

MINUTES OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEETING

HELD ON DECEMBER 6 – 7, 2022

CONTRACTING AUTHORITY:	The Capital City of Prague represented by the Department of Property Management of the Capital City of Prague Prague Public Transit Company, a joint stock company Správa železnic, state organisation
NAME OF PUBLIC CONTRACT:	NEW MAIN STATION DISTRICT

Where capitalised words are used in this Protocol without further definition, they shall have the meaning as set out in the Tender Documentation. These Minutes are drawn up in the Czech and English language, and in the event of any discrepancies between the individual language versions, the Czech version of the Minutes shall apply.

On 6 December – 7 December 2022, a meeting of the evaluation committee took place within the framework of the Procurement Procedure for the public contract "Nový hlavák" ("**Public Contract**"), whose co-contracting authorities are the Capital City of Prague represented by the Department of Property Management of the Capital City of Prague, the Prague Public Transit Company, a joint stock company and Správa železnic, state organisation (the "**Contracting Authority**").

The subject of the Evaluation Committee meeting was to reduce the number of solutions based on the Concepts submitted by the participants to the Procurement Procedure.

The following minutes (the "**Minutes**") were taken at the meeting of the Evaluation Committee and summarise the proceedings of the meeting.

DAY ONE – DECEMBER 6, 2022

- On 6 December 2022 at 08:50 a.m., the deputy secretary of the Competition Dialogue, Ing. Arch. Miroslav Vodák, opened the first day of the Evaluation Committee meeting ("**Deputy Secretary**"). The Deputy Secretary began by welcoming the persons present at the meeting of the Evaluation Committee (see **Annex 1** to the Protocol - Attendance List of December 6, 2022). He had it added to the Minutes that the presentations of individual participants would be monitored by Dipl.-Ing. Peter Gero and Ing. Kamila Krejčířková, Ph.D. online.
- Subsequently, the Deputy Secretary presented the agenda for the Day 1 of the Evaluation Committee meeting as follows:

1.	Initial meeting of the Evaluation Committee	08:50 – 09:00 a.m.
2.	Chybík + Kristof + Civitas – presentation of the Concept	09:00 – 10:00 a.m.

3.	Discussion of the Evaluation Committee on the previous presentation (without the participation of the participant)	10:00 – 10:20 a.m.
4.	Break	10:20 – 10:25 a.m.
5.	West 8 Urban Design and Landscape Architecture B.V. – presentation of the Concept	10:25- 11:25 a.m.
6.	Discussion of the Evaluation Committee on the previous presentation (without the participation of the participant)	11:25 – 11:45 a.m.
7.	Lunch break	11:45 – 12:25 p.m. (noon)
8.	Henning Larsen Architects A/S – presentation of the Concept	12:25 – 1:25 p.m.
9.	Discussion of the Evaluation Committee on the previous presentation (without the participation of the participant)	1:25 – 1:45 p.m.
10.	Break	1:45 – 1:50 p.m.
11.	Miralles Tagliabue EMBT S.L.P. + OCA architects Prague, s.r.o. – presentation of the Concept	1:50 – 2:50 p.m.
12.	Discussion of the Evaluation Committee on the previous presentation (without the participation of the participant)	2:50 – 3:10 p.m.
13.	Break	3:10 – 3:25 p.m.
14.	re:architects+baukuh+YellowOffice – presentation of the Concept	3:25 – 4:25 p.m.
15.	Discussion of the Evaluation Committee on the previous presentation (without the participation of the participant)	4:25 – 4:45 p.m.
16.	Break	4:45 – 5:00 p.m.
17.	Final instructions for Day 2 of the Evaluation Committee meeting	5:00 – 5:15 p.m.

3. The Deputy Secretary then briefed the Evaluation Committee on the instructions given to the participants for the presentation of the Concepts to the Evaluation Committee, i.e. that the

participants are expected to present their Concept for the first 30 minutes and then have a 30 minute discussion with the Evaluation Committee on the presented Concept.

