Tender specifications
Open procedure

Purchase of a new SEM with automated minerology analysis software

These tender specifications contain guidelines for submission of tender, communication between the tenderer and the contracting authority, and information about the tender procedure in general.

1. SUBMISSION OF TENDER

The tender must be submitted not later than **Tuesday, 16th May 2017, at 12:00 UTM +2**. Tenders received after this deadline will be rejected.

Tenders must be submitted or handed in to/at the following address:

Geological Survey of Denmark and Greenland (GEUS)
Att.: Senior researcher Nynke Keulen, PhD
Øster Voldgade 10
1350 Copenhagen K
Denmark
Telephone: +45 38 14 20 00
Contact email address: semlab@geus.dk

Tenders may not be submitted in any other way, including by e-mail.

The tender is requested to be submitted in **three** hardcopy versions and one electronic version on a USB stick saved as a .pdf file. The tender should be submitted in a sealed envelope marked *"Purchase of a new SEM with automated minerology analysis software - tender. May not be opened by the internal mail department. GEUS-journale nr. 046-0016."*

Attention is drawn to the fact that mail might be opened in the administration of GEUS, if the envelope is not marked as stated above.

The tenderer may only submit one tender and must keep open its tender for acceptance for four months from expiry of the tender deadline.

2. THE PROCUREMENT DOCUMENTS

The procurement documents constitute the basis of the tenderer's preparation of tender. The procurement documents are accessed via www.geus.dk/UK/services/labs/sem-lab.

The procurement documents consist of the following documents:

- **Contract notice**
- XML-file to ESPD
- These **tender specifications**
- Appendix of the tender specifications:
    - Appendix A: The tender evaluation (award criterion and evaluation method)
    - Appendix B: Additional information (the tender process and preparation of tender)
- Draft **contract** containing the legal provisions governing the relationship between the contractual parties.
- Draft **Appendices 1, 2, 4 and 5** which contain detailed requirements for the products/services which will form part of the contract when the tender procedure is concluded.

If the tenderer finds that there are elements in the contract and/or the appendices of the contract which are unacceptable or clearly undesirable, the tenderer may propose a change of the contract/the appendices of the contract according to the procedure set out in paragraph 3. The contracting authority will decide on a case-by-case basis whether the proposed changes will be incorporated.

Any changes of the procurement documents will be communicated to all via www.geus.dk/UK/services/labs/sem-lab.

3. COMMUNICATION AND QUESTIONS FOR THE CONTRACTING AUTHORITY

All communication in connection with the tender procedure, including questions and answers regarding the procurement documents, must be in English or Danish and must be submitted via e-mail to semlab@geus.dk.

The written questions of the tenderers and the contracting authority's answers will be regularly communicated to all at www.geus.dk/UK/services/labs/sem-lab.

Questions must be asked not later than Wednesday 10th May, 12:00 UTM+2.

4. CONTENT OF THE TENDER

A tender consists of the following documents:

A. Duly completed appendices.
B. The XML-file with the ESPD

There is no need to include the contract and the appendices of the contract that are not to be completed/finalised by the tenderer. The contract and such appendices are deemed to have been accepted by the tenderer.

Re A) Appendices duly completed
The tenderer is requested to complete or finalise the following appendices:

- Appendix 2: Tenderers solution description
- Appendix 4: Maintenance and support description
- Appendix 5: Price structure

Appendix 1 includes guidelines explaining how to complete and finalise Appendix 2, 4 and 5.

Re B) The ESPD
The tenderer must enclose in its tender an ESPD as preliminary documentation:

1) that the applicant or tenderer is not subject to any of the grounds for exclusion, see section VI.3 of the contract notice, and
2) that the tenderer complies with the minimum suitability requirements in respect of economic and financial capacity, see section III.1.2 of the contract notice and, in respect of technical and professional capacity, see section III.1.3) of the contract notice.

For groups of operators (e.g. a consortium), a separate ESPD must be submitted for each participating operator. If the tenderer relies on the capacity of other entities, an ESPD must be submitted for each of the entities on which the tenderer relies. See the contracting authority's guide to the ESPD.

5. EVALUATION OF TENDERS

The evaluation of tenders is carried out as described in Appendix A.

6. FINALISATION OF THE TENDER PROCEDURE

Before award of the contract, the tenderer to whom the contracting authority intends to award the contract must provide documentation of the information stated in the ESPD, see section 159(2) of the Danish Public Procurement Act *(udbudsloven)* and sections III.1) and VI.3) of the contract notice.

