CRITERIA LISTED IN ANNEX 4 OF THE OPEN CALL — IT REQUIREMENTS WITH REGARD TO THE ISO 27000 FAMILY

The minimum criteria consisted of 199 IT features, subdivided into nineteen (19) IT domains. For each IT domain, the maximum points per domain, as well as the passing mark (i.e. the minimum number of points required), are indicated in the tables below.

The Agency reviewed the self-assessment submitted by each operator against the requested auditor report as follows, noting that in case of discrepancy the auditor assessment prevailed.

2.2.1 PRISMA [Confidential table]

PRISMA						
ID	IT DOMAIN	MAXIMUM POINTS PER DOMAIN	POINTS TO PASS PER DOMAIN	SELF-ASSESSMENT	AUDITOR CERTIFICATION	PASS/FAIL
23	Access Management	6.5	4	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
24	Asset Management	12	6	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
25	Business Continuity Management	19	9	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
26	Change Management D	8.5	6	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
27	Cryptography	6	3	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
28	Exception Management	9	4	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
29	HR/Organizational Context	7	5	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
30	Incident Management	6	4	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
31	Information Management	11.5	6	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
32	Log Management	6.5	3	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
33	Physical Security	10.5	5	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
34	Risk Management	6.5	5	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
35	Service Provider Management	6.5	4	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
36	System Development Lifecycle	11	6	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
37	Teleworking	5	3	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
38	Secure platform access for network users	5.5	3	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
39	Peak service load	5	2	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
40	Graphical user interface of the platform in English	6	3	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
41	Helpdesk availability (outside business hours)	5.5	3	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
	TOTAL	153.5	84	[confidential]	[confidential]	PASS

PRISMA has met the minimum passing mark for each of the 19 relevant IT domains and the overall passing mark, as verified by the certified auditor, and shall be considered further in the evaluation.

2.2.2 GSA [Confidential table]

GSA						
ID	IT DOMAIN	MAXIMUM POINTS PER DOMAIN	POINTS TO PASS PER DOMAIN	SELF-ASSESSMENT	AUDITOR CERTIFICATION	PASS/FAIL
23	Access Management	6.5	4	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
24	Asset Management	12	6	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
25	Business Continuity Management	19	9	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
26	Change Management D	8.5	6	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
27	Cryptography	6	3	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
28	Exception Management	9	4	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
29	HR/Organizational Context	7	5	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
30	Incident Management	6	4	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
31	Information Management	11.5	6	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
32	Log Management	6.5	3	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
33	Physical Security	10.5	5	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass

GSA						
ID	IT DOMAIN	MAXIMUM POINTS PER DOMAIN	POINTS TO PASS PER DOMAIN	SELF- ASSESSMENT	AUDITOR CERTIFICATION	PASS/FAIL
34	Risk Management	6.5	5	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
35	Service Provider Management	6.5	4	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
36	System Development Lifecycle	11	6	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
37	Teleworking	5	3	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
38	Secure platform access for network users	5.5	3	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
39	Peak service load	5	2	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
40	Graphical user interface of the platform in English	6	3	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
41	Helpdesk availability (outside business hours)	5.5	3	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
	TOTAL	153.5	84	[confidential]	[confidential]	PASS

GSA has met the minimum passing mark for each of the 19 relevant IT domains and the overall passing mark, as verified by the certified auditor, and shall be considered further in the evaluation.

2.2.3 RBP [Confidential table]

RBP						
ID	IT DOMAIN	MAXIMUM POINTS PER DOMAIN	POINTS TO PASS PER DOMAIN	SELF- ASSESSMENT	AUDITOR CERTIFICATION	PASS/FAIL
23	Access Management	6.5	4	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
24	Asset Management	12	6	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
25	Business Continuity Management	19	9	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
26	Change Management D	8.5	6	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
27	Cryptography	6	3	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
28	Exception Management	9	4	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
29	HR/Organizational Context	7	5	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
30	Incident Management	6	4	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
31	Information Management	11.5	6	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
32	Log Management	6.5	3	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
33	Physical Security	10.5	5	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
34	Risk Management	6.5	5	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
35	Service Provider Management	6.5	4	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
36	System Development Lifecycle	11	6	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
37	Teleworking	5	3	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
38	Secure platform access for network users	5.5	3	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
39	Peak service load	5	2	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
40	Graphical user interface of the platform in English	6	3	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
41	Helpdesk availability (outside business hours)	5.5	3	[confidential]	[confidential]	pass
	TOTAL	153.5	84	[confidential]	[confidential]	PASS

RBP has met the minimum passing mark for each of the 19 relevant IT domains and the overall passing mark, as verified by the certified auditor, and shall be considered further in the evaluation.

A. EVALUATION REPORT – The CASE STUDY

1. Scoring per booking platform (maximum 100 points)

The Evaluation below contains the Agency's assessment of the technical case studies provided by the three platforms which were considered to meet the minimum criteria to be further evaluated.

The Agency scored the technical case studies uniformly on five criteria, each valued with a maximum of 20 points:

- a. Completeness (in the sense of including all the requested information in detail, including duly considered constraints);
- b. Consistency (in the sense of describing a workable and realistic project that could be implemented in practice, with means staff, skills and contracts which are already available);
- c. Robustness (in the sense of allowing adjustments in scope and time, mitigating expected and unexpected events);
- d. Relevance (in the sense of being in line with existing working practices and functioning of the platform); and
- e. Efficiency (in the sense of, as a minimum, being in line with time or other constraints established in the case study).

