

PROTOCOL OF THE COMPETITION JURY EVALUATION MEETING

("Protocol")

CONTRACTING AUTHORITY:	Správa železnic, státní organizace Dlážděná 1103/7 110 00 Prague 1
NAME OF THE DESIGN COMPETITION:	PRAGUE EAST TERMINAL

On 9 December 2020, starting from 9:30 a.m., an evaluation meeting of the jury of the architectural – urban competition for design entitled "**Prague East Terminal**" ("**Competition**"), the contracting authority of which is Správa železnic, státní organizace ("**Contracting Authority**"), was held at the headquarters of HAVEL & PARTNERS s.r.o., the law firm.

A protocol ("**Protocol**") was prepared from the jury meeting, which summarises the course of the jury evaluation meeting. This Protocol will form an integral part of the protocol on the course of the Competition.

Based on the consent of the chairman of the jury, Ing. arch. Petr Štefek, the evaluation meeting of the jury was organisationally led by the representative of the organiser of the Competition, Mgr. Kamila Kulhánková, in the constant presence and under the supervision of the chairman of the jury.

1. On 9 December 2020 at 9:30 a.m. the evaluation meeting of the Competition jury was started by the representative of the Competition organiser, Mgr. Kamila Kulhánková.
2. At the beginning, individual members of the jury, representatives of the subsidiary bodies of the Competition jury and invited experts were welcomed.
3. At the evaluation meeting (following the presence of individual members of the jury), the jury voted in the following composition:

DEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY	INDEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY
1. Ing. arch. Pavel Andršt (SŽ)	1. Ing. arch. Antonín Novák
2. Ing. Marek Pinkava (SŽ)	2. Ing. arch. Karel Hájek, Ph.D.
3. Ing. Jiří Poběřežský (Municipality of Nehvizdy)	3. Ing. arch. Ing. Jiří Jandourek
	4. Ing. arch. Petr Štefek
	5. Ing. arch. Anna Švarc
	6. Ing. arch. Pavla Pannová

4. Other members of the jury present at the jury evaluation meeting:

Alternates/substitute members:	Alternates/substitute members:
1. Ing. arch. Matyáš Hron (SŽ)	1. doc. Ing. arch. Akad. sheet. Jiří Klokočka
	2. Ing. arch. David Hlouch

5. The following persons also took part in the jury's evaluation meeting:

Representative of the Competition organiser:	Mgr. Kamila Kulhánková
Competition Secretary:	Ing. arch. Miroslav Vodák
Competition Entries Reviewer:	Ing. Jiří Velebil
Invited Expert:	Ing. Jan Janoušek
Invited Expert:	Ing. Lenka Žemličková, Ph.D.

6. All persons present at the evaluation meeting of the jury confirmed their participation by signing the attendance list, which forms **Annex No. 1 to this Protocol**.

09:40 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.:

7. Mgr. Kamila Kulhánková acquainted those present with the course of the Competition during the competition period. She acquainted those present with the course of opening of the competition entries (in both paper and electronic form) on the basis of the protocol on the opening of envelopes and on the result of the assessment of compliance with the participation conditions of individual participants of the Competition based on the report on the assessment of compliance with the participation conditions. Due to the fact that the participant, who submitted Competition Entry No. 20 in the Competition, did not prove the fulfilment of the participation conditions, this participant will be excluded from the Competition. The jury was informed of this fact and thus acknowledged that it would not carry out the evaluation of Competition Entry No. 20 within the evaluation of the competition entries.

No request to record a different opinion of a jury member in the Protocol was made by the jury for the introductory part of the Competition evaluation meeting.

10:00 a.m. – 10:40 a.m.:

8. The reviewer of the competition entries acquainted the present jurors with the reviewer's report, which forms **Annex No. 2 to this Protocol**, and drew attention to any findings identified in relation to the individual competition entries. The extent of the examination of individual competition entries is set out in Annex No. 2 to this Protocol.

9. After acquainting the jury with the reviewer's report, the jury subsequently voted on each competition entry, in relation to which any finding was stated in the reviewer's report.
10. The following procedure was proposed for the vote: The regular members of the jury vote (in case of absence of a regular member of the jury, an alternate pursuant to point 3 of the Protocol). Each voting member shall have one vote. The jury has a quorum. The jury makes decisions by a majority of votes. The procedure described above was approved by the jury as follows:

FOR: 9

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

The chairman of the jury, with his consent, confirmed the procedural correctness of the performed voting.

JURY'S VOTING

10:20 a.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 1

During the review of Competition Entry No. 1, the reviewer identified the following finding:

Competition Entry No. 1	The flow chart of passengers is on panel no. 5 instead of panel no. 4
--------------------------------	---

The abovementioned fact did not give any advantage to the given competition entry compared to other competition entries.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 1 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the fact identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

FOR: 9

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 1 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

10:21 a.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 4.