When the contracting authority has selected the tender with the best price-quality ratio, see Appendix A, and obtained the above-mentioned documentation, the contracting authority will make its decision regarding award of the contract.

The contracting authority is not obliged to award the contract and reserves the right to cancel the tender procedure.

Even though the contract has been awarded to another tenderer, the tenderer is bound by the tender until the contracting authority has concluded the contract, but no longer than the date specified for the tender to remain open for acceptance.

The notification of the tenderers of the award decision does not mean that the contract has been concluded. The contract is not deemed to have been concluded until the contract is signed.

The contracting authority does not consider the tender procedure completed until the contract has been signed.

Appendix A
The tender evaluation

Open procedure

1. THE AWARD CRITERION

The award criterion is the best price-quality ratio.

In this connection, the contracting authority will apply the following sub-criteria:

1) Price 15 %

evaluated on the basis of the following sub-criterion elements:

- Price of the new SEM instrument, including at least all minimum requirements mentioned in Appendix 1, requirements 1-4. **12%**
    - The price for the Deliverable; to be quoted in Appendix 5 must include all costs payable by GEUS to the tenderer, including fees, expenditure, licenses, hardware, software, transport, installation and training as specified in Appendix 1.
- Price for maintenance and support, including at least all minimum requirements mentioned in Appendix 1, requirement 5. **3%**
    - The price for maintenance and support in 5 years time; to be quoted in Appendix 5. The price includes all items listed in Appendix 1, paragraph 2.1, requirement 5.

Thus, when determining the Price sub-criterion, the price for the SEM instrument counts for 80%, while the service and maintenance price counts for 20%.

2) Quality 80 %

evaluated on the basis of the following sub-criterion elements mentioned in Appendix 1:

- Imaging of coated samples at high magnification 5% Requirement 6
- Imaging of uncoated samples at high magnification 9% Requirement 7
- EDS on uncoated samples 4% Requirement 8
- Automated stitching 1% Requirement 9
- Fast and easy shift between high-low vacuum 5% Requirement 10
- CL quality 4% Requirement 11
- Simultaneous BSE & CL 1% Requirement 12
- EDS quality 8% Requirement 13
- Boron 5wt% 4% Requirement 14

- Fast and precise EBSD 2% Requirement 15
- EBSD library 1% Requirement 16
- Quantitative analysis of 1200 touching grains in rock 11% Requirement 17
- Spacing 0.2µm 2% Requirement 18
- Mineral library 7% Requirement 19
- Grain size as a basis for classification 4% Requirement 20
- B in mineral mapping 3% Requirement 21
- C in mineral mapping 4% Requirement 22
- Batch reporting with figures 1% Requirement 23
- Autom. min. based on optical or CL images 2% Requirement 24
- Integrated images, BSE, optical, CL 1% Requirement 25
- Integrated software solution 1% Requirement 26

3) Collaboration criterion 5 %

If tenderer is able to provide a plan for further updates and development of the delivered software after the delivery, this should be described. Tenderer should also indicate whether it is possible to establish cooperation regarding customers' suggestions for changes of the software during the contract period, as well as inform of the conditions for such cooperation.

Evaluation preference:

The tenderer will be evaluated positively for an update and development plan for their delivered software, and for their openness to incorporate ideas from GEUS in their new software.

The percentage rates indicate the weighting of the individual sub-criteria in the tender evaluation.

2. EVALUATION METHOD - THE DIFFERENCE MODEL

In order to evaluate which tender offers the best price-quality ratio, the contracting authority uses a difference model for comparing the sub-criteria "Price", "Imaging of coated samples at high magnification", "Imaging of uncoated samples at high magnification", "EDS on uncoated samples", "Automated stitching", "Fast and easy shift between high-low vacuum", "CL quality", "Simultaneous BSE&CL" "EDS quality", "Boron 5wt%", "Fast and precise EBSD", "EBSD library", "Quantitative analysis of 1200 touching grains in rock", "Spacing 0.2µm", " Mineral library", "Grain size as a basis for classification", "B in mineral mapping", "C in mineral mapping", "Batch reporting with figures"," Autom. min. based on optical or CL images", "Integrated images, BSE, optical, CL", "Integrated software solution" and "Collaboration". The details of the difference model are described below.