Given that the case study required the description of the implementation plan for two tasks – Task A and Task B (with the latter containing three sub-tasks) – the Agency valued each of the above-mentioned criteria with a maximum of 10 points per task. Therefore, offers could be assigned a maximum score of 50 points per task and a total score of 100 points for the full case study.

In some instances, several criteria were affected by the same shortcoming, usually lack of clarity or information. For example, in the case of unclear resource plans, the scoring often decreased for several criteria for the underlying reason that the information on the resource plans did neither meet the criterion on efficiency, nor on robustness, consistency or completeness.

The Agency evaluated the five criteria for each of the five distinct features, established in the Open Call of the Agency requesting offers (Annex 2, Chapter 6). The Agency distinguished five case study features, as follows: (i) description of the task, (ii) list of activities of the task, (iii) risk assessment/plan with the requirement that three major risks are defined and risk mitigation is proposed, (iv) required implementation timelines and (v) proposed resource plans. The five features shall suitably explain the proposals of the platforms for Tasks A and B of the case study.

The Agency evaluated the case-study features individually along the above-mentioned five criteria. Hence, each feature was evaluated in terms of completeness, consistency, robustness, relevance and efficiency. This meant that a single feature could score a maximum of 10 points, if it fulfilled adequately the requirements of the five criteria. The maximum score for a feature evaluated per a single criterion was 2 points; the smallest reduction of score for a unique feature per a single criterion was established as 0.25 point.

BOOKING PLATFORM OPERATOR: PRISMA [Scoring confidential]

TASK A	COMPLETENESS (Max. 10 points)	CONSISTENCY (Max. 10 points)	ROBUSTNESS (Max. 10 points)	RELEVANCE (Max. 10 points)	EFFICIENCY (Max. 10 points)
Description (Max. 10 points)	The legal requirements are covered and taken into due consideration. All business requirements are tackled, especially those described in Chapter 2 of Annex 6 of the Open Call. The proposed solution to the case study is well-developed and includes all requested elements.	The description provides a workable and realistic project in line with the scope of the assigned task. Means, schedule, staff and skills listed can provide an effective contribution to the achievement of the project goals, also in light of the requirements defined in Chapter 2 of Annex 6.	The description refers to the project management practices as well as to the contingency measures. This means that the proposal is well structured and allows adjustments in scope and time.	The description is relevant to the scope of the task assigned. It includes adequate measures concerning the platform's governance and IT processes (e.g. test – driven agile approach). In addition, it is in line with current internal practices of the platform, which are also described. The description meets all the requirements of Chapter 2 of Annex 6.	The proposed description is in line with the efficiency requirements defined by the Agency. The methodology is appropriate for the task implementation and is coherent with the required deadlines in terms of effectiveness of the requested actions.
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
List of Activities (Max. 10 points)	The list of activities is complete in order to perform Task A and with respect to the requirements of Chapter 2 of Annex 6.	The list of activities responds to the task requested by the case study in a structured and logical way. The proposal describes and implements methodologies (also called agile methodologies), which allow to deliver high quality results in the desired time frame and can guarantee a realistic and workable implementation of the proposed plan.	Critical activities are indicated in the plan. The contingency time slots are reasonably allocated and ensure an adequate implementation.	The list of activities addresses in an adequate manner the assigned task in line with the current working practice of the platform operator.	The efficiency of the activities is in line with the minimum requirements imposed by the time constraints defined in Chapter 2 of Annex 6.
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
Risk Assessment Plan (3 major risks) (Max. 10 points)	The risk assessment plan identifies and addresses the treatment of three major risks with appropriate and planned mitigation measures. However, the risk assessment lacks details concerning how the platform identified, assessed	The risks listed are consistent and coherent with the tasks of the case study, and with the sequence of activities formulated in the proposal. The approach to mitigate the identified risks is also realistic and adequate to address their potential occurrence. It is in line	The measures proposed to mitigate the identified risks appear to be adequate for the purpose in terms of timing and scope. However, the lack of details in the methodology for the risk selection and assessment doesn't allow to understand to	The three risks listed and the plan are pertinent to the scope of the task.	Several measures mitigate the identified risks and those show not only a high level of risk treatment efficiency, but span from the chosen project management approach to the time and resource buffers planned.

	and prioritised those risks as the three major ones.	with the means, staff and skills already available to the platform.	which extent (and whether or not to a major extent) the risks presented contribute to possible delays or issues in terms of implementation of the proposed activities.		
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
Timeline (Deadline 3 months) (Max. 10 points)	The timeline foresees the accomplishment of all the tasks to be carried out to fulfil the objectives and goals described in the case study.	The timeline is consistent with the descriptive part of the proposal. The timeline reflects a realistic and conscious use of resources, skills and means with respect to the implementation of Task A.	The timeline is clearly defined and allows adjustments in time in case of need.	The timeline is in line with the requirements, as well as with the entire proposal for the implementation of Task A.	The deadline proposed for completion of the task is within the required timeline limits (3 months from the signature of the contract).
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
Resource Plan (Budget, Human Resources, Skills) (Max. 10 points)	The description of the budget allocation refers mainly to the general investments and operations of the platform (mid-term 4 or 5-year plans). However, the details and specific budget allocation are absent with regard to Task A. The HR plan provides a clear team composition and professional profiles, as well as the skills needed for the task, but the effort per profile and the outsourced services (man-days) are not provided.	The financial resources planned do not refer clearly to the specific task envisaged under Task A, creating unclarity as to whether the financial resources are realistic for the task implementation. The allocation of human resources seems sufficient to ensure the works foreseen. Yet, there is a shortcoming despite that resources seem sufficient and the profiles are well defined, because the HR effort requested from each specific IT profile is not provided, and this sheds some doubt whether the planned resources are realistic for the implementation of Task A.	The resource plan lacks clarity concerning the financial resources allocated for the implementation of Task A. The resource plan leaves open whether the human resources working on several sub-tasks are available for the work allocated to them and whether they have all the necessary skills. Nonetheless, the human resources and skills offered seem sufficient to meet the task assigned.	The resource plan is in line with the current IT practice and governance structure of the platform and can contribute to the achievement of Task A.	The availability of financial resources is declared in a generic mid-term plan, but the plan is not detailed enough to explain the efficient access to resources dedicated for Task A. Overall the resource plan does not provide any breakdown for the financial needs of Task A. There is no evidence whether the use of human resources is efficient, in terms of access to people and whether the use of the same human resource for multiple overlapping tasks, may be feasible. Based on the information received, it is not possible to assess whether the resources for Task A could be efficiently covered.
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
TOTAL TASK A	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]

