

EXPLANATION OF TENDER DOCUMENTATION

within the meaning of Section 98 (3) of the Act No 134/2016, on public procurement, as amended
(hereinafter the “Act”)

Name of public contract:

DELIVERY OF STATIONARY CAMERA SYSTEMS AND PROVISION OF RELATED SERVICES

Above-the-threshold public delivery contract,
open procedure (hereinafter the “Public Contract”)

Reference number: VZ_2020_A46

ID	Question	Answer
1	<p>In answer to question no. 3 in explanation no. 01, the contracting Authority stated that it will determine the correct country of origin of the license plate according to the ISO 3166 standard. The referenced ISO 3166 standard defines country codes. Given that the question "how the contracting authority determines the correct country of origin" was answered "by country code", the Interviewer assumes that he will decide according to the country code on the left side of the license plate.</p> <p>In answer to question no. 5 in explanation no. 10, the contracting Authority stated that the country of registration can be recognized even if the registration number does not contain information on the country of origin in text form. This answer means that the contracting authority did not answer relevantly to question no. 3 in the explanation of no. 01, because it is still not clear how the contracting authority will determine the correct country of origin of the license plate.</p> <p>We hereby ask the contracting authority to answer question no. 3 in explanation no. 01 (and to extend the deadline for submission of tenders in an adequate manner - for a delay in replying), ie to clearly and transparently determine how it will determine the country of origin of the license plate, which will not contain the text designation of the country of</p>	<p>Explained.</p> <p>Among other things, the contracting authority requires the camera system to recognize the country of registration of the vehicle and, as part of the sample test, the contracting authority wants to verify this functionality.</p> <p>How and what algorithm the technology that is the subject of the supplier's offer will recognize the country of registration of the vehicle is a matter and the proprietary know-how of the supplier.</p> <p>Based on preliminary market consultations, the contracting authority assumes that the available technologies and algorithms can recognize the country of registration (in addition to text marking, eg according to EU convention) also according to the syntax of license plate, fonts used and overall graphic form of the license plate, ie comparative data according to the current knowledge of the contracting authority, is stored in a database and used for the recognition of the registration number and the country of registration.</p> <p>The contracting authority also assumes that the supplier's system is able to gradually add new model comparison types of license plates, resp. ensure that the system continuously learns to refine, among others classification of country of origin.</p> <p>This is also the reason, the contracting authority requires the participant to prove technical qualification by at least 3 reference supplies, the</p>

ID	Question	Answer
	<p>origin according to the ISO 3166 standard.</p> <p>Can the contracting Authority determine the country of origin of this license plate and describe on the basis of what objective criteria this has happened?</p> 	<p>subject of which corresponds to the subject of this public contract and that it has a system (or know-how) that has a sufficient base of recognized patterns and syntax is used to assign the country of origin in the conditions necessary for the performance of this contract.</p> <p>To the specific question of the participant, the contracting authority answers that the displayed license plate would use the available syntactic and graphic patterns of license plates (in this case it is the syntax PPP_CCCP, where P is a letter, C is a number) in the country of origin Great Britain. As justification, the contracting authority states that, according to the available information of the contracting authority, this syntax does not exist for any other models of license plates available to the contracting authority.</p> <p>The Contracting Authority recalls that the purpose of this public contract is to detect and classify vehicles that use toll roads in the Czech Republic and that vehicles registered in the Czech Republic, vehicles from neighboring countries and other continental EU countries predominate on these roads. Samples will also be tested on the same roads. Of course, the contracting authority cannot rule out that similar or even the same registration plate syntax could not occur in some less common countries of origin, but at the same time claims that the graphic design, including the vehicle license plate fonts used from these countries, will certainly be different from the example, their occurrence in the Czech Republic is absolutely exceptional and will certainly not affect the credibility of the sample test.</p> <p>The contracting authority therefore reasonably expects that the test of recognizing (in this case) the country of origin (registration) will not be distorted by the occurrence of less common countries of origin of vehicle registration, as the participant is clearly trying to suggest to the contracting authority.</p> <p>The contracting authority is convinced that it answered both previous questions asked by the participant correctly and without delay. For this reason, the contracting authority will not further extend the deadline for submission of tenders.</p>
2	<p>Can the contracting Authority explain how it will verify that the bidder's solution offered meets the B3 parameters? It follows from the above changes in the tender documentation that the contracting Authority does not intend to verify that the offered solution meets the</p>	<p>Explained.</p> <p>The contracting authority described the method of fulfilling the offered parameter B3 (or some of its components) in sufficient detail in paragraph 9.8 of Annex No. 2, version dated 4.5.2020.</p> <p>The contracting authority agrees with the opinion of</p>