4. Presentations of the Concepts of the individual participants followed, accompanied by a discussion with the Evaluation Committee, each lasting 60 minutes. After the presentation of each participant, the Evaluation Committee led a discussion on presented Concept.
5. After the presentation of the last participant's Concept and the discussion of the Evaluation Committee on presented Concept, the Secretary of the Competition Dialogue, Mgr. Kamila Kulhánková, summarized the procedural course of the Day 2 of the Evaluation Committee meeting.
6. Subsequently, in view of the fact that the agenda of the first day of the Evaluation Committee meeting was exhausted, the Chairman of the Evaluation Committee, Ing. arch. Jaroslav Wertig, closed the meeting of the Evaluation Committee and announced its continuation on December 7, 2022 at approximately 09:00.

The Minutes of the Day 1 of the Evaluation Committee meeting were drawn up by Ing. arch. Miroslav Vodák

DAY TWO – DECEMBER 7, 2022

7. On December 7, 2022 at 9:20 a.m., the secretary of the Competition Dialogue opened the second day of the Evaluation Committee meeting. The Secretary of the Competitive Dialogue presented the agenda for Day 2 of the Evaluation Committee meeting as follows:

1.	Checking attendance	09:25 – 09:30 a.m.
2.	Presentation of invited experts' comments on the Concepts	09:30 – 10:30 a.m.
3.	Discussion of the Evaluation Committee on the Concepts	10:30 – 12:00 (noon)
4.	Lunch break	12:00- 12:30 p.m.
5.	Continued discussion of the Evaluation Committee and the decision of the Evaluation Committee to reduce the number of solutions	12:30 – 1:45 p.m.
6.	Discussion of the Evaluation Committee on the further procedure in the Competitive Dialogue	1:45 – 2:30 p.m.

8. The secretary of the Competitive Dialogue checked the attendance of the members/alternates of the Evaluation Committee present at the meeting of the Evaluation Committee on December 7, 2022. The following persons were present at the meeting of the Evaluation Committee among the members/alternates of the Evaluation Committee on December 7, 2022:

REGULAR MEMBERS OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE - INDEPENDENT PART

1. **Ing. arch. Jaroslav Wertig** architect
2. **Ing. Štěpánka Šmídová** landscape architect, authorization No. CCA 03543
3. **Ing. Jana Pyšková** landscape architect, authorization No. CCA 04160
4. **Igor Marko MA Arch ARB** architect
5. **Ing. arch. Zdeněk Lukeš** architect, architectural historian

REGULAR MEMBERS OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE - DEPENDENT PART

1. **Ing. Jan Šurovský, Ph.D.** Prague Public Transit Company, joint-stock company
Technical Director – Surface
2. **Ing. Michal Kliský** Ministry of Transport
Ministerial Council, Department of Infrastructure and Zoning Plan

- | | | |
|----|---------------------------|---|
| 3. | Ing. Petr Hofhanzl | Správa železnic, state organisation,
Stavební správa západ
Organisational Unit Director |
|----|---------------------------|---|

ALTERNATES FOR REGULAR MEMBERS - INDEPENDENT PART OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | Ing. arch. Ing. Jiří Jand'ourek | architect, authorisation no. CCA 04859 |
| 2. | MgA. Markéta Zdebská | architect, authorization No. CCA 04561 |
| 3. | Ing. Milota Sidorová, Ph.D. | urban planner |
| 4. | Ing. arch. Mgr. Klára Brůhová, Ph.D. | architect, architectural historian |
| 5. | Ing. arch. Jan Magasanik | architect |

ALTERNATES FOR REGULAR MEMBERS - DEPENDENT PART OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Alternates for doc. Ing. arch. Petr Hlaváček

- | | | |
|----|------------------------------|---|
| 1. | Ing. Marek Zděradička | Prague Institute of Planning and Development,
contributory organisation

Deputy Director for professional activities
authorised engineer for transport
constructions |
|----|------------------------------|---|

Alternates for Ing. Jan Šurovský, Ph.D.

