

**JUSTIFICATION
FOR NOT DIVIDING THE PROCUREMENT OBJECT INTO LOTS**

Buyer	UAB "LTG Kompetencijų centras" (hereinafter – LTG KC) on behalf of the AB „Lietuvos geležinkeliai“ or for the benefit of the company
Procurement number	34200
Subject of the procurement	Consulting services for the update of the LTG Group strategy
Procurement value limits	International procurement
Procurement method	Negotiated procedure with publication of a contract notice

LTG KC is conducting an international procurement procedure and, in accordance with Article 28 of the Law on Public Procurement of the Republic of Lithuania, has assessed the possibility of dividing the procurement object into lots, the impact of such division on Supplier competition and on the opportunities for small and medium-sized enterprises to participate in the procurement procedure, as well as the nature of the procurement object, the interrelationship between the individual services, and the management of Contract performance. The reasons for the decision not to divide the procurement object into lots are set out in the procurement documents.

The subject matter of the procurement is not divided into parts because, prior to initiating the procurement, an analysis of the subject matter and the market established that:

1. The services comprising the Procurement Object are functionally and methodologically interconnected and are intended to deliver a single overall outcome, namely the preparation of a coherent and integrated strategy for the LTG Group. During the strategy update process, the analyses performed, strategic directions and objectives identified, priorities established, operational and financial assumptions developed, performance indicators defined, and implementation measures formulated must all be based on a consistent methodology and the same underlying data. The outcomes of each stage directly influence the content of subsequent stages; therefore, the results of services procured separately could not be combined mechanically without additional methodological alignment, creating a risk of inconsistencies in assumptions, objectives, performance indicators, or implementation measures. The final deliverable must not only constitute a high-level strategic document setting out strategic directions but also a comprehensive, well-substantiated, and practically implementable strategy document.
2. The scope and complexity of the Procurement Object necessitate a single, unified methodological responsibility for the overall outcome. If the Procurement Object were divided into lots by project stages, areas of activity, or LTG Group companies, the performance of individual contracts would be directly dependent on the timely delivery, quality, and consistency of interim results provided by other Suppliers. The Buyer would be required to undertake additional coordination of the transfer of data, assumptions, and interim deliverables, resolve inconsistencies between different methodologies and conclusions, and allocate responsibility for deficiencies affecting the overall outcome. This would increase the risk of duplication of work, delays, additional costs, and unclear accountability, and could hinder the achievement of the overall procurement objective. A single service provider will be responsible for ensuring the consistency and coherence of all parts of the strategy, as well as the quality of the final document.

The Buyer, in deciding not to divide the Procurement Object into lots, considered the objective set out in Article 28 of the Law on Public Procurement to promote competition among suppliers and facilitate the participation of small and medium-sized enterprises in procurement procedures. However, in this specific case, it was determined that dividing the Procurement Object into lots would create a greater risk to achieving the Procurement objective and ensuring the efficient performance of the Contract than the potential benefits of increased competition resulting from such division.