ID	Question	Answer
	<p>offered functionalities. Due to the fact that these are parameters included in the evaluation criteria and due to the fact that no significant occurrence of pedestrians or cyclists can be expected under the toll gates, it can be reasonably assumed that this functionality will never be actually used, more precisely it will never be actually verified its accuracy and reliability in real operation and that it is required only for the purpose of favoring the pre-preferred supplier.</p> <p>Can the contracting Authority explain why it does not require real testing of the functionality entering into the evaluation criteria and directly influencing the selection of the winner of the public contract and the price of the bid?</p> <p>Can the contracting Authority explain how, after signing the contract and delivering the solution with the winner, it will verify the functionality and accuracy of parameter B3?</p>	<p>the participant that the occurrence of pedestrians and cyclists, ie two of the three objects defined by the contracting authority in paragraph 3.3 of Annex No. 1 to the tender documentation, version dated 4.5.2020, will be exceptional and in real operation their functionality does not occur at all. It is therefore practically impossible to verify the occurrence of these two specific objects during the test of the samples.</p> <p>Precisely due to the difficult verification of parameter B3, the contracting authority included any non-compliance with this parameter only in the contractual penalties, see new paragraph 9.8 of Annex No. 2 of the tender documentation, version dated 4.5.2020 and not under the test of samples.</p> <p>By his question, the participant himself correctly justified why the contracting authority waived the verification of this additional parameter within the sample test and why, precisely because it is an evaluated (albeit additional, ie optional) parameter, included it in the provisions on contractual penalties with specific and transparent method of verification.</p> <p>The contracting authority recalls that this parameter would be tested after the conclusion of the purchase contract only if there is a reasonable suspicion that the offered parameter is not met by the delivered goods (eg after the occurrence of these objects is documented in the perimeter of the supplier's installed camera system and the supplier's system did not detect them (if this situation were in conflict with the supplier's offer).</p> <p>In such a case, the contracting authority could also, depending on the circumstances, provide, for example, an expert examination of the fulfillment of parameter B3. If the expert examination subsequently showed that parameter B3 was not fulfilled, even though its fulfillment was offered in the offer of the selected supplier, the contracting authority would apply the relevant contractual penalties.</p> <p>The solution described above is in full compliance with the law.</p>
3	<p>In Article 2.7 of the sample contract, the contracting Authority states that it is entitled to choose any of the methods listed in paragraph 3.4 of Annex No. 1 to the TD, so it is obviously a choice of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the contracting authority requires that, within the method proposed by the supplier, defective goods (dismantled by the contracting authority) can be handed over to the supplier in at least 	<p>Explained, not accepted.</p> <p>The participant misinterprets paragraph 2.7 of Annex 2 and its relationship to paragraph 3.4 of Annex 1.</p> <p>The contracting authority requires the participant to state in his tender how he proposes to exchange (take over) defective goods and return them (handover) to the contracting authority, ie it is up to</p>