For this purpose, the contracting authority uses the following scale:

- *Extremely satisfactory (e.g. 5 points)*
- *Very satisfactory (e.g. 4 points)*
- *Satisfactory (e.g. 3 points)*
- *Less than satisfactory (e.g. 2 points)*

- *Not satisfactory (e.g. 1 point)*

The contracting authority uses the scale by awarding points for each sub-criterion element based on the overall evaluation of the fulfillment of requirements in the tender and then by calculating an overall score for each of the qualitative sub-criteria and the collaborative subcriterion “Imaging of coated samples at high magnification”, “Imaging of uncoated samples at high magnification”, “EDS on uncoated samples”, “Automated stitching”, “Fast and easy shift between high-low vacuum”, “CL quality”, “Simultaneous BSE&CL” “EDS quality”, “Boron 5wt%”, “Fast and precise EBSD”, “EBSD library”, “Quantitative analysis of 1200 touching grains in rock”, “Spacing 0.2µm”, ” Mineral library”, “Grain size as a basis for classification”, “B in mineral mapping”, “C in mineral mapping”, “Batch reporting with figures”,” Autom. min. based on optical or CL images”, “Integrated images, BSE, optical, CL”, “Integrated software solution” and “Collaboration”.

The overall score for each of the qualitative sub-criteria is calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{Subcriterion} = \frac{\left(\begin{matrix}\text{Points for subcriterion element 1 x}\\ \text{Weighting of subcriterion element 1}\end{matrix}\right) + \left(\begin{matrix}\text{Points for subcriterion element 2 x}\\ \text{Weighting of subcriterion element 2}\end{matrix}\right) + \left(\begin{matrix}\text{Points for subcriterion element 3 x}\\ \text{Weighting of subcriterion element 3}\end{matrix}\right)}{\text{Sum of weightings of subcriterion elements}}$$

For the comparison of the sub-criterion "Price" and the overall qualitative evaluation of the sub-criteria “Imaging of coated samples at high magnification”, “Imaging of uncoated samples at high magnification”, “EDS on uncoated samples”, “Automated stitching”, “Fast and easy shift between high-low vacuum”, “CL quality”, “Simultaneous BSE&CL” “EDS quality”, “Boron 5wt%”, “Fast and precise EBSD”, “EBSD library”, “Quantitative analysis of 1200 touching grains in rock”, “Spacing 0.2µm”, ” Mineral library”, “Grain size as a basis for classification”, “B in mineral mapping”, “C in mineral mapping”, “Batch reporting with figures”,” Autom. min. based on optical or CL images”, “Integrated images, BSE, optical, CL”, “Integrated software solution” and “Collaboration”, an overall quality score for each tenderer based on the mutual weighting between the qualitative sub-criteria is then calculated using the following formula:

Quality and collaboration score

$$\left(\text{Points for Imaging of coated samples at high magnification x}\right)_{5\%}$$

$$+\left(\text{Points for Imaging of uncoated samples at high magnification x}\right)_{9\%}$$

$$+\left(\text{Points for EDS on uncoated samples x}\right)_{4\%}+\left(\text{Points for Automated stitching x}\right)_{1\%}$$

$$+\left(\text{Points for Fast and easy shift between high}-\text{low vacuum x}\right)_{5\%}+\left(\text{Points for CL quality x}\right)_{4\%}$$

$$+\left(\text{Points for Simultaneous BSE and CL x}\right)_{1\%}+\left(\text{Points for EDS quality x}\right)_{8\%}$$

$$+\left(\text{Points for Boron 5wt\% x}\right)_{4\%}+\left(\text{Points for fast precise EBSD x}\right)_{2\%}+\left(\text{Points for EBSD library x}\right)_{1\%}$$

$$+\left(\text{Points for Quantitative analysis of 1200 touching grains in rock x}\right)_{11\%}$$

$$+\left(\text{Points for Spacing 0.2µm x}\right)_{2\%}+\left(\text{Points for Mineral library x}\right)_{7\%}$$

$$+\left(\text{Points for Grain size as a basis for classification x}\right)_{4\%}+\left(\text{Points for B in mineral mapping x}\right)_{3\%}$$

$$+\left(\text{Points for C in mineral mapping x}\right)_{4\%}+\left(\text{Points for Batch reporting with figures x}\right)_{1\%}$$