During the review of Competition Entry No. 4, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 4	Designation of the panels is located in the upper left corner and is processed by a graphic diagram.
	TERMINÁL PRAHA VÝCHOD/ PRAGUE EAST TERMINAL designation is located in the upper left corner.
	The scale on panel no. 2 is different from the recommended one.

The abovementioned facts did not give any advantage to the given competition entry compared to other competition entries.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 4 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

FOR: 9

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 4 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

10:21 a.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 5.

During the review of Competition Entry No. 5, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 5	No scale is specified on panel no. 1.
	No scale is specified on panel no. 2.
	The scale on panel no. 3 is different from the recommended one.
	The flow chart of passengers is stated also on panel no. 3.

The abovementioned facts did not give any advantage to the given competition entry compared to other competition entries.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 5 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

FOR: 9

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 5 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

10:22 a.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 7.

During the review of Competition Entry No. 7, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 7	Confusion of the formal designation of panels no. 3 and no. 4.
	The flow chart of passengers was placed by the participant on panel no. 3 instead of panel no. 4.
	The interior visualisation is displayed on panel no. 4 (their incorrect designation as panel no. 3) instead of on panel no. 5.

The abovementioned facts did not give any advantage to the given competition entry compared to other competition entries.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 7 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

FOR: 9

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 7 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

10:22 a.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 8.

During the review of Competition Entry No. 8, the reviewer identified the following finding:

Competition Entry No. 8	Panel no. 2 contains an incorrect designation of the selected scale; the scale of 1:250 is stated, but in fact the scale is 1:750.
--------------------------------	--

The abovementioned fact did not give any advantage to the given competition entry compared to other competition entries.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 8 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

FOR: 9

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 8 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

10:23 a.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 9.

During the review of Competition Entry No. 9, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 9	Panels numbering in the lower left corner is missing.
	Panel no. 1 contains an incorrect designation of the selected scale; the scale of 1:750 is stated, but in fact the scale is 1:4000.
	The flow chart of passengers was placed by the participant on panel no. 3 instead of panel no. 4.
	The interior visualisation is shown on panel no. 4 instead of panel no. 5.

The abovementioned facts did not give any advantage to the given competition entry compared to other competition entries.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 9 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

FOR: 9

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 9 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

10:24 a.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 10.

During the review of Competition Entry No. 10, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 10	No scale is specified on panel no. 1.
	No scale is specified on panel no. 2.
	The scale on panel no. 3 is different from the recommended one.

The abovementioned facts did not give any advantage to the given competition entry compared to other competition entries.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 10 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

FOR: 9

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 10 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

10:26 a.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 13.

During the review of Competition Entry No. 13, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 13	Graphic section:
	No scale is specified on panel no. 1.
	No scale is specified on panel no. 2.
	The scale on panel no. 3 is different from the recommended one.
	The flow chart of passengers is displayed on panel no. 3 instead of panel no. 4
	Text part:
	Only the title page has A3 format, the others are in A4 format.
It does not contain a preview of P2 panel, but a visualisation. It does not contain the annotation, which is on P1 panel.	

The abovementioned facts did not give any advantage to the given competition entry compared to other competition entries.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 13 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

FOR: 9

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 13 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

10:26 a.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 14.

During the review of Competition Entry No. 14, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 14	The scale on panel no. 1 is different from the recommended one.
	No scale is specified.
	No scale is specified.

The abovementioned facts did not give any advantage to the given competition entry compared to other competition entries.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 14 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

FOR: 9

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 14 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

10:28 a.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 15.

During the review of Competition Entry No. 15, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 15	The graphic part of the competition entry (panels) submitted in a format different than B1. However, B1 format was only a recommended format.
	The scale on panel no. 1 is different from the recommended one.
	The scale on panel no. 2 is different from the recommended one.
	The scale on panel no. 3 is different from the recommended one.

The abovementioned facts did not give any advantage to the given competition entry compared to other competition entries.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 15 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

FOR: 9

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 15 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

10:29 a.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 16.

During the review of Competition Entry No. 16, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 16	Panels numbering in the lower left corner is missing.
	No scale is specified on panel no. 1.
	The scale on panel no. 2 is different from the recommended one.
	Views and sections shown on panel no. 4; arrival to the platform and the roofing construction is on panel no. 4
	Interior visualisation included on panel no. 3.

The abovementioned facts did not give any advantage to the given competition entry compared to other competition entries.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 16 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

FOR: 9

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 16 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

10:30 a.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 17.

During the review of Competition Entry No. 17, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 17	Graphic section:
	Panels numbering in the lower left corner is missing.
	Panel no. 1 states the scale of 1:750, but in fact the scale is 1: 4000.
	Text part:
	Only TERMINÁL PRAHA VÝCHOD designation is present, the designation PRAGUE EAST TERMINAL is missing.

The abovementioned facts did not give any advantage to the given competition entry compared to other competition entries.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 17 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

FOR: 9

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 17 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

10:31 a.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 18.

During the review of Competition Entry No. 18, the reviewer identified the following finding:

Competition Entry No. 18	Only TERMINÁL PRAHA VÝCHOD designation is present, the designation PRAGUE EAST TERMINAL is missing.
---------------------------------	---

The abovementioned fact did not give any advantage to the given competition entry compared to other competition entries.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 18 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

FOR: 9

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 18 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

10:32 a.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 19.