ID	Question	Answer
	<p>one of the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sending by courier or other postal service to one of the European countries, • handover and acceptance at the registered office or establishment of the contracting authority, • handover and acceptance at the registered office or establishment of the supplier in the Czech Republic; <p>At the same time, however, at this point the contracting authority requires AT LEAST one of the above methods, not all 3, therefore the requirement in the contract is in conflict with the definition in the TD. Can the contracting authority eliminate this discrepancy?</p>	<p>the supplier to choose at least one of the possible listed methods and state this / these in the SLA on the menu.</p> <p>Para. 2.7 of Annex 2 refers to paragraph 3.4 of Annex 1 and cannot therefore, in principle, be in conflict with it.</p> <p>If the supplier does not propose in the offer the method of handing over and taking over defective (and repaired or replaced) goods in accordance with paragraph 3.4 of Annex No. 1 to the tender documentation (ie with at least one of the above options), the customer is entitled to choose any of them (ie in paragraph 3.4 of Annex No. 1) to the above methods of handover and acceptance.</p> <p>The contracting authority considers the above provisions to be mutually consistent, without conflict, and will not modify the tender documentation in this regard in any way.</p>
4	<p>In Article 5.1 of the sample contract, the contracting authority newly states that the delivery period of 90 days applies in the case of an order within 30 days from the effective date of the contract. Can the contracting authority state what period applies to a later order? And if it is different, can the contracting Authority explain what led him to this change in the contract? If it requires different fulfillment times and at the same time it is not specified how many goods it will order with which delivery time, this is a non-transparent procedure of the contracting authority, which does not allow the participant to properly determine the price of performance.</p>	<p>Explained.</p> <p>The participant misinterprets the change in paragraph 5.1. of Annex No. 2. The contracting authority complied with the request of the participants to specify the deadline for the delivery of goods by modifying (by inserting the maximum period in which the contracting authority undertakes to send the invitation to perform). The other parts of this paragraph remain unchanged.</p> <p>Thus, by sending a call for performance, the contracting authority shall invite the supplier to perform to the extent and within the deadlines specified in paragraph 5.1. Annex No. 2; ie for the delivery of all goods defined in paragraph 2.1 of Annex No. 2 in parts according to letter a) to c) paragraph 5.1. Annex No. 2. Failure to comply with the deadline for making a call for performance by the contracting authority specified in paragraph 5.1 of Annex No. 2 shall not be permitted by the contracting authority, ie in the event of a delayed call by the contracting authority, the supplier shall not be obliged to deliver a performance.</p> <p>The contracting authority rejects the interviewer's claim of the contracting authority's non-transparent procedure as unfounded and calls on the supplier to use the institute of requests for explanations of the tender documentation in the manner for which it is intended.</p>
5	<p>Article 9.8 of the contract lists the sanctions for non-compliance with the declared parameters as 1% of the total price for every 0.2 points of the negative difference. part A)</p>	<p>Explained, not accepted. part A)</p> <p>The contracting authority will conclude a contract with a supplier who has met the requirements of the contracting authority, defined in the tender</p>

ID	Question	Answer
	<p>Difference found during the test - the contracting Authority states that if the declared parameters are not met during the test of the operation of the goods, a certain fine will be paid by the supplier. The contracting authority therefore admits the situation that it will sign a contract with a tenderer who has not met the promised parameters, on the basis of which he became the winner of the public contract. This procedure is in direct conflict with the Act. The contracting Authority may not sign the contract with the supplier. Will the contracting Authority provide an adequate TD correction?</p> <p>part B)</p> <p>The difference found during operation - does the participant correctly understand that the contracting Authority reserves the contractual right to fine the entire delivery of the supplier on the basis of a test of one camera? How often will the contracting Authority apply this fine? Or, is it only a one-off fine and it will not be possible to enforce it a second time (even during another test at another toll gate)? Will the participant have the right to request (in case the fine will apply) to perform a new test, as it will be performed before signing the contract according to this TD? (The contracting authority also speaks in the contract about an undefined credible manner of verification).</p>	<p>documentation and met other conditions for concluding the contract pursuant to § 104 of the Act, including the successful test result to the extent specified by the contracting authority.</p> <p>As the additional B3 parameters (if they are the subject of the supplier's offer) cannot be effectively tested during normal operation and these parameters will not be included in the sample test verification, it will not be possible to determine with certainty at the time of the contract that the supplier did not receive the offered optional parameters.</p> <p>However, this applies in general, not only in relation to additional parameters, but also to the mandatory requirements of the contracting authority (eg resistance to dust or moisture, operating temperature range, etc.). These risks are generally acceptable and the institute of contractual penalties is legally possible for their possible mitigation and quite commonly used.</p> <p>The Contracting Authority is convinced that its procedure is not in any (direct or indirect) conflict with the law and will not make adjustments to the tender documentation in connection with this issue.</p> <p>part B)</p> <p>If there is a demonstrable non-fulfillment of any of the offered parameters, the contracting authority (client) has the right to a contractual penalty according to Article 9 of Annex No. 2 for each individual case of violation.</p> <p>The contracting authority stipulates that the rules of sample testing are applied appropriately to a possible test (if the contracting authority reasonably accepts it) and thus allows not only the possibility of repeating the test, but also the application of a credible method of verification, ie parallel measurement of monitored parameters by the contracting authority's own equipment, etc.</p> <p>The contracting authority does not specify how often it will perform the test, but stipulates that it will take the test if it has reasonable doubts about the fulfillment of the quality parameters of the delivered goods.</p> <p>The contracting authority states that in principle it cannot be a one-time and temporary failure of one camera (such a case would be solved, for example, by a complaint of a defective camera), but a systematic phenomenon, detected, verified and properly documented.</p> <p>With regard to other variants of how to prove that some of the offered parameters are not fulfilled, it is no longer possible in principle to limit the list of</p>