TASK B	COMPLETENESS (Max. 10 points)	CONSISTENCY (Max. 10 points)	ROBUSTNESS (Max. 10 points)	RELEVANCE (Max. 10 points)	EFFICIENCY (Max. 10 points)
Description (Max. 10 points)	For each sub-task, the proposal meets the requirements listed in the case study. The proposal focuses on the technical execution of the project, developing prototypes and using other good IT practices.	For each sub-task, the proposal provides a description of a workable and realistic project, identifying incremental and realistic development plans supported by adequate means, staff skills and the needed service contracts in place.	For each sub-task, the proposal contains an adequate description identifying the project management practices as well as the contingency measures to allow adjustments in scope and time. All elements described from a methodological and operational perspective in the proposal are appropriate.	For each sub-task, the proposal contains an adequate description in line with the existing platform functions, governance and IT processes already available (e.g. agile approach).	For each sub-task, the proposal contains a description of the efficient methodology (e.g. test-driven dual-track agile approach or test-driven service delivery approach) supporting the accomplishment of each task efficiently, within the time limits of the project.
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
List of Activities (Max. 10 points)	The proposal provides a detailed list of the activities to be performed. It is complete, taking into consideration all the constraints envisaged by the case study for each sub-task.	The list of activities proposed reflects the sub-tasks to be accomplished. It is realistic in terms of activities to be performed, taking into account the constraints imposed by the case study and the human and financial resources available to the platform.	The list of activities proposed for each sub-task contains the critical activities addressed in the plan. The contingency time slots are reasonably allocated, also ensuring adjustments in scope and in time, to properly prevent and mitigate unexpected delays/ development issues in the course of the execution of the project.	The list of activities proposed for the accomplishment of each task is adequate to the scope of each assigned sub-task and is in line with the existing functioning of the platform, its governance and IT processes.	The list of the activities provided for each sub-task respects the time constraints foreseen in the case study, in line with the requirements.
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
Risk Assessment Plan (3 major risks) (Max. 10 points)	The risk treatment plan refers to three major risks that could be faced during the development process. The risks are appropriately identified with all requested elements. However, the risk assessment is not detailed concerning how the operator identified, assessed and prioritised those risks as the three major ones for the three different development sub-tasks.	The risks identified in the proposal are realistic and technically consistent with the scope of the activities to be performed. The measures proposed to mitigate the identified risks are feasible and realistic and in line with existing platform's processes.	The measures suggested to mitigate the risks identified are planned in a way which allows adjustments in scope and in time, to prevent and mitigate unexpected delays/project issues. However, the lack of details in the methodology for the risk selection and assessment does not allow to fully understand to which extent the risks presented affect delays or lead to project issues, and this undermines the	The risks listed and the plan (risk treatment) meet the requirements of the case study for each sub-task. The proposal is relevant in the context of the platform, its functioning, its governance and its IT processes.	The measures proposed to address or mitigate the identified risks foresee a realistic timing for their execution in light of the constraints foreseen in the case study.