During the review of Competition Entry No. 19, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 19	Graphic section:
	The panels numbering is stated on the top left and right.
	TERMINÁL PRAHA VÝCHOD/PRAGUE EAST TERMINAL designation is located in the upper right and left corner.
	No scale is specified on panel no. 1.
	Panel no. 2 does not state the overall situation of the terminal, car park and bridge; instead, an overview perspective and diagrams are shown; the overall situation at a scale of 1:750 is not displayed on other panels either.
	No scale is specified on panel no. 3.
	The overview perspective is stated on panel no. 2 instead of panel no. 4.
	Text part:
The text part is in A4 vertical (portrait) format.	

The abovementioned facts did not give any advantage to the given competition entry compared to other competition entries.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 19 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

FOR: 9

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 19 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

10:34 a.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 21.

During the review of Competition Entry No. 21, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 21	No scale is specified on panel no. 1.
	No scale is specified on panel no. 2.

The abovementioned facts did not give any advantage to the given competition entry compared to other competition entries.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 21 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

FOR: 9
 AGAINST: 0
 ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 21 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

10:40 a.m.: Following the voting result, a list of competition entries which advance to the evaluation phase was subsequently summarised, namely:

Competition Entry No. 1
Competition Entry No. 2
Competition Entry No. 3
Competition Entry No. 4
Competition Entry No. 5
Competition Entry No. 6
Competition Entry No. 7
Competition Entry No. 8
Competition Entry No. 9
Competition Entry No. 10

Competition Entry No. 11
Competition Entry No. 12
Competition Entry No. 13
Competition Entry No. 14
Competition Entry No. 15
Competition Entry No. 16
Competition Entry No. 17
Competition Entry No. 18
Competition Entry No. 19
Competition Entry No. 21

10:41 a.m.: The chairman of the jury, with his consent, confirmed the procedural correctness of the performed voting.

1. EVALUATION ROUND

10:40 – 11:15 a.m.

11. In the given time period, the jury devoted itself to the individual study of the competition entries.

11:15 – 11:30 a.m.: BREAK

11:30 a.m. – 1:45 p.m.:

12. In the given time period, the jury held a joint discussion to the individual competition entries in terms of the extent to which they met the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions.

1:50 – 2:15 p.m.:

13. After the end of the joint discussion on the individual competition entries, the chairman of the jury announced the vote on which competition entries shall advance to the 2nd round of competition entries evaluation; the jury would vote based on the extent to which individual competition entries met the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions, in connection with the findings of the jury identified within the individual study of the competition entries

and during the joint discussion held by the jurors on the individual competition entries.

14. The following procedure was proposed for the vote: The regular members of the jury vote (in case of absence of a regular member of the jury, an alternate pursuant to point 3 of the Protocol). Each voting member shall have one vote. The jury has a quorum. The jury makes decisions by a majority of votes.

The procedure described above was approved by the jury as follows:

FOR: 9
AGAINST: 0
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

The chairman of the jury, with his consent, confirmed the procedural correctness of the performed voting.

JURY'S VOTING (ADVANCE TO THE 2ND EVALUATION ROUND):

1:50 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 1

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 1 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 0
AGAINST: 9
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 1 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

1:54 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 2.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 2 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 8
AGAINST: 1
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 2 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

1:55 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 3.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 3 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 9
AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 3 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

1:56 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 4.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 4 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 0

AGAINST: 9

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 4 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

1:56 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 5.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 5 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 0

AGAINST: 9

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 5 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

1:57 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 6.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 6 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 7

AGAINST: 1

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 1

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 6 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

1:58 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 7.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 7 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 7
AGAINST: 1
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 1

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 7 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

1:59 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 8.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 8 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 8
AGAINST: 1
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 8 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

2:00 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 9.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 9 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 6
AGAINST: 1
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 2

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 9 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

2:01 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 10.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 10 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 7
AGAINST: 1
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 1

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 10 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

2:02 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 11.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 11 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 0
AGAINST: 9
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 11 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

2:03 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 12.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 12 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 0
AGAINST: 9
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 12 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

2:04 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 13.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 13 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 0
AGAINST: 9
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 13 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

2:05 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 14.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 14 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 0
AGAINST: 9
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 14 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

2:06 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 15.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 15 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 7
AGAINST: 1
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 1

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 15 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

2:07 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 16.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 16 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 9
AGAINST: 0
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 16 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

2:08 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 17.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 17 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 6
AGAINST: 2
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 1

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 17 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

2:09 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 18.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 18 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 7
AGAINST: 0
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 2

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 18 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

2:10 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 19.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 19 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 5
AGAINST: 1
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 3

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 19 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

2:11 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 21.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 21 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 0
AGAINST: 9
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 21 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

2:12 p.m.: Following the voting result, a list of competition entries which advance to the next (2nd round of) evaluation was subsequently summarised, namely:

Competition Entry No. 2
Competition Entry No. 3
Competition Entry No. 6
Competition Entry No. 7
Competition Entry No. 8
Competition Entry No. 9
Competition Entry No. 10
Competition Entry No. 15
Competition Entry No. 16
Competition Entry No. 17
Competition Entry No. 18
Competition Entry No. 19

2:15 p.m.: The chairman of the jury, with his consent, confirmed the procedural correctness of the performed voting.

