

## Written report of the Contracting Authority

**Contracting Authority:** Czech University of Life Sciences Prague  
**Seat:** Kamýcká 129, 165 00 Praha - Suchbát  
**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

1. Subject of public contract	
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.	
2. Price agreed in the public contract	
CZK 775 382, 23 without V.A.T.	
3. Type of procurement procedure	
Simplified under-limit procedure according to Sect. 53 of the Act.	
4. Identification of the participants	
Business name:	INTERREX-RINGS Sp. z o.o.
Seat:	Ogrody Romanów 7, 91-174 Łódź, Poland
Legal form:	limited company
ID:	366365637
5. Identification of all participants excluded from the procurement procedure including a statement of grounds for their exclusion	
Business name:	---
Seat:	---
Legal form:	---
ID:	---
Grounds for their exclusion:	---
6. Identification of the economic operators with which a contract or a framework agreement was concluded	
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</p> <p>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