			robustness of the proposed risk assessment plan.		
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
Timeline (Deadline 9 months) (Max. 10 points)	The proposed timeline for each of the sub-tasks is detailed and takes into consideration the constraints included in the case study.	The proposed timeline for each of the tasks is realistic and feasible to be implemented so as to guarantee a timely fulfilment of the activities to be performed.	The proposed timeline for each of the tasks is designed in an adequate manner, taking into consideration the possibility for adjustments in scope and in time, to properly prevent and mitigate unexpected delays/project issues in the course of the execution of the project.	The proposed timeline for each of the tasks is in line with the sub-tasks. The timelines proposed are relevant to the technical context, the platform, its functioning, its governance and IT processes.	The milestones proposed are efficiently set to meet the implementation deadline of 9 months, taking duly into account the constraints foreseen in the case study.
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
Resource Plan (Budget, Human Resources, Skills) (Max. 10 points)	<p>The budget allocation for the sub-tasks is specified per phase of the particular task.</p> <p>The Budget allocation for all the sub-tasks refers mainly to the general investments and operations of the whole platform (mid-term 4 or 5-year plans) rather than to the specific sub-tasks identified in the case study.</p> <p>The human resource plan provides a clear team composition and professional profiles as well as skills needed for the sub-tasks.</p> <p>However, the proposal lacks details with regard to the effort expected from each specified profile.</p>	<p>The allocation of human resources reflects the needs of the three projects.</p> <p>As for the financial framework, the framework does not refer clearly to the specific tasks and planned efforts per specific profile. This detail is missing and could hinder the ability to perform the sub-tasks successfully.</p>	<p>Human resources and skills are planned in line with the requirements described in Task B.</p> <p>However, the overbooking of human resources (in the sense that the same resource is used over several sub-tasks), and the lack of clarity on the effort per profile needed for the completion of each sub-task raises reservations with regard to the availability of profiles on concurrent sub-tasks.</p> <p>Additionally, the lack of clear and detailed financial resource allocation per sub-tasks further raises reservations on the ability to implement the sub-tasks.</p> <p>Moreover, unclarity casts some doubt whether adjustments in scope and in time could be done to properly prevent and mitigate unexpected delays/issues in the course of the project.</p>	<p>The resource planning is sufficient to meet the requirements established in the case study and it is adequate to the scope of the assigned sub-tasks.</p> <p>It respects the existing functioning, IT processes and governance practices of the platform, and it takes into due consideration the requirements of Chapter 2 of Annex 6.</p>	<p>The resource planning lacks clarity. The availability of financial resources contains basic mid-term plans, but the plans are not detailed to indicate efficient access to resources dedicated to Task B.</p> <p>Overall, the resource plan provides a high-level overview rather than a practical plan to cover the financial needs of Task B.</p> <p>There is no evidence whether the use of human resources for Task B is efficient, in terms of access to people and whether the redundant use of professionals is feasible.</p> <p>Based on the information received, it is not possible to assess whether the resources for Task B could be efficiently covered.</p>
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]

Total TASK B	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
Total TASKS A + B	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
TOTAL	[confidential]				

BOOKING PLATFORM OPERATOR: GSA [Scoring confidential]

TASK A	COMPLETENESS (Max. 10 points)	CONSISTENCY (Max. 10 points)	ROBUSTNESS (Max. 10 points)	RELEVANCE (Max. 10 points)	EFFICIENCY (Max. 10 points)
Description (Max. 10 points)	The legal requirements are covered and taken into due consideration. All business requirements and constraints are included in the proposed implementation plan. The description focuses very much on the technical implementation and contains all relevant elements for Task A as described in Chapter 2 of Annex 6.	The description provides a workable and realistic solution to the implementation of Task A as proposed in the case study, and it provides reasonable use of resources, skills, and contracts in order to achieve and match the objectives of Task A.	The proposal is overall well-structured: it provides a description of the project management practices as well as the contingency measures, which allows adjustments in scope and time.	The description is in line with the existing practice of the platform. It takes into consideration the governance of the platform and its processes (e.g. negotiation-implementation streams). In addition, it takes into consideration the objectives of Task A, and the constraints described in Chapter 2 of Annex 6.	The description and objectives follow the requirements of the case study. The methodology described in the case study is appropriate for the implementation of Task A and coherent with the required deadlines. Overall, the proposal ensures the implementation of the requested actions in an adequate manner.
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
List of Activities (Max. 10 points)	The list of activities contains all those needed for the correct implementation of all the streams related to Task A. All activities' described are precise and detailed, facilitating the comprehension of the logic across the implementation of Task A.	The list of activities is realistic and workable, and shows coherence with the description of how Task A will be implemented. The project approach and the proposed planning are clear. Resources, staff, means and skills are allocated properly in order to contribute to the achievement of the objectives of Task A.	Activities are clearly indicated, as well as possible adjustments, which may be used in order to prevent or mitigate delays/project issues in the project implementation. The contingency measures are reasonably allocated, also allowing to mitigate unexpected delays during the course of the project.	The list of activities proposed for the accomplishment of Task A is adequate for the scope of the tasks and is in line with the existing functioning of the platform, its governance and IT processes.	The list of the activities provided for each task respects the time constraints foreseen in the case study and is in line with the requirements for Task A.
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
Risk Assessment Plan (3 major risks) (Max. 10 points)	The risk assessment/plan includes all the requested elements with a good level of detail, such as the identification of root cause(s), an estimation of the likelihood that the event (risk) will materialise, a description of consequences/impacts and existing mitigation measures based on the risk evaluation criteria used by the platform.	The risks identified in the proposal are realistic and reflect the scope of the activities to be performed. The measures proposed to mitigate the identified risks are feasible, realistic and in line with platform's existing processes, its allocated resources, skills and service contracts.	The mitigation measures presented in the implementation plan allow to effectively mitigate project issues and delays which may emerge during the implementation, as presented in the risk assessment plan of the platform. The mitigation measures also allow for further adjustments in the implementation process which may be needed.	The risk assessment plan takes into consideration the objectives of Task A of the case study, as well as the current governance and practices of the platform, and it carefully considers the context and the scope of the proposed implementation plan.	The measures proposed to address or mitigate the identified risks foresee a realistic timing for their execution in light of the time constraints and resource availability foreseen in the case study.
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]