$$+\left(\text{Points for Autom.min.based on optical or CL images x}\right)_{2\%}+\left(\text{Points for Integrated images, BSE, optical, CL x}\right)_{1\%}$$

$$+\left(\text{Points for Integrated software solution x}\right)_{1\%}+\left(\text{Points for Collaboration x}\right)_{5\%}$$

$$=\frac{}{\text{Sum of weightings of subcriteria (“Imaging on coated samples at high magnification”, “Imaging on uncoated samples at high magnification”, “EDS on uncoated samples”, “Automated stitching”, “Fast and easy shift high − low vacuum”, “CL quality”, “Simultaneous BSECL” “EDS quality”, “Boron 5wt%”, “Fast and precise EBSD”, “EBSD library”, “Quantitative analysis 1200 touching grains in rock”, “Spacing 0.2µm”, ”Mineral library”, “Grain size as a basis for classification”, “B in mineral mapping”, “C in mineral mapping”, “Batch reporting with figure”, ”Autom.min.based on optical or CL images”, “Integrated images, BSE, optical, CL”, “Integrated software solution” and “Collaboration”)}$$

All tenders are compared two-by-two for the purpose of evaluating the advantages of the tenders against the evaluation criteria stated. When comparing two tenders, the advantages of the tenders are evaluated against the tender (of the two) having achieved the lowest overall quality score.

This means that when comparing the two tenders, where the percentage difference between the tenders is calculated using the formula "percentage difference = (y-x)/x" and where "x" and "y" represent the respective scores or tender prices of the tenders compared, depending on the relevant evaluation criterion, "x" will represent the tender (of the two) having achieved the lowest overall quality score. This also applies when "x" represents the tender price of the tender in question and regardless of whether "y" is larger than "x" in the "Price" comparison.

If two tenders compared have identical quality scores, the highest tender price of the two tenders compared will replace "x" above. This will not change the above method, when the tenders are compared with other tenders with no identical quality scores. Here, "x" will remain the tender of the two having achieved the lowest quality score.

If the weighted percentage difference for the qualitative evaluation criteria of a tender exceeds the weighted percentage difference for price, the tender having offered the best quality of the two tenders compared will be considered to have the best price-quality ratio.

If the weighted percentage difference for the qualitative evaluation criteria of a tender does not exceed the weighted percentage difference for price, the tender having offered the lowest price of the two tenders compared will be considered to have the best price-quality ratio.

If one of the two tenders compared is evaluated to be both better and cheaper in relation to the respective evaluation criteria, that tender will be considered to have the best price-quality ratio.

In the comparison of the percentage differences for quality and price, percentages are rounded to two decimal places. For example, 5.5443445443 % is rounded to 5.54 %, and 18.7695844 is rounded to 18.77 %.

See the calculation examples below.

Example 1:

Sub-criteria	**SUPPLIER 1**	**SUPPLIER 2**
[…] (50 %)	4.00	3.00
[…] (15 %)	3.50	4.00
[…] (15 %)	3.00	4.00
Price (20 %)	DKK 1,300,000	DKK 1,000,000

Calculation of quality score

$$\text{SUPPLIER 1 Quality score} = \frac{(4 \times 50\ \%) + (3.5 \times 15\ \%) + (3 \times 15\ \%)}{80\ \%} = 3.72 \text{ points}$$

$$\text{SUPPLIER 2 Quality score} = \frac{(3 \times 50\ \%) + (4 \times 15\ \%) + (4 \times 15\ \%)}{80\ \%} = 3.38 \text{ points}$$

SUPPLIER 1 has a quality score which is 10.06 % better than SUPPLIER 2 ((3.72-3.38)/3.38) = 0.1006 = 10.06 %), corresponding to a weighted difference of 8.05 %. SUPPLIER 1, however, has offered a price which is 30.00 % higher than SUPPLIER 2 ((1,300,000-1,000,000)/1,000,000 = 0.3 = 30.00 %), corresponding to a weighted difference in price of 6.00 %.

In view of the fact that SUPPLIER 1 has achieved a quality score which is 8.05 % better than that of SUPPLIER 2 and offered a price which is only 6.00 % higher, SUPPLIER 1 has offered the best ratio between "Price" and the qualitative criteria.