2. EVALUATION ROUND

2:15 p.m. – 4:15 p.m.

15. The jury then proceeded to a detailed joint discussion on the individual competition entries, which, based on the result of the voting (see the minutes at 2:12 p.m.), advanced to the next, 2nd round of, evaluation of the competition entries.
16. After the end of the joint discussion on the individual competition entries, the chairman of the jury announced the vote on which competition entries shall advance to the 3rd round of competition entries evaluation; the jury will vote based on the extent to which individual competition entries met the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions, in connection with the findings of the jury identified within the individual study of the competition entries

and during the joint discussion held by the jurors on the individual competition entries.

17. The following procedure was proposed for the vote: The regular members of the jury vote (in case of absence of a regular member of the jury, an alternate pursuant to point 3 of the Protocol). Each voting member shall have one vote. The jury has a quorum. The jury makes decisions by a majority of votes.

The procedure described above was approved by the jury as follows:

FOR:	9
AGAINST:	0
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING:	0

The chairman of the jury, with his consent, confirmed the procedural correctness of the performed voting.

JURY'S VOTING (ADVANCE TO THE 3RD EVALUATION ROUND):

4:01 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 2.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 2 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR:	0
AGAINST:	9
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING:	0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 2 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

4:02 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 3.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 3 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR:	9
AGAINST:	0
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING:	0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 3 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

4:03 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 6.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 6 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR:	0
AGAINST:	7

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 2

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 6 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

4:04 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 7.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 7 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 1

AGAINST: 8

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 7 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

4:05 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 8.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 8 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 5

AGAINST: 2

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 2

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 8 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

4:05 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 9.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 9 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 2

AGAINST: 6

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 1

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 9 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

4:06 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 10.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 10 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where*

the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"

FOR: 7
AGAINST: 1
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 1

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 10 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

4:07 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 15.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: "Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 15 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"

FOR: 2
AGAINST: 7
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 15 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

2:07 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 16.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: "Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 16 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"

FOR: 7
AGAINST: 1
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 1

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 16 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

4:07 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 17.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: "Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 17 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"

FOR: 0
AGAINST: 9
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 17 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

4:08 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 18.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 18 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 6

AGAINST: 2

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 1

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 18 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

4:10 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 19.

Question of Mgr. Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 19 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 1

AGAINST: 7

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 1

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 19 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

4:15 p.m.: Following the voting result, a list of competition entries which advance to the next (3rd round of) evaluation was subsequently summarised, namely:

Competition Entry No. 3
Competition Entry No. 8
Competition Entry No. 10
Competition Entry No. 16
Competition Entry No. 18

4:15 p.m.: The chairman of the jury, with his consent, confirmed the procedural correctness of the performed voting.

3. EVALUATION ROUND

4:15 p.m. – 5:45 p.m.

18. The jury then proceeded to a detailed joint discussion on the individual competition entries, which, based on the result of the voting (see the minutes at 4:15 p.m.), advanced to the next, 3rd round of, evaluation of the competition entries.
19. After the end of the joint discussion on the individual competition entries, the chairman of the jury announced the vote on the award/reward of the competition entries; the jury will vote based on the extent to which individual competition entries met the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions, in connection with the findings of the jury identified within the individual study of the competition entries and during the joint discussion held by the jurors on the individual competition entries.
20. The following procedure was proposed for the vote: The regular members of the jury vote (in case of absence of a regular member of the jury, an alternate pursuant to point 3 of the Protocol). Each voting member shall have one vote. The jury has a quorum. The jury makes decisions by a majority of votes.

The procedure described above was approved by the jury as follows:

FOR:	9
AGAINST:	0
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING:	0

The chairman of the jury, with his consent, confirmed the procedural correctness of the performed voting.

JURY'S VOTING (AWARDING AND REWARDING OF THE competition entries):

5:40 p.m.: Voting about ranking on the 1st awarded place

Question from the chairman of the jury: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 3 ranking 1st?"*

FOR:	9
AGAINST:	0
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING:	0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 3 ranked 1st**

5:41 p.m.: Voting about ranking on the 2nd awarded place

Question from the chairman of the jury: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 16 ranking 2nd?"*

FOR:	8
AGAINST:	0
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING:	1

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 16 ranked 2nd**

5:42 p.m.: Voting about ranking on the 3rd awarded place

Question from the chairman of the jury: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 8 ranking 3rd?"*

FOR: 8

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 1

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 8 ranked 3rd**

5:43 p.m.: Voting about awarding a reward in the amount of CZK 350,000.

