

Written Report of the Contracting Authority

CONTRACTING AUTHORITY: Czech University of Life Sciences Prague
Registered office: Kamýcká 129, 165 00 Praha - Suchbát
Person authorized: Ing. Jana Vohralíková, bursar
Company ID: 60460709
Contracting Authority's profile: <https://zakazky.czu.cz>

TITLE OF THE PUBLIC CONTRACT:

**Delivery of ICT equipment to Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan under IQAT project
part b. Delivery of ICT equipment to Uzbekistan under IQAT project**

ev. č. Z2017-012189

The Contracting Authority of the above mentioned public contract, based on § 128 of the Act No. 134/2016 Sb., the Public Procurement Act, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the „Act“), made this written report.

1. Subject of the public contract

The subject of the public contract consists of delivery of ICT equipment to Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan under the IQAT project.

Delivery of ICT equipment to Uzbekistan under IQAT project

2. Value of the public contract

EUR 84 845

3. Type of procurement

Simplified below-threshold procedure pursuant to Section 53 of the Act.

4. Identification data of the tenderers in the procurement procedure

Name of legal person/Name of physical person (business entity):	Huge Trade (HK) Limited
Registered office/ place of business, respectively place of residence:	Unit 1109, 11/F., Kowloon Centre, 33 Ashley Road, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon, Hong Kong
Company ID:	1550131

5. Identification data of the excluded tenderers and the justification of the exclusion

Name of legal person/Name of physical person (business entity):	---
Registered office/ place of business, respectively place of residence:	---
Company ID:	---
Justification:	---

6. Identificaton data of the selected supplier and the justification of it's selection	
Name of legal person/Name of physical person (business entity):	Huge Trade (HK) Limited
Registered office/ place of business, respectively place of residence:	Unit 1109, 11/F., Kowloon Centre, 33 Ashley Road, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon, Hong Kong
Company ID:	1550131
Justification :	<i>The contracting authority did not make a bid evaluation because it would only evaluate the bid of one tenderer. However, the contracting authority has stated that the tenderer has fulfilled all the terms and conditions of the tender and its tender is acceptable to the contracting entity.</i>

7. Identification data of the subcontractors
There are no subcontractors.

8. Justification for using the procedure with publication or procedure with the competitive dialogue
Not used.

9. Justification for using the procedure without publication
Not used.

10. Justification for using the simplified procedure/mode
Not used.

11. Justification of the cancellation of the procuremet procedure or non-introduction of the dynamic purchasing system
Not canceled.

12. Justification for using the other communication means within the tender submission instead of the electronic means
Considering the experience of the contracting authority and the maximum effort to facilitate the process of submission of tenders, it was required to submit the tenders in a paper form at the address of the Contracting Authority without the use of an electronic tool (in particular an electronic signature).

13. Persons who have been identified as having a conflict of interest and indication of the measures taken
There has been not identified a conflict of interest by any person.

14. Justification of not dividing the above-threshold procedure procurement into parts
This is not an above-threshold procurement and it was divided into 2 parts.

15. Justification of the requirement for proof of turnover in case of the procedure according to § 78 Art. 3 of the Act
The contracting authority did not require the proof of turnover in case of the procedure according to § 78 Art. 3 of the Act.