ID	Question	Answer
		<p>possible means of proof in advance. In the case of court proceedings in general, pursuant to the provisions of Section 125 of Act No. 99/1963 Coll., The Code of Civil Procedure, as amended, all means by which the state of affairs can be ascertained may serve as evidence. Contractual exclusion of the application of this legal provision is probably not legally possible.</p>
6	<p>In Article 10.2, the contracting Authority added the right to withdraw from the purchase contract if the goods for the test were equipped with software that allows to distort the actual values of the parameters of the goods (for example, by excluding images).</p> <p>Can the contracting Authority explain what this means? Is this another additional SW that is not needed for the operation of the goods? Or does it mean some specific SW settings that are needed to ensure functionality? Under the above definition, the very setting of the detection reliability threshold in integrated algorithms, which is the basic technology of the required goods.</p>	<p>Explained.</p> <p>The contracting authority modified the tender documentation on the basis of acceptance of the participant's comment formulated in response to question 1 of the request for explanation of tender documentation No. 3 of 4.5.2020 that (cit.) <i>"The contracting authority cannot prevent any selection by the software so that the checked parameters A1 and A2 came out as best as possible"</i>.</p> <p>With this measure, the contracting authority wants to face the risk of possible distortion of the sample test by the selected supplier.</p> <p>Distortion of the sample test means the artificial achievement of better results of the supplier's system during the sample test compared to the actual state of recognition of the offered parameters of all vehicles that passed the scanned section of road during the sample test.</p> <p>In particular, the contracting authority does not allow the SW of the supplier, which is a part of the camera system, in any way and on the basis of any parameter, to spontaneously delete the acquired images in order to distort the test of samples.</p> <p>For example, it is permissible (or even desirable) for the supplier's system to select the best quality from several images of the same vehicle, but it is completely unacceptable for the supplier's system to delete all vehicle images and give the impression that the vehicle did not pass the section of road at all during the test.</p>
7	<p>Does the inquirer correctly understand Article 16.10 so that the measurement of 10,000 + 2,000 will be carried out continuously and will not be completed until both limit values have been reached? I.e. if 18,000 passes are collected during the day and only 1,900 at night, will the measurement continue throughout the second day, when, for example, another 18,000 passes will be collected and will not end until the beginning of the second night, when 2,000 night passes will be reached? So in this hypothetical case, 36,000 day and 2,000 night passes will be evaluated?</p>	<p>Explained.</p> <p>The participant's conclusion is not identical with the intention of the contracting authority. In such a case, the contracting authority would interrupt the test and collect the missing records in night mode. However, as the interviewer himself states, his conclusion is purely hypothetical. The contracting authority has verified that the required minimum number of passes in day and night mode is realistic to acquire during continuous measurement for 24 (but also less) hours.</p> <p>In this context, the contracting authority recalls that in paragraph 16.10 of the tender documentation, it</p>