- | | | |
|----|-------------------------|--|
| 1. | Ing. Filip Jiřík | Prague Public Transit Company, a joint-stock
company
Project Manager |
|----|-------------------------|--|

Alternates for Ing. Jan Rak

- | | | |
|----|----------------------------------|---|
| 1. | Ing. arch. Jakub Hendrych | Prague Institute of Planning and Development,
contributory organisation
Guarantor of the Competition Brief for the
project of the HMP and the project of the DPP,
Architect |
| 2. | Ing. Lukáš Tittl | Prague Institute of Planning and Development,
contributory organisation
Transport Concept Specialist |

Alternates for Ing. Michal Kliský

- | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------|---|
| 1. | JUDr. Ing. Antonín Krejčí, MBA | State Fund for Transport Infrastructure
Lawyer |
|----|---------------------------------------|---|

Alternates for Ing. Petr Hofhanzl

- | | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|--|
| 1. | doc. Ing. arch. Jakub Cigler | JAKUB CIGLER ARCHITEKTI a.s.
Guarantor of the Competition Brief for the
project of SŽ, Architect |
|----|-------------------------------------|--|

2. **Ing. Jakub Bazgier**

Správa železnic, state organization,
Stavební správa západ
Deputy Director of the Organisational Unit,
Technical Section Prague

9. The following persons were absent and excused from the meeting of the Evaluation Committee on December 7, 2022:
- Ing. Jan Rak
 - Ing. Adam Scheinherr, MSc., Ph.D.
 - Ing. Miroslav Penc, Ph.D.
 - Ing. Pavel Paidar
 - doc. Ing. arch. Petr Hlaváček
 - Ing. Kamila Krejčířková, Ph.D.
 - Dipl.-Ing. Peter Gero (*outside the time slot during which he joined the Evaluation Committee meeting online*)
10. In addition to the members/alternates of the Evaluation Committee listed in point 7 of the Minutes, other persons listed in the attendance list attended the meeting of the Evaluation Committee on December 7, 2022. The attendance list of the meeting of the Evaluation Committee on December 7, 2022 is attached as **Annex 2** to this Protocol.
11. Based on a check of the members/alternates of the Evaluation Committee present, the secretary of the Competitive Dialogue summarized that in case the Evaluation Committee would vote on December 7, 2022 then the list of voting persons would be as follows:

INDEPENDENT PART OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE	DEPENDENT PART OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE
Ing. arch. Ing. Jiří Jand'ourek (due to the absence of Dipl.-Ing. Peter Gero outside the time slot during which he joined the Evaluation Committee meeting online)	Ing. Marek Zďeradička
Ing. arch. Jaroslav Wertig	Ing. Filip Jiřík (due to the absence of Ing. Jan Šurovský, Ph.D. at the meeting of the Evaluation Committee on December 6, 2022 and therefore for the sake of continuity of information, Ing. Jan Šurovský, Ph.D. was represented in the vote by Ing. Filip Jiřík, despite his presence at the meeting of the Evaluation Committee)
Ing. Štěpánka Šmídová	Ing. arch. Jakub Hendrych

Ing. Jana Pyšková	Ing. Michal Kliský
Igor Marko MA Arch ARB	Ing. Petr Hofhanzl
Ing. arch. Zdeněk Lukeš	