Question from the chairman of the jury: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 10 being rewarded with CZK 350,000?"*

FOR: 9

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 10 is rewarded with CZK 350,000.**

5:43 p.m.: Voting about awarding a reward in the amount of CZK 250,000.

Question from the chairman of the jury: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 18 being rewarded with CZK 250,000?"*

FOR: 9

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 18 is rewarded with CZK 250,000.**

5:44 p.m.: Following the voting result, the result of the evaluation of awarding and rewarding the competition entries was as follows:

Competition Entry No. 3	1. place
Competition Entry No. 16	2. place
Competition Entry No. 8	3. place
Competition Entry No. 10	Reward of CZK 350,000
Competition Entry No. 18	Reward of CZK 250,000

5:45 p.m.: The chairman of the jury, with his consent, confirmed the procedural correctness of the performed voting.

RECORD OF THE VERBAL EVALUATION OF THE COMPETITION ENTRIES

21. **The jury jointly formulated a verbal evaluation of the individual competition entries according to the extent to which the individual competition entries met the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions, in connection with the findings of the jury identified within the individual study of the competition entries and during the joint discussion held by the jurors on the individual competition entries.**

	OVERALL QUALITY OF THE URBAN, ARCHITECTURAL, CONSTRUCTION, TRANSPORT AND LANDSCAPE SOLUTION OF THE COMPETITION ENTRY	ECONOMIC ADEQUACY OF THE CONSTRUCTION ENTRY FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF INVESTMENT PROPOSALS
Competition Entry No. 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The overall urban, landscape and transport solution with axial symmetry is not convincing. - Approaches to the platform and the solution of all transfer links is complicated. - A pair of roads on the roof of the terminal is a technically and economically more expensive solution. - The space directly in front of the terminal is inappropriately intersected by the road and is only solved schematically. - Only partial roofing of the platforms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
Competition Entry No. 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Simple, architecturally and statically understandable construction of the terminal above the platform. - Possibility of variability, but with an indistinct contextual approach to the given place. In its form, the terminal attracts to enter from its side, from the side of the road bridge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Constructionally adequate solution of the bridge located outside the terminal building. – The urban and landscape solution is not convincing in comparison with the technical part of the solution. – Problematic and schematic transport solution and connections for pedestrians in the north-south direction. 	
Competition Entry No. 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Unequivocally convincing urban, transport and landscape solution with regard to the surroundings. – Adequate scale of the terminal, bridge and car park buildings with efficient construction. – Significantly elegant technical and architectural solution of details of all buildings. – The possibility of future development in the designed urban structure of the car park. The design of the car park defines a possible future street network. Potential construction above the parking areas may be attractive to investors in the future for the development of, for example, hotel and other additional services in direct connection to the terminal in the form of Public Private Partnership. – Covered waiting rooms directly on the platform. – The separate construction of the bridge and the terminal is perceived in the context of the whole solution as very advantageous. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
Competition Entry No. 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Appropriate placement of the terminal building over the entire rail yard with a strong identity. – The interior of the terminal is relatively small and narrow, the roofing appears to be oversized. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The solution of both boarding areas of the square in front of the terminal is schematic and unconvincing. - Longer walking distance from the platforms and to the car park. 	
Competition Entry No. 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Urbanistically and architecturally unconvincing solution. - Complicated from the transport perspective for all types of transport in the north-south direction. - Construction of the terminal roofing too large, and conversely, platform roofing missing. - Parking houses located at a great distance from the terminal. - The wooden roofing structure with glazing will be difficult to maintain. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
Competition Entry No. 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appropriate placement of the terminal building over the entire rail yard with a strong identity. - The supporting structure is statically unconvincing and interferes with the layout of the terminal. - Spaces are oversized in terms of height and volume. - The solution of the public space in front of the terminal is schematic. - Underground parking is inefficient, surface parking has a potential for further development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
Competition Entry No. 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Visually attractive and original form of design, which is, however, inadequate to the importance of the high-speed railway station. The visualisations represent a station in a quiet and peaceful landscape. However, this landscape will be very busy, burdened by a high 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.