Timeline (Deadline 3 months) (Max. 10 points)	The timeline includes all the necessary elements for the implementation of Task A, foresees the accomplishment of all the tasks to be carried out to fulfil the objectives and goals described in the case study.	The timeline reflects realistic and conscious use of resources, skills and means in respect to the implementation of Task A.	The timeline is clearly defined and allows adjustments in time. It takes into due consideration all elements and requirements requested by Task A.	The timeline is in line with the constraints of Task A, as well as with the entire proposal for the implementation of Task A.	Deadline proposed for completion is within the required timeline limits for the completion of Task A (3 months from the signature of the contract), as proposed in the case study (see Chapter 2 of Annex 6).
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
Resource Plan (Budget, Human Resources, Skills) (Max. 10 points)	[Confidential]	[Confidential]	[Confidential]	The resource plan is relevant to the scope of the assigned task. The resource plan is presented in the context of existing governance and IT practice, and it takes into consideration the constraints and requirements of Chapter 2 of Annex 6.	[Confidential]
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
TOTAL TASK A	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
TASK B	COMPLETENESS (Max. 10 points)	CONSISTENCY (Max. 10 points)	ROBUSTNESS (Max. 10 points)	RELEVANCE (Max. 10 points)	EFFICIENCY (Max. 10 points)
Description (Max. 10 points)	All business requirements and constraints are included in the proposed implementation plan. The description focuses on the technical implementation and development of new processes. The description contains all relevant elements for Sub-tasks B(i) and B(ii) (e.g. trainings, KPIs etc.). The description for Sub-task B(iii) focuses on the technical aspect of the past implementation of the AS4 and Edig@s specifications and it is comprehensive.	All provided descriptions reflect the scope of the assigned sub-tasks and the resources assigned to these sub-tasks. The financial and human resources and their allocation reflect the skills described and required to fulfil these sub-tasks. The descriptions include clear, realistic and workable actions, together with realistic timelines for Sub-tasks B(i) and B(ii). The description for Sub-task B(iii) is realistic and functional. The solution is already adequately implemented and supported by platform processes.	Each description of the sub-tasks of Task B includes details in the planning and in the description, allowing to positively assess the possibility and ability of the platform to mitigate and prevent risks related to delays or deal with issues related to the projects.	The descriptions for the implementation of Task B are in line with the functioning of the platform, its governance and its common practices. This is clearly shown in the detailed description of each sub-task.	The description is in line with the requirements and objectives defined in the case study and applicable to Task B. The methodology described in the case study is appropriate for implementing the task and is coherent with the required deadlines in terms of effectiveness of the requested actions.
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]

List of Activities (Max. 10 points)	The list of activities contains all activities needed for the implementation of Sub-tasks B(i) and B(ii), having regard to the requirements and constraints for the implementation. [Confidential]	The list of activities is consistent both with the full description and with the activities planned for Sub-tasks B(i) and B(ii). [Confidential]	The provided activities include appropriate time contingencies, allowing to assess the robustness in terms of delays. Concerning other aspects which may impact the robustness of the implementation proposal, the in-depth analysis reported per each sub task provides evidence that the overall proposal can mitigate these issues.	The list of activities proposed for the accomplishment of Task B is adequate for the scope of the tasks and is in line with the features of the platform, its functioning, its governance and its IT processes.	The list of the activities provided for each sub-task respects the time constraints foreseen in the case study and is in line with the requirements and constraints for Task B.
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
Risk Assessment Plan (3 major risks) (Max. 10 points)	The risk assessment/plan section includes all the requested elements with a good level of detail, including for example the identification of root cause(s) and an estimation of the likelihood that the event will materialise. A description of consequences/impacts and existing mitigation measures is based on the risk evaluation criteria proposed by the platform.	The risks identified in the proposal are realistic and workable, and take into consideration the skills, staff and means available to the platform to undertake the activities proposed. The measures proposed to mitigate the identified risks are feasible and realistic and in line with the allocated resources, skills and contracts.	The applicable mitigation measures presented in the implementation plans allow to effectively mitigate issues and delays which may emerge in the implementation of subtasks of Task B, as presented in the implementation plan of the platform. It also allows further adjustments which may be needed.	The risk assessment plan takes into consideration the objectives of Task B, as well as the current governance and practices of the platform. Nevertheless, on the content, one of the risks (ID 3) is too general in nature and is not specific enough in the context of Sub-tasks B(i) and B(ii).	The measures proposed to address or mitigate the identified risks foresee a realistic timing for their execution in light of the constraints foreseen in the case-study for Task B.
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
Timeline (Deadline: 9 months) (Max. 10 points)	The timeline included reflects all the sub-tasks and their accomplishment so as to fulfil the objectives and goals described in the case study.	The timeline reflects a realistic and workable use of resources, skills and means in respect to the implementation of Task B.	The timeline is clearly defined and allows adaptations, including re-planning of the activities or delays, and yet keeping the deadlines to fulfil the requirements. It takes into due consideration all elements and requirements requested by the Task B.	The timeline is in line with the requirements applicable to Task B, as well as with the entire proposal for the implementation of Task B (and its sub-tasks).	Deadline proposed for completion of Task B is within the required time limits set for the completion of Task B.
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
Resource Plan (Budget, Human Resources, Skills) (Max. 10 points)	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	The resource plan reflects the existing functioning, governance and IT practices of the platform, and it takes into consideration the constraints and requirements of case study and its Task B.	[confidential]
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]

Total TASK B	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
Total TASKS A + B	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
TOTAL	[confidential]				

BOOKING PLATFORM OPERATOR: RBP [Scoring confidential]

