

## Written report of the Contracting Authority

**Contracting Authority:** Czech University of Life Sciences Prague  
**Seat:** Kamýcká 129, 165 00 Praha - Suchdol  
**Represented:** Ing. Jakub Kleindienst, Bursar  
**ID:** 60460709  
**Contracting authority profile:** <https://zakazky.czu.cz>

### PUBLIC CONTRACT:

#### Purchase of GPS tracking device

The Contracting Authority based on the provisions of Section 217 of Act No. 134/2016 Coll., On Public Procurement, as amended (hereinafter "the Act"), to the above-mentioned public contract awarded pursuant to Act draw up a written report

<b>1. Subject of public contract</b>	
The subject-matter of the Public Contract is the delivery of a GPS tracking device, including data service and the acquisition of a replacement device in the event of the termination of the device on preferential terms.	
<b>2. Price agreed in the public contract</b>	
CZK 775 382, 23 without V.A.T.	
<b>3. Type of procurement procedure</b>	
Simplified under-limit procedure according to Sect. 53 of the Act.	
<b>4. Identification of the participants</b>	
Business name:	INTERREX-RINGS Sp. z o.o.
Seat:	Ogrody Romanów 7, 91-174 Łódź, Poland
Legal form:	limited company
ID:	366365637
<b>5. Identification of all participants excluded from the procurement procedure including a statement of grounds for their exclusion</b>	
Business name:	---
Seat:	---
Legal form:	---
ID:	---
Grounds for their exclusion:	---
<b>6. Identification of the economic operators with which a contract or a framework agreement was concluded</b>	
Business name:	INTERREX-RINGS Sp. z o.o.
Seat:	Ogrody Romanów 7, 91-174 Łódź, Poland

Legal form:	<b>limited company</b>
ID:	<b>366365637</b>
Reasons for their selection:	<p>The basic evaluation criterion is the economic viability of the bids.</p> <p>This basic evaluation criterion consists of the following sub-evaluation criteria (hereinafter also referred to as "DEC"), which are weighted as follows:</p> <p>DHK1: Bid price.....75% weight  DHK2: Lifetime warranty against natural causes of transmission equipment failure ..... 25% weight</p> <p>The Evaluation Committee did not assess the tenders because it would assess only one tender. The Evaluation Committee merely stated the tender Nr. 1 was acceptable to the Contracting Authority.</p>

<b>7. Identification of subcontractors</b>	
Business name:	---
Seat:	---
Legal form:	---
ID:	---

<b>8. Justification of the use of a negotiated procedure with prior publication or a competitive dialogue procedure</b>
Was not used

<b>9. Justification of the use of a negotiated procedure without prior publication</b>
Was not used

<b>10. Justification of the use of a light regime</b>
Was not used

<b>11. Justification of the cancellation of the procurement procedure or of not setting up a dynamic purchasing system</b>
Was not used

<b>12. Justification of the use of means of communication other than electronic means for the submission of tenders</b>
In accordance with the Act, the Contracting Authority allowed the submission of tenders only in electronic form.

<b>13. List of persons who were found to have a conflict of interest and a list of subsequently adopted measures</b>
--

No conflict of interest was identified for any person.

**14. Justification of not dividing an above-threshold public contract into lots**

The public contract was not divided in lots because, regarding the subject-matter, it was not necessary.

**15. Justification of laying down the requirement of turnover when proceeding pursuant to Section 78 (3) of the Act**

Contracting authority did not lay down the requirement of turnover when proceeding pursuant to Section 78 (3) of the Act