	<p>concentration of various means of transport, requiring fast and clear service visible from a distance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The symmetry of the design complicates the transport solution in the north-south direction. – The location of the underground car parks is unnecessarily far from the terminal. – A quality material solution with a number of details may be difficult from the perspective of the building maintenance. – The possibility of further stages of development in a regular urban structure. 	
Competition Entry No. 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Appropriate placement of the terminal building over the entire rail yard. – Visually attractive horizontal and transparent volume of the terminal building. – Efficient construction of the terminal with sufficient capacity and flexibility of all spaces. – The urban design of the surroundings works functionally, albeit quite schematically. However, this part allows for further development and definition. – Use of solar panels for roofing the long-term car parks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
Competition Entry No. 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Appropriate placement of the terminal building over the entire rail yard. – The shape-wise expressive object with a green roof seems very attractive. Unfortunately, these qualities are not transferred to the foyer of the station at the point of entry, to the bus terminal and in relation to the surrounding context. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – More space-saving and more expensive solution of the parking in parking houses. However, a weaker urban concept. – Wooden structures and glazed surfaces are more difficult to maintain. 	
Competition Entry No. 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Attractive and generous solution with a larger volume of constructions and higher costs. – Sufficiently dimensioned approaches and suitably located transfer links of all means of transport. – Green roofs will be more demanding on investments and ongoing maintenance. – The integration of north-south communication into the overall concept is problematic. – The overall urban, transport and landscape solution is high quality and adequate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
Competition Entry No. 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Minimises interference with the landscape, the volume of buildings and the interior of the terminal. – A significant motive is the set of roofing, which is, however, not very transparent and convincing. – Stacker parking saves space, but may have a problem with driveway capacity. – Sufficient capacity of access to the platform and proximity to transfer links. – Improper placement of areas for retail. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
Competition Entry No. 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Unconvincing urban, transport and landscape solution influenced by a very technical approach. – Improperly located terminal object with long walking distances. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The layout of the terminal is confusing and unsuitable for railways. – The subway and exit to the platform from the terminal is significantly eccentrically located. – The solution of the bridge object is unnecessarily oversized without supports. 	
Competition Entry No. 13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Suitable location of the terminal building, but there are two separate halls. – Overall unconvincing urban, transport and landscape solution. – The form of the architecture is not appropriate to the surroundings and the estimated budget. – Sufficient amount of accesses to the platform and a suitably designed transfer to the bus. – The use of ETFE foil for cladding is debatable from the perspective of operation and maintenance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
Competition Entry No. 14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The overall solution blends sensitively with the landscape. However, the pair of buildings of the terminal and the separate bridge appears to be expensive to operate and maintain. – The direct north-south connection of Horoušanská Street is interrupted. – The use of ETFE foil and relatively high shrubbery (<i>cornus sanguinea</i>) for the platforms roofing is debatable from the perspective of operation and maintenance. Especially with regard to high voltage trolleys in their immediate vicinity. – The entry is very well presented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.

<p>Competition Entry No. 15</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appropriate placement of the terminal building over the entire rail yard. - Good and capacitive access to the platform and transfer to other means of transport. - The architectural form with the module of well-known concrete shells allows a high degree of future flexibility. - The location of public spaces and car parks on the bridge structure is spatially limited. - The proposed urban solution allows further development in stages. - Suitable lighting of the terminal building. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
<p>Competition Entry No. 16</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appropriate placement of the terminal building over the entire rail yard. - Strong urban and landscape concept with a clearly defined character of places. - Relatively well-solved connection of the bridge structure with the terminal building. - Very well designed approaches to the platform as well as transfers to other mean of transport. - Lower legibility of the main entrance and too much adoration of the north-south axis and symmetry. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
<p>Competition Entry No. 17</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appropriate placement of the terminal building over the entire rail yard. - Commendable effort of the house to act as a landmark in the landscape, which seeks to minimise the occupation of the landscape. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The location of the multi-storey car park above the terminal is inefficient at the given location. – Very schematic and unconvincing design of public spaces. – Limited possibilities of construction flexibility and its modifications. – Oversizing of the terminal interior. – Arrivals to the platform with respect to the terminal scheme seem to be complicated; arrivals directed more to the east would require further transitions to be considered, which would cause confusion of the building due to the overall oversizing of the interior. 	
<p>Competition Entry No. 18</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Appropriate placement of the terminal building over the entire rail yard. – Elegant visual form of the architectural solution with an adequate scale. – Conveniently located bus stop at the terminal; on the contrary, the other proposed bus stops within the entry make the transfer situation somewhat unclear; – Insufficient capacities of access to the platform and of transfer links, especially in the case of an escalator or staircase failure. – Formal solution of the spatial arrangement of the car park and static solution of roofing supports limiting the permeability of platforms. – Smaller dimensions of the terminal interior and its low flexibility; in the case of implementation, it would be necessary to extend the building above the tracks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.

<p>Competition Entry No. 19</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – It focuses more on the landscape solution and opens the topic of broader relations in the landscape. – The architectural and technical design of the terminal itself seems to be unconvincing. – Challenging in terms of construction and long-term maintenance. – The location of the car park under ground is inefficient in the given place. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
<p>Competition Entry No. 21</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Too large rail yard covering area without adequate use on the surface. – The urban and architectural design is not convincing and does not correspond to the importance of the building. Pedestrian routes do not make it easier for newcomers to find their way around. Spaces are created "behind the house", around which it is necessary to walk without the certainty of a correctly selected destination. – The platforms are not roofed in full length. – The solution of transport and parking is very schematic. – The green roof on the platform and the roofing of the platforms is inefficient in the given area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.