TASK A	COMPLETENESS (Max. 10 points)	CONSISTENCY (Max. 10 points)	ROBUSTNESS (Max. 10 points)	RELEVANCE (Max. 10 points)	EFFICIENCY (Max. 10 points)
Description (Max. 10 points)	The legal requirements are covered and taken into due consideration. All business requirements and constraints are included in the proposed implementation plan. The description focuses on the technical implementation and contains all relevant elements for the implementation of Task A, and takes into consideration all constraints required under Chapter 2 of Annex 6.	The description provides a workable and realistic solution for Task A, and it proposes a reasonable use of resources, skills, and contracts in order to achieve the objectives.	The description leaves space to allow adjustments in time and scope, and overall the description is well structured. It includes also a risk assessment/plan at task level, as well as optimistic and pessimistic implementation scenarios.	The description fits with the requirements of Task A. It takes into consideration the scope of the assigned task, the current functionalities, and the governance and IT practices of the platform.	The description is coherent and in line with the requirements. The methodology described in the case study is appropriate for the implementation of Task A and follows the requirements concerning deadlines.
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
List of Activities (Max. 10 points)	The list of activities contains all the activities needed for the correct execution of the project implementing Task A. All activities are precisely described, showing the activities with a beginning and end date for each implementation sub-step.	The list of activities is realistic and workable, and shows coherence with the description of how Task A will be implemented, based on the suggested project approach and proposed project planning. Resources, staff, means and skills are allocated appropriately in order to achieve the objectives, taking in due consideration the availability of skills.	The activities are clearly indicated, along with the potential adjustments, which may be needed and used in order to prevent or mitigate issues and delays in the project implementation. The contingency measures are reasonably allocated, assuring the necessary level of robustness of the activities to be implemented.	The list of activities proposed for the accomplishment of Task A is adequate for the scope of the tasks and is in line with the functioning, governance of the platform, and its IT processes.	The list of the activities provided for Task A respects the time constraints foreseen in the case study and is in line with the overall technical and functional requirements for Task A.
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
Risk Assessment Plan (3 major risks) (Max. 10 points)	The risk assessment/plan section contains a set of risks identified at task level (more than 3) with declared risk level ('weight') and suggested mitigations measures. However, risks are not prioritised, in the sense of identifying which are the three major ones. The risk assessment methodology does not allow a succinct	The risk assessment plan is realistic and the provided mitigation measures are workable in the context of the implementation of Task A. The risk assessment/plan can be implemented with the resources described and is in line with the existing constraints of the case study.	The risks listed have mitigation plans that allow for time and scope adjustments. The risks described seem to focus mainly on the timeliness and less on how the risks affect the scope of Task A.- The risk-related delays are assessed under two scenarios (optimistic and pessimistic).	The risk assessment plan proposed for the case study considers the IT practices, processes, functioning and governance of the platform.	The measures proposed to address or mitigate the identified risks foresee a realistic timing for their execution in light of the constraints foreseen in the case study.

	understanding of the risk prioritisation.		It is unclear what reference scenario to consider for the evaluation. The lack of details of the risk assessment and scaling methodology do not allow to understand how the potential materialisation of risks impact the two scenarios.		
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
Timeline (Deadline: 3 months) (Max. 10 points)	The timeline foresees the accomplishment of all activities to be carried out to fulfil the objectives and goals described in the case study.	The timeline reflects a realistic and viable use of resources, skills and means with respect to the implementation of Task A.	The timeline is clearly defined and allows adjustments. It takes into due consideration all elements and requirements requested for Task A. It presents an optimistic and a pessimistic scenario.	The timeline is in line with the requirements applicable to Task A. The proposal for the implementation is in line with existing IT practices, governance and IT processes already used by the platform.	The deadline proposed is within the required time limits set by the case study requirements, and allows for the completion of Task A as proposed in the case study.
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
Resource Plan (Budget, Human Resources, Skills) (Max. 10 points)	The budget allocation refers to the total cost of the project. However, the budget composition is not detailed. The implementation costs for Task A would be covered by a lump-sum by the platform and the fees collected from the TSOs are meant to finance service costs of the platform. The operation and maintenance costs are not explicitly mentioned. The HR plan provides a team composition with high-level professional profiles without, however, clearly detailing the skills needed for the tasks. The HR effort is presented by means of duration of work in days and in working hours, providing a good granular level for the activities.	The allocation of human resources is realistic for the project and seems workable. The functions proposed in the project are reasonable and realistic. However, the allocation of financial resources per project activity is unclear, and it is not possible to assess if the total estimated investment cost would cover the project needs (e.g. human and IT services), based on the provided description. In addition, in terms of human resources, the project functions lack details concerning the needed skills.	Human resources planned for the implementation of Task A may allow flexibility to solve issues or delays, but in the absence of a detailed presentation this cannot be fully assessed. For example, the absence of team roles, profiles and skills impedes a full assessment of the HR qualities. In addition, financial resources planned for the implementation of Task A are not detailed and are fixed, so it is not possible to assess if those resources allow the needed flexibility to mitigate project issues or delays.	The resource plan is relevant to the scope of Task A. It follows the existing governance and IT practices of the platform, and it takes into consideration the constraints defined under the requirements of the case study.	The resource plan does not provide any evidence of efficiency in the use of budget and human resources. In particular, it lacks clarity on detailed cost coverage and on availability of human skills to assess systematically the efficiency criterion.
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
TOTAL TASK A	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]