ID	Question	Answer
		reserved the right to suspend the testing of samples for important reasons.
8	<p>The contracting authority in TD requires lossless compression of the PNG or JPG image. In answer to question No.4 in the explanation No.10, the contracting Authority explained that it requires either PNG or JPG or both. Because the JPG format is always compressed in principle (there is no lossless compression for JPG), the image quality will always be degraded when transmitting images in JPG format. This can easily lead to a situation where for the human eye, which will check the correctness of the recognition during the test, the given license plate will be blurred or unreadable, even though the system has recognized the license plate correctly on the basis of uncompressed data.</p> <p>How will the Contracting Authority proceed in such a case? (ie the image of the SS will be "out of focus" but not through the Supplier, but through the use of the JPG format, which the Contracting Authority expressly allows in the ZD)</p>	<p>Explained.</p> <p>The contracting authority requires either PNG or JPG or both. The contracting authority confirms that neither the format (ie PNG or JPG) nor the degree of compression of the image is decisive for the contracting authority (as proof the contracting authority submits the fact that it does not specify any compression ratio in its requirements used by the supplier at all), however, requires for high-quality visual inspection of machine-recognized metadata.</p> <p>Furthermore, the contracting authority states for order that lossless compression also exists in the JPG format, if suitable algorithms are used in its application.</p>
9	<p>The contracting Authority assumes to evaluate the license plate only on the basis of one image, which will be sent from the supplier's equipment. The inquirer has an experience that it is often not clear from the individual image which sign it is on the license plate, or sometimes one character looks like another. If the vehicle is photographed at a distance of 30m in front of the camera, "B" can be regularly recognized as "8", because it will look like that for the human eye (and therefore the persons evaluating the correctness will make the same mistake as the camera). However, if images at a distance of 25, 20 and 15 meters were used, it would already be obvious to the human eye in these images that it is the number "8".</p> <p>Can the contracting Authority explain how it will ensure that in this hypothetical case the image from 30 meters is not recognized as correct, but is included as incorrect? (The inquirer recommends shooting a video, and those who evaluate it will be based primarily on the video, not the image from the device)</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The contracting authority states that the usual way of recording camera systems similar to the purpose for which this public contract is conducted is that the camera system automatically takes a sequence of images and for further processing evaluates and selects the most suitable according to the manufacturer's proprietary algorithm.</p> <p>The client therefore expects to select an image of the camera system software for visual verification of the correct detection and classification.</p> <p>Visual inspection of the correctness of the detection of license plate is not feasible from the video if the vehicle is not stationary or does not move very slowly, which is unusual in normal operation and not usable for testing samples.</p>
10	<p>The contracting authority assumes to evaluate the license plate only on the basis of one image, which will be sent from the supplier's equipment. The inquirer warns the contracting authority that well-trained neural networks can</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>As it is clear from paragraph 16.11 of the tender documentation, the contracting authority requires legibility of vehicle images, except in cases where</p>