22. The jury then formulated the jury's recommendations for the Contracting Authority for the awarded competition entries, as follows:

	SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE JURY
Competition Entry No. 3	<p>The jury recommends focusing in particular on the following aspects of the competition entry:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To consider a possible increase in the capacity of accesses/transfers/escape exits from or to the platform (overpass/underpass at the end of the platforms). • To consider sloping parking spaces at the Taxi and K+R car parks. Next, to consider a holding car park for TAXI vehicles at a reasonable distance from the waiting edge of the TAXI car park. • To consider extending the northern part of the terminal in case of development of the area between the railway and the highway. • To consider the construction of buildings above the parking areas in the case of investors' interest in the development of, for example, hotel or other additional services in direct connection to the terminal.
Competition Entry No. 8	<p>The jury recommends focusing in particular on the following aspects of the competition entry:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To finish the roofing of the platforms. • To complete the design of public spaces and car parks in front of the terminal.
Competition Entry No. 16	<p>The jury recommends focusing in particular on the following aspects of the competition entry:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To consider various solutions for revitalisation of the road bridge with regard to passers-by and the scale of the construction. (e.g. green roof) • To suggest a possible phasing of further development of buildings in the vicinity of the terminal.

23. The representative of the organiser of the Competition subsequently asked the jurors, whether any of the voting members of the jury is interested in exercising the right to revoke or to record any different opinion in the Protocol. None of the voting members of the jury exercised this right.

INFORMATION TO THE JURY ABOUT THE COMPETITION PARTICIPANTS

24. In connection with the consent of the chairman of the jury, Mgr. Kulhánková subsequently proceeded to open the envelopes of the authors and acquainted the jury with the identification data of the individual participants in the Competition. The record of identification data of the Competition participants is as follows:

Competition entry accepted under the serial number (paper submission):	Competition entry accepted under the serial number (electronic submission):	New number of the competition entry after opening the envelopes with the graphic part of the competition entries:	Participant	Author	Co-author	Architect	Surface constructions designer	Transport constructions designer
Competition Entry No. 8	Competition Entry No. 8	Competition Entry No. 1	CASUA, spol. s r.o.	Ing. arch. Oleg Haman	Ing. arch. Jakub Seifert	Ing. arch. Oleg Haman	Ing. Radan Jurášek	Ing. Martin Čermák
Competition Entry No. 5	Competition Entry No. 2	Competition Entry No. 2	SIAL architekti a inženýři spol. s r.o. Liberec	doc. Ing. arch. Jiří Buček	—	doc. Ing. arch. Jiří Buček	Ing. František Bielik	Ing. Jiří Souček
Competition Entry No. 10	Competition Entry No. 12	Competition Entry No. 3	MP+ov Nehvizdy 2020 on behalf of METROPROJEKT Praha a.s.	Ing. arch. Jiří Opočenský	Ing. Pavel Burian Ing. Jaroslav Vala	Ing. arch. Jiří Opočenský	Ing. Pavel Burian	Ing. Jaroslav Vala

				Ing. arch. Štěpán Valouch Ing. Petr Malinovský Ing. Petr Vyskočil				
Competition Entry No. 6	Competition Entry No. 16	Competition Entry No. 4	Gateways	Dipl.-Ing. Marten Wassmann	Hans-Michael Földeak Herminie Metzger Vladislav Janota	Dipl.-Ing. Marten Wassmann	Herminie Metzger	Ing. Marek Lukáč
Competition Entry No. 15	Competition Entry No. 17	Competition Entry No. 5	RH-ARCH s.r.o.	Ing. arch. Rostislav Říha	Ing. arch. Ondřej Kaluš Ing. arch. Milan Šírek	Ing. arch. Rostislav Říha	Ing. arch. Rostislav Říha	Ing. Ota Heller
Competition Entry No. 17	Competition Entry No. 21	Competition Entry No. 6	Studio COSMO s.r.o.	Ing. arch. Jiří Kabelka Ing. arch. Tereza Kabelková Ing. Tomáš Petr Ing. Milan Pelikán	Kristýna Vaňková Petr Moschner	Ing. arch. Tereza Kabelková	Ing. Milan Pelikán	Ing. Tomáš Petr
Competition Entry No. 13	Competition Entry No. 7	Competition Entry No. 7	JIKA-CZ s.r.o.	ohboi s.r.o.	JIKA-CZ s.r.o.	Ing. arch. Libor Toman	Ing. Jiří Slánský	Ing. Petr Musílek

Competition Entry No. 2	Competition Entry No. 1	Competition Entry No. 8	SBS Engineering Group Sp. Z o.o	Arch. Maher Matar	—	Arch. Maher Matar	Monica Veninata	Tine Haas
Competition Entry No. 11	Competition Entry No. 13	Competition Entry No. 9	MS architekti s.r.o.	prof. Ing. arch. Michal Šourek Ing. Martin Studnička Ing. arch. Kseniya Bahdanovich Ing. arch. Kateřina Fišerová akad. Arch. Pavel Hřebecký	—	prof. Ing. arch. Michal Šourek	Ing. Martin Studnička	Ing. Jindřich Jirák
Competition Entry No. 3	Competition Entry No. 5	Competition Entry No. 10	Ing. arch. Pavel Fajfr (Boele Association)	Ing. arch. Pavel Fajfr Ing. arch. Petr Šuma Ing. arch. Tomáš Kroužil	Ing. Jiří Kott, Ph.D. Ing. Petr Rospopčuk	Ing. arch. Pavel Fajfr	Ing. Jiří Kott, Ph.D.	Ing. Petr Rospopčuk
Competition Entry No. 16	Competition Entry No. 20	Competition Entry No. 11	Architektonická kancelář Kolpron, s.r.o.	Petr Starčevič	Petr Macek	Petr Starčevič	Miroslav Zyma	Martin Čermák
Competition Entry No. 7	Competition Entry No. 10	Competition Entry No. 12	ATELIER KLEIN, s.r.o.	Ing. arch. Jan Klein	Ing. Radek Lavička Ph.D.	Ing. Radek Lavička Ph.D.	Ing. Václav Krampera	Ing. Ondřej Zenkl