Example 2:

Sub-criteria	SUPPLIER 1	SUPPLIER 2
[…] (50 %)	4.00	4.00
[…] (15 %)	4.00	4.00
[…] (15 %)	5.00	4.00
Price (20 %)	DKK 1,300,000	DKK 1,000,000

Calculation of quality score

$$\text{SUPPLIER 1 Quality score} = \frac{(4 \times 50\ \%) + (4 \times 15\ \%) + (5 \times 15\ \%)}{80\ \%} = 4.19 \text{ points}$$

$$\text{SUPPLIER 2 Quality score} = \frac{(4 \times 50\ \%) + (3 \times 15\ \%) + (3 \times 15\ \%)}{80\ \%} = 4.00 \text{ points}$$

SUPPLIER 1 has a quality score which is 4.75 % better than SUPPLIER 2 ((4.19-4.00)/4.00) = 0.0475 = 4.75 %), corresponding to a weighted difference of 3.80 %. SUPPLIER 1 has offered a price which is 30.00 % higher than SUPPLIER 2 ((1,300,000-1,000,000)/1,000,000 = 0.30 = 30.00 %), corresponding to a weighted difference in price of 6.00 %.

In view of the fact that SUPPLIER 1 has achieved a quality score which is 3.80 % better than that of SUPPLIER 2 but offered a price which is 6.00 % higher, SUPPLIER 2 has offered the best ratio between price and the qualitative criteria.

3. EVALUATION METHOD – RANKED COMMISSION MODEL.

In the case where an evaluation of the quality criterion leads to a nearly-identical score between the Supplier with the best quality score and other Suppliers, and where the primary model does not give a fair result, the following evaluation method will come into place in stead of the Difference model cf. paragraph 2 in this Appendix. A nearly-identical best quality score is here defined as a quality score which is less than 2% lower than the best offer.

Price is defined as the ranked price for the Deliverable (80%) and the Maintenance and Support costs (20%) cf. paragraph 1, point 1 in this Appendix.

The evaluation will award the best price-quality & collaboration ratio by awarding points for quality and collaboration, cf. paragraph 1 in this Appendix Tenders should earn at least 300 out of 425 points (85 ranked quality and collaboration points, times 5 points = 425), in order to qualify for further competition. For qualifying tenders the ratio between price and quality & collaboration is calculated. This means that the points for quality & collaboration are divided by the price, after which the tender with the lowest price/quality & collaboration ratio will win.

The example below explains the model:

Supplier	Points for Quality & Collaboration	Price	Price per point
A	280	3500000	Does not qualify
B	310	4200000	13548
C	370	4900000	13243
D	410	6100000	14878

Supplier A does not earn the minimum 300 points for quality & collaboration and is therefore not considered. Supplier C wins the tender, as this offer both is higher than the minimum 300 points and has the best ratio between price and quality & collaboration.

4. EVALUATION METHOD – COMMISSION MODEL

In the case where an evaluation of the quality & collaboration-price criterion (paragraph 3 in this Appendix) evaluation does not lead to a winner of the tender, e.g. in case of two same price per quality & collaboration scores (rounded without decimals) or in case of no tenderers qualifying for the minimum of 300 points, the following evaluation method will come into place in stead of the Difference model cf. paragraph 2 in this Appendix and the Ranked Commission model cf. paragraph 3 in this Appendix.

Price is defined as the ranked price for the Deliverable (80%) and the Maintenance and Support costs (20%) cf. paragraph 1 in this Appendix.

The evaluation will award the best price-quality & collaboration ratio by awarding points for quality & collaboration without taking the ranking of the quality & collaboration factors

into account. Tenders should earn at least 80 out of 110 points (22 quality requirements, times 5 points = 110), in order to qualify for further competition. For qualifying tenders the ratio between price and quality is calculated. This means that the points for quality & collaboration are divided by the price, after which the tender with the lowest price/quality ratio will win.

The example below explains the model:

Supplier	Points for Quality & Collaboration	Price	Price per point
A	78	4400000	Does not qualify
B	81	4500000	58025
C	87	5100000	58621
D	106	6100000	57547

Supplier A does not earn the minimum 80 points for quality and is therefore not considered. Supplier D wins the tender, as this offer both is higher than the minimum 80 points and has the best ratio between price and quality.

Appendix B
Additional information
Open procedure

This appendix contains additional information that the tenderer should note when participating in the tender procedure.

1. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING COMMUNICATION AND QUESTIONS FOR THE CONTRACTING AUTHORITY

As stated in paragraph 3 of the tender specifications, questions must be asked not later than Wednesday 10th May, 12:00 UTM+2.