ID	Question	Answer
	<p>recognize poor-quality images of the monitoring system significantly better than the human eye. Thus, the inquirer's equipment can reliably recognize the registration number on the image, when the person of the contracting authority cannot yet reliably recognize it and will probably consider such an image to be of poor quality. In the best case, he will be disqualified for not being able to decide on the correctness, in the worst case, the supplier will be awarded an error for a poor quality image.</p> <p>Can the contracting Authority update the TD so that it assesses only the correctness of the required function (ie recognition of the license plate and the country of origin) and ceases to complicate the entire TD and the method of evaluation by the enormous number of exceptions, conditions and gray areas of uncertainty? (see recommendation in question no. 9)</p>	<p>the illegibility is caused by external influences (dirty or missing number plates, vehicle speed above 200 km/h, etc.). Readability is obviously assessed from the point of view of the capabilities of the human eye, as follows from the description of the test of the samples.</p> <p>Therefore, if the supplier's system generates unreadable images for the human eye without the external effects of image illegibility being mentioned, this will be considered as a supplier system error for sample testing, regardless of whether the supplier's system can hypothetically obtain the correct metadata (or rather an estimate of these metadata) even for an unreadable image for the human eye.</p> <p>The contracting authority further explains that for any further use of the obtained data in administrative or other proceedings, quality photo documentation (suitable for correct evaluation by the human eye) is crucial. In most cases, it is not enough just to potentially correctly identify the license plate and store it in the metadata of the image. Everything that the contracting authority requires is transparently described in the tender documentation. Regarding the selection of images, see also the explanation of question no. 9.</p>
11	<p>By changing the TD on 4.5.2020, the contracting authority newly accepted the delivery of cameras and a local server.</p> <p>part A)</p> <p>what are the power restrictions / requirements for this server? What kind of power supply is required / enabled (230 AC, 24DC)? Is there a limit on consumption?</p> <p>part B)</p> <p>It follows from the above text that 1 server is allowed per set of cameras, so the inquirer assumes</p> <p>that all cameras on one toll gate are to be operated by one local server. Can the contracting Authority explain how the participant is to fill in the price of this server in the document "tender price.xlsx"? From the participant's point of view, it is not possible to "dissolve" the price of the server into cameras, because each toll gate will have a different number of cameras, regardless of the fact that the price of the server may differ depending on the number of cameras. At the same time, it is not clear whether local servers are also required to supply 10% more devices than will</p>	<p>Explained.</p> <p>The contracting authority repeatedly warns the participant that the institute of a request for an explanation of the tender documentation is not intended for attempts to influence the contracting authority's preferences. The contracting authority reiterates that he prefers image processing directly in the camera system. However, in the interest of non-discrimination, the contracting authority allows alternative solutions through either the contracting authority's existing servers, the specifications of which are given in the tender documentation and specified in previous explanations of the tender documentation, or (newly) supply of additional components (eg servers) as part of the supply of camera systems.</p> <p>part A)</p> <p>The connection of additional components (eg server or servers) will be in the competence of the contracting authority while maintaining the contracting authority's power supply requirement (see paragraph 2.8 of Annex No. 1 to the tender documentation), which does not change in any way by allowing additional components.</p>

ID	Question	Answer
	<p>actually be installed.</p>	<p>part B)</p> <p>The contracting authority did not stipulate that all cameras on one toll gateway be operated by one local server. The contracting authority does not specify any additional requirements or restrictions regarding the number of servers per number of cameras.</p> <p>How the supplier takes this alternative solution, not requested by the contracting authority and not preferred by the contracting authority into the price offer, is entirely up to the supplier. The contracting authority is not able to process price offers for suppliers; on the contrary, it expects that the suppliers themselves will be able to adequately price the performance they offer, ie include all their other costs in the price offer of cameras, including costs for delivery of local servers, if it considers this solution for performance. public procurement as the most appropriate and wants to offer it to the contracting authority in this way.</p> <p>The contracting authority's request for the supply of a reserve does not apply to servers in principle and in relation to the above.</p>
12	<p>In response to question no. 3 in explanation no. 04, the contracting Authority stated that the supplier must prove which vehicles traveled faster than 200 km/h, if an error occurred during recognition.</p> <p>This requirement of the contracting Authority is in conflict with the Act. The contracting authority MUST ensure a transparent, objective, repeatable and verifiable evaluation of the public contract. It is not permissible for the evaluation of the results to depend on any unspecified optional equipment of the participant.</p> <p>Will the contracting authority carry out the corresponding TD correction? (The inquirer proposes to use the video according to question no. 9 also to determine the speed of the vehicle, or for the contracting authority to provide a certified speed measurement, which will be taken into account in the evaluation)</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The contracting authority does not require or measure the speed measurement. It is entirely up to the supplier whether he accepts this possibility of checking the course of the sample test and implements it at his own expense (but with the appropriate cooperation of the contracting authority). The contracting authority notes that it is in the supplier's interest to measure the speed for the reasonable elimination of vehicles traveling higher than the speed limit required by the contracting authority. If the supplier accepts this possibility of protection, he must provide a metering equipment that meets the requirements set out in paragraph 16.11 of the tender documentation, ie it is not a (cit.) "<i>Unspecified optional device</i>", as the participant tries to introduce to the contracting authority.</p> <p>However, notwithstanding the above, the contracting authority states that it does not consider speed measurement to verify the offered parameters to be absolutely necessary, as the occurrence of vehicles traveling at speeds higher than 200 km/h is statistically on the roads of the Czech Republic very low and therefore the risk of distorting the test of samples with unrecorded, resp. undetected and unclassified vehicles is negligible.</p> <p>By accepting the possibility of measurement, the</p>