TASK B	COMPLETENESS (Max. 10 points)	CONSISTENCY (Max. 10 points)	ROBUSTNESS (Max. 10 points)	RELEVANCE (Max. 10 points)	EFFICIENCY (Max. 10 points)
Description (Max. 10 points)	<p>All business requirements and constraints are included in the proposed implementation plan for the sub-tasks of Task B. The description focuses on the technical implementation. It contains all the elements requested and it takes into consideration all constraints required under Chapter 2 of Annex 6. The description of Sub-task B(iii) does not clarify whether Edig@s-XML needs to be implemented or is already implemented.</p>	<p>The description provides a workable and realistic solution for the sub tasks of Task B, as requested in the case study. It takes into consideration a reasonable use of resources, skills, and contracts in order to achieve the objectives of Task B. One exception has been identified in Sub-task B(iii), where it is unclear if the requirement concerning Edig@s-XML is in scope of the proposed implementation project or not.</p>	<p>The descriptions of the sub-tasks under Task B include details concerning the planning of the task, which allows to understand how the platform will be able to mitigate and prevent risks related to delays and issues of any kind.</p>	<p>The descriptions for the implementation of Task B of the case study are in line with the way in which the platform works, is governed, and with its common IT practices. This is clearly shown in the detailed description of the sub-tasks.</p>	<p>The requirements and objectives defined in the case study and applicable to Task B is followed up thoroughly by the description. The methodology described in the case study is appropriate for the task implementation and is coherent with the deadlines required.</p>
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
List of Activities (Max. 10 points)	<p>The list of activities includes all details and lists all activities needed for the implementation of Sub-task B(i) and Subtask B(ii), having also regard to the requirements and constraints defined under Task B. For Sub-task B(iii), there is no list of the activities associated with Edig@s-XML.</p>	<p>The list of activities is workable, realistic and aligned with the overall description of the activities planned for Sub-tasks B(i) and B(ii). Nevertheless for Sub-task B(iii) the proposal does not provide sufficient details about the Edig@s-XML implementation. Therefore, the proposal does not completely reflect the requirements for the implementation of Task B.</p>	<p>The provided activities include appropriate time contingencies. The proposal contains an in-depth analysis reported per sub task. There is sufficient evidence that the overall proposal for Task B can mitigate issues and time delays in a solid manner.</p>	<p>The list of activities proposed for the accomplishment of Task B reflects in full the scope of the tasks and it is in line with the functioning of the platform, its governance and IT processes.</p>	<p>The list of the activities provided for each task reflects adequately the time constraints foreseen in the case study, showing a rational employment of the available time in line with the requirements of Task B.</p>
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
Risk Assessment Plan (3 major risks) (Max. 10 points)	<p>The risk assessment/plan section identifies three risks with declared weights and planned mitigation measures. However, the provided information lacks a clear description of the priorities and a</p>	<p>The risk assessment plan is realistic and the provided mitigation measures are workable in the context of the implementation of Task B and its sub-tasks. The proposal for the risk assessment plan provides</p>	<p>The risks listed have mitigation plans that allow for time and scope adjustments. The risks described seem to focus mainly on the timeliness and less on how the risks affect the scope. On risk-related delays, the risk assessment does neither propose</p>	<p>The risk assessment plan proposed for the case study considers the IT practices, processes and governance of the platform.</p>	<p>The measures proposed to address or mitigate the identified risks foresee a realistic timing for their execution and in light of the constraints foreseen in the case study for Task B.</p>

	clear declaration which are the three major risks. The risk assessment methodology does not allow a succinct understanding of the risk prioritisation.	sufficient reassurance on the possibility of implementation, identifying the resources needed, in light of the identified constraints.	a buffer, nor other measures. The absence of a clear risk assessment makes it difficult to understand the abilities of the platform to adjust time and scope, if needed.		
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
Timeline (Deadline: 9 months) (Max. 10 points)	The timeline is complete, foresees the accomplishment of all the tasks to be carried out to fulfil the objectives and goals described in Task B and its sub tasks.	The timeline reflects the realistic and viable use of resources, skills and means with respect to the implementation of Task B and its sub tasks.	The timeline is clearly defined and allows adjustments. It takes into due consideration all elements, including the scope of Task B and its requirements.	The timeline is in line with the requirements applicable to Task B. The proposal for the implementation of Task B is in line with the IT practices, governance and IT processes already used by the platform.	The deadline proposed for the completion of Task B is within the required time limits. It allows for the completion of Task B, including its subtasks.
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
Resource Plan (Budget, Human Resources, Skills) (Max. 10 points)	The budget composition for the implementation of Task B of the case study lacks details as follows: i) the costs are presented with a variation which makes the resource planning unclear from the perspective of project needs. For example, the allocation of resources seems to be fixed, but the budgetary assumptions are vague; ii) operations and maintenance costs are either not explicit or not detailed, depending on the sub-task; iii) the HR plan provides a team composition with high-level professional profiles, but it does not detail the skills needed for each sub-task. The HR plan is clear and presents the duration of the works in days and in the effort in working hours.	The allocation of human resources is realistic and workable. The skills proposed are reasonable and adequate. However, Sub-task B(ii) does not contain the planned profiles in detail concerning skills needed. The planned financial resources are unclear with respect to the implementation of Task B. For example, the resource allocation contains financial options that allow varied budgetary options for project implementation. These options show partial cost coverage in some cases and it is unclear how the financial sources made available to the platform will cover these additional costs.	The Human Resources planned for the implementation of Task B (and its sub-tasks) allow flexibility to mitigate issues or delays. The financial resources planned are unclear, so it is not entirely possible to assess if those resources allow the needed flexibility to solve these issues or delays. At the same time, the absence of team skills and lack of nominated experts impedes to clearly assess the robustness criterion.	The resource plan adequately reflects the scope of Task B. It is presented in the context of the existing governance structure, IT processes and practices of the platform. It takes into consideration the constraints identified in Chapter 2 of Annex 6.	The resource plan does not provide evidence of the efficient use of budget and human resources. In particular, it lacks clarity on cost coverage and on the availability of IT skills, hence the proposal does not allow the systematic assessment of the criterion.
	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
Total TASK B	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]
Total	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]	[confidential]