Competition Entry No. 1	Competition Entry No. 3	Competition Entry No. 13	VISION ARCHITECTURE s.r.o.	Ing. arch. Radek Vopalecký	Ing. Marek Richtera	Ing. arch. Radek Vopalecký	Ing. Miroslav Smutek, Ph.D.	Ing. Jiří Kalčík
Competition Entry No. 19	Competition Entry No. 19	Competition Entry No. 14	Ing. arch. MgA. Petr Janda	Ing. arch. MgA. Petr Janda	MgA. Petr Souček	Ing. arch. MgA. Petr Janda	Ing. Petr Kniha	Ing. Jaroslav Míka
Competition Entry No. 20	Competition Entry No. 15	Competition Entry No. 15	JAKUB CIGLER ARCHITEKTI a.s.	doc. Ing. arch. Jakub Cigler	Ing. arch. Boris Vološin	doc. Ing. arch. Jakub Cigler	doc. Ing. arch. Jakub Cigler	Ing. Ota Heller
Competition Entry No. 21	Competition Entry No. 18	Competition Entry No. 16	ra15 a.s.	doc. Ing. arch. Radek Lampa Ing. Libor Hrdoušek Max Petricov Daria Vlasova Erik Sovet Daniil Solovev	—	doc. Ing. arch. Radek Lampa	Ing. Libor Hrdoušek	Ing. Tomáš Kapal
Competition Entry No. 4	Competition Entry No. 9	Competition Entry No. 17	ABM architekti s.r.o.	Ing. arch. Petr Bouřil Ing. arch. Lukáš Lipert Ing. arch. Jan Sochor	—	Ing. arch. Petr Bouřil	Ing. David Mužík	Ing. Ondřej Kvaček
Competition Entry No. 12	Competition Entry No. 14	Competition Entry No. 18	Union of companies DKFS architects ltd + JAKUB KLASKA LTD	Dirk Krolikowski Jakub Kláška Falko Schmitt	—	Dipl.-Ing. RWTH Dirk Krolikowski ARB RIBA AKNW	Ing. Aleš Marek	Ing. Otta Heller

Competition Entry No. 9	Competition Entry No. 6	Competition Entry No. 19	Arcadis Czech Republic s.r.o.	J.H.A. Eulderink	ARCADIS Nederland B.V.	J.H.A. Eulderink	Pieter Bout	Marc Starmans
Competition Entry No. 14	Competition Entry No. not submitted electronically	Competition Entry No. 20	Ing. arch. Ivan Matys	Ing. arch. Ivan Matys	X	Ing. arch. Ivan Matys	Ing. Maroš Mažáry	Ing. Ján Tomko
Competition Entry No. 18	Competition Entry No. 11	Competition Entry No. 21	Ting s.r.o.	MgA. Štěpán Toman	—	MgA. Štěpán Toman	Dagmar Pilařová	Ing. Filip Eichler

25. At the end of its meeting, the jury thanked the Contracting Authority for organising the Competition and expressed its gratitude for the fact that the Contracting Authority announced this Competition. At the same time, the jury expressed its conviction that the selected competition entry will, after its implementation, fulfil its main function properly – it will become a dignified pilot terminal on the first high-speed section in the Czech Republic and at the same time it will urbanistically complete the wider surroundings in an appropriate way.
26. At the end of the meeting, the Competition secretary and the representative of the Competition organiser thanked, on behalf of the Contracting Authority, the members of the jury for their work, for cooperation during the entire Competition and for the overall approach of all jurors to the Competition and the Contracting Authority's intention.
27. The jury meeting was ended at 6:15 p.m.

Protocol annexes:

Annex No. 1 Attendance List

Annex No. 2 Examiner's Report

The correctness of this Protocol is confirmed by the below signature of:

DEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY	
Ing. arch. Pavel Andršt	
Ing. Marek Pinkava	
Ing. Jiří Poběřežský	
INDEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY	
Ing. arch. Antonín Novák	
Ing. arch. Karel Hájek, Ph.D.	
Ing. arch. Ing. Jiří Jandourek	
Ing. arch. Petr Štefek	
Ing. arch. Anna Švarc	
Ing. arch. Pavla Pannová	