ID	Question	Answer
		<p>contracting authority wanted to satisfy the participants, who drew attention to this matter, especially with regard to ensuring transparency, objectivity and reviewability of the evaluation of the public contract. Therefore, the contracting authority does not and by this principle cannot be in conflict with the law by this acceptance of the control speed measurement (provided by the supplier).</p> <p>In order to avoid any doubts about its intention to proceed in a non-discriminatory manner, the contracting authority allows the supplier to perform measurements of other quantities that may affect the testing of samples, eg outdoor temperature, etc.</p> <p>The contracting authority considers the measurement of the vehicle speed by means of video to be at most indicative and thus does not meet the requirements for transparency and reviewability, and therefore will not carry out this modification of the tender documentation recommended by the interviewer.</p>
13	<p>From the perspective of the inquirer, the contracting authority has already sufficiently explained the course of testing, subsequent evaluation and the rules of repeating the test if any of the criteria are not met.</p> <p>Can the contracting authority confirm or refuse whether the supplier will be able to modify the settings of the camera and the integrated SW before repeating the test?</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>The contracting authority is aware that the quality of recognition of the required parameters depends directly on the settings of the camera system software with respect to local conditions and will allow the supplier to modify the integrated software before repeating the test.</p> <p>If the selected supplier is interested, it will also be possible to exchange some potentially malfunctioning goods for another piece of the same type, if the spare piece is available to the supplier.</p>
14	<p>In response to question no. 16 in explanation no. 04, the contracting Authority stated that the total number will be determined using the existing system of the contracting authority, which will measure the number of vehicles. This explanation is misleading and confusing, because we first talk about determining the number of vehicles and then we talk about each individual vehicle and does not define at all what kind of equipment it is.</p> <p>Can the contracting authority specifically describe how it will proceed in determining the total set of vehicles that should have been detected and recognized?</p> <p>Does the inquirer understand this answer correctly that the contracting authority will run another license plate recognition system in parallel and will merge the photographs from</p>	<p>Explained.</p> <p>The participant misinterprets the changes to the tender documentation. The contracting authority does not state that (cit.) "<i>the total number will be determined using the current system</i>". In its response to previous requests for clarification and subsequent modification of the tender documentation, the contracting authority clearly declares its expectation that the supplier's camera system (tested) will demonstrate better results than the (camera) system currently available to the contracting authority.</p> <p>Parallel measurement by the contracting authority's camera system is only a control mechanism, especially against the possible influence of the number of collected images by the software of the selected supplier, see also the answer to question no. 6 and article 16 of the tender documentation.</p>

ID	Question	Answer
	both systems for evaluation purposes, remove duplications and this will be considered as the default group of 100% of vehicles to be recognized? If the contracting authority switches off the illumination of the existing equipment, will it provide relevant results also for night operation?	<p>The contracting authority implicitly expects the selected supplier's camera system to detect and recognize more passing vehicles than the contracting authority's existing camera system operating at the same time, both during the day and at night, especially if the contracting authority switches off the daylight on its camera system.</p> <p>The evaluation procedure is described in detail in paragraph 16.11 of the tender documentation, version dated 4.5.2020</p>

In Prague on 15 May 2020

Ing. Jan Paroubek
in charge of the state enterprise