Questions asked after this deadline will be answered if they are received in time for the contracting authority to provide the information required and communicate the answers not later than six days before expiry of the tender deadline.

Questions received later than six days before the expiry of the tender deadline cannot expect to be answered.

The contracting authority may change the procurement documents. If the contracting authority makes substantial changes to the procurement documents, the deadline for submission of tender stipulated in paragraph 1 of the tender specifications will be extended.

The contracting authority is not permitted to change essential elements of the procurement documents, including the award criteria.

Changes of the procurement documents will be communicated to all via www.geus.dk/UK/services/labs/sem-lab.

2. THE TENDER MUST BE FINAL AND COMPLETE

The contracting authority is not allowed to negotiate the tenders submitted with the tenderers. The tender should therefore be drafted so that the contract can be entered into without prior negotiations between the tenderer and the contracting authority.

Hence, when filling in/completing the appendices, the tenderer should to the extent possible use wording of legal obligations and not wording such as “this might pertain to ...”, “one might also consider to ...” or “usually is used ...”, “we have often successfully ...”, “one might also envisage ..” or “this might be solved by ...”. Phrasing not suitable for legal obligations may, in the given circumstances, be treated as reservations with ensuing implications, see paragraph 3 below.

It is the responsibility of the tenderer to ensure that the tender is complete and drafted in accordance with the guidelines set out in the procurement documents.

3. RESERVATIONS IN THE TENDER

Reservations to minimum requirements or essential elements in the procurement documents must not be included in the tender. Reservations to minimum requirements or essential elements in the procurement documents will cause the tender to be rejected.

Several reservations to elements of the procurement documents that are not essential may lead to the reservations, overall, constituting a reservation to essential elements.

If the tenderer is uncertain about how to fill in or complete appendices or in case of doubt as to whether a reservation will cause the tender to be rejected, the tenderer is encouraged to submit written questions, see paragraph 3 of the tender specifications.

4. CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION IN THE TENDER

Documents or information in the tenderer's tender may be covered by the rules on access to documents. This means that competitors, etc., may request access to tenders submitted. According to the practice of the Danish Complaints Board for Public Procurement *(Klagenævnet for Udbud)*, requests for access to documents from other operators also participating in the tender procedure must be granted by the contracting authority. However, in the assessment of whether to grant access to documents, the contracting authority will include considerations as to whether the operator has asked that part of the tender be treated confidentially and has indicated which information/elements of the tender to be kept confidential.

If the tender contains information or elements which, for business reasons, are desired to be exempted from access to documents, the tenderer is asked to state so in its tender. However, irrespective of the tenderer's requests for confidentiality, the contracting authority will be entitled and obliged to give access to documents to the extent required by law.

5. OPENING AND EVALUATION OF TENDERS

The contracting authority will open the tenders after expiry of the tender deadline.

The tenderers are not authorised to attend the opening of tenders.

After opening the tenders, the contracting authority will initially check whether the tenders comply with the formal requirements of the procurement documents. The contracting authority may use the procedure of section 159(5) and (6) of the Danish Public Procurement Act *(udbudsloven)* if the tender does not comply with the formal requirements of the procurement documents.

Regardless of the use of the words "must" or "shall" in the procurement documents, the contracting authority reserves the right to obtain further information within the scope of the above mentioned provisions.

However, the contracting authority is not obliged to obtain further information or documentation from the tenderers.

The contracting authority may furthermore clarify possible ambiguities in the tenders within the scope of the Danish Public Procurement Act.

The contracting authority will furthermore evaluate whether the tenders are compliant. The tenders will then be evaluated as described in Appendix A.

After deciding on the award of the contract, the contracting authority will notify all tenderers of the award decision. The notification of the tenderers who have submitted a compliant tender but who are not awarded the contract will include a brief statement of the relevant grounds for the decision, including the characteristics and advantages of the successful tender as compared to the unsuccessful tenders, the name of the successful tenderer, plus information about the date of expiry of the standstill period.

6. OTHER INFORMATION

The contract is not divided into lots.

The contract concerns one instrument with its detectors that will work as one integrated unit. The instrument and its dedicated software are best serviced, maintained and updated by the dedicated service engineers and application specialists of the winning tenderer, as these persons will be educated to excel on the instrument of their own company. GEUS will thus be best served by not having the contract divided into lots.