TASKS A + B					
TOTAL	[confidential]				

2. Scoring summary per criteria for booking platform candidate (total for Tasks A and B)

BOOKING PLATFORM OPERATOR: **PRISMA** [Scoring confidential]

CRITERION	TOTAL POINTS	PROJECT FEATURES RECEIVING MAXIMUM SCORE	DEFICIENT FEATURES
Completeness	[confidential]	Descriptions, Lists of activities, Timelines	Risk assessments and Resource planning
Consistency	[confidential]	Descriptions, Lists of activities, Timelines and Risk assessment	Resource planning
Robustness	[confidential]	Descriptions, Lists of activities and Timelines	Risk assessments and Resource planning
Relevance	[confidential]	Descriptions, Lists of activities, Timelines, Risk assessments and Resource planning	NA ⁴
Efficiency	[confidential]	Descriptions, Lists of activities, Risk assessments and Timelines	Resource planning
ALL	[confidential]		

BOOKING PLATFORM OPERATOR: **GSA** [Scoring confidential]

CRITERION	TOTAL POINTS	PROJECT FEATURES RECEIVING MAXIMUM SCORE	DEFICIENT FEATURES
Completeness	[confidential]	Descriptions, Risk assessments and Timelines	Lists of activities and Resource planning
Consistency	[confidential]	Descriptions, Risk assessments and Timelines	Lists of activities and Resource planning
Robustness	[confidential]	Descriptions, Lists of activities, Risk assessments and Timelines	Resource planning
Relevance	[confidential]	Descriptions, Lists of activities, Timelines and Resource planning	Risk assessment
Efficiency	[confidential]	Descriptions, Lists of activities, Risk assessments and Timelines	Resource planning

⁴ Not applicable

CRITERION	TOTAL POINTS	PROJECT FEATURES RECEIVING MAXIMUM SCORE	DEFICIENT FEATURES
ALL	[confidential]		

BOOKING PLATFORM OPERATOR: RBP [Scoring confidential]

CRITERION	TOTAL POINTS	PROJECT FEATURES RECEIVING MAXIMUM SCORE	DEFICIENT FEATURES
Completeness	[confidential]	Timelines	Descriptions, Lists of activities, Risk assessments and Resource planning
Consistency	[confidential]	Risk assessments and Timelines	Descriptions, Lists of activities and Resource planning
Robustness	[confidential]	Descriptions, Lists of activities and Timelines	Risk assessments and Resource planning
Relevance	[confidential]	Descriptions, Lists of activities, Timelines, Risk assessments and Resource planning	NA ⁵
Efficiency	[confidential]	Descriptions, Lists of activities and Timelines	Risk assessment sand Resource planning
ALL	[confidential]		

Quality points awarded for the case study:

Based on the case study scores, the Agency calculated the final quality scores using the formula published in its Open Call:

$$\frac{CASE\ STUDY\ POINTS}{100} \times 60$$

PLATFORMS	CASE STUDY SCORE (OUT OF 100)	QUALITY SCORE (BASED ON THE FORMULA MAXIMUM 60 POINTS)
GSA	[confidential]	[confidential]
PRISMA	[confidential]	[confidential]
RBP	[confidential]	[confidential]

⁵ Not applicable

B. EVALUATION REPORT – Financial offers [BUSINESS SECRETS, CONFIDENTIAL]

The Agency received the financial offers and confirmed their comparability. All fees are expressed in Euro and are exclusive of VAT.

BOOKING PLATFORM OPERATOR: PRISMA [Confidential]

IP	Operator	2020 [Euro]	2021 [Euro]	2022 [Euro]	Sum (per IP side) [Euro]	Average annual fee over period 2020-2022 [Euro]
Mallnow	Gaz-System	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]
Mallnow	GASCADE	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]
GCP	Gaz-System	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]
GCP	ONTRAS	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]
Total		[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]

BOOKING PLATFORM OPERATOR: GSA [Confidential]

IP	Operator	2020 [Euro]	2021 [Euro]	2022 [Euro]	Sum (per IP side) [Euro]	Average annual fee over period 2020-2022 [Euro]
Mallnow	Gaz-System	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]
Mallnow	GASCADE	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]
GCP	Gaz-System	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]
GCP	ONTRAS	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]
Total		[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]

BOOKING PLATFORM OPERATOR: RBP [Confidential]

IP	Operator	2020 [Euro]	2021 [Euro]	2022 [Euro]	Sum (per IP side) [Euro]	Average annual fee over period 2020-2022 [Euro]
Mallnow	Gaz-System	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]
Mallnow	GASCADE	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]
GCP	Gaz-System	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]
GCP	ONTRAS	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]
Total		[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]

Price points awarded:

$$\text{Price points} = \frac{\text{LOWEST OFFER}}{\text{OFFER of the PLATFORM}} \times 40$$

Platform	OFFER of the PLATFORM (yearly fee per IP side) [Euro]	LOWEST OFFER [Euro]	points (max 40)
GSA	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]
PRISMA	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]
RBP	[conf.]	[conf.]	[conf.]

*The points are independent of the unit of the offer fee as per IP, per IP side or total. For PRISMA, the offer is [confidential]. For GSA, the offer is [confidential].