12. The Evaluation Committee subsequently heard directly/mediated presentations from some of the invited experts, specifically:
- Ing. arch. David Měska, Ing. arch. Zdeňka Poliačiková (*representatives of the National Heritage Institute, present at the meeting in person, presenting comments on the Concepts on behalf of the National Heritage Institute*)
 - Ing. arch. Veronika Hájková (*representative of the City Hall of the Capital City of Prague, Heritage Department, Department of State Administration of Heritage Conservation, absent from the meeting, statement of Ing. arch. Veronika Hájková, which Ing. arch. Hájková submitted in writing on December 6, 2022, was presented by Ing. arch. Jakub Hendrych*)
 - Ing. arch. Kristina Ullmannová, Ph.D. (*Prague Institute of Planning and Development, contributory organisation, Head of Public Space Office, absent from the meeting, statement of Ing. arch. Kristina Ullmannová on the topic of public space was presented by Ing. arch. Jakub Hendrych*)
 - Ing. Jakub Kutílek (*representative of Prague City Hall, Transport Department, Transport Concept Specialist, absent, statement of Ing. Jakub Kutílek focused on cycling and pedestrian transport, which Ing. Kutílek submitted in writing on December 1, 2022, was presented by Ing. arch. Jakub Hendrych*)
 - Pavla Pelčíková, MSc. (*Prague Institute of Planning and Development, contributory organisation, Participatory Process Specialist, absent from the meeting, statement by Pavla Pelčíková, MSc., on the topic of participation, was presented by Ing. arch. Jakub Hendrych*)
 - doc. Ing. David Stránský, Ph.D. (*Czech Technical University, Head Department of Municipal Water Management, Faculty of Civil Engineering, absent, statement of doc. Ing. David Stránský, Ph.D. on the topic of rainwater management and blue-green infrastructure system was presented by Mgr. Kamila Kulhánková*)
13. Ing. Filip Jiřík and Ing. Lukáš Tittl commented on the topic of the transport.
14. At the meeting of the Evaluation Committee, the statements of the absent members/alternates of the Evaluation Committee were also presented as follows:
- Ing. Kamila Krejčířiková, Ph.D. (*at the request of Ing. Kamila Krejčířiková, Ph.D., her written statement was read by Mgr. Kamila Kulhánková*)
 - doc. Ing. arch. Petr Hlaváček (*doc. Ing. arch. Petr Hlaváček entrusted a summary of his comments to the present Ing. arch. Zdeněk Völfl*)
 - Dipl.-Ing. Peter Gero (*for the purpose of presenting his comments on the Concepts, Dipl.-Ing. Peter Gero joined the evaluation committee for the time slot online*)
15. After the comments of the invited experts and absent members/alternates, the Evaluation Committee discussed the individual Concepts in terms of the individual sub-criteria identified in paragraph 9.7. 2 of the Tender Documentation as criteria for the reduction of the number of

solutions under the evaluation criterion "Quality of the proposed design"; each member/alternate member of the Evaluation Committee had the opportunity to score the Participants' Concepts in each sub-criterion; the Evaluation Committee then, by consensus of the voting members/alternates of the Evaluation Committee, awarded points for each subcriterion as follows:

PARTICIPANT NUMBER	QUALITY OF THE PROPOSED URBAN AND ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN	QUALITY OF THE PROPOSED LANDSCAPE DESIGN	QUALITY OF THE PROPOSED TRANSPORT SOLUTION	TOTAL SCORE
Chybik + Kristof + Civitas	20	20	10	50
West 8 Urban Design and Landscape Architecture B.V.	10	10	5	25
Henning Larsen Architects A/S	35	30	20	85
Miralles Tagliabue EMBT S.L.P. + OCA architects Prague, s.r.o.	20	20	20	60
re:architects+ baukuh+ YellowOffice	30	10	20	60

16. Based on the result of the scoring of the Concepts, the Evaluation Committee decided that the following participants are the successful participants in the Public Procurement for the Public Contract (based on the scoring of the individual Concepts):

Participant no. 5 Henning Larsen Architects A/S

Participant no. 17 Miralles Tagliabue EMBT S.L.P. + OCA architects Prague, s.r.o.

Participant no. 23 re:architekti + baukuh + YellowOffice

17. The Evaluation Committee, having completed the scoring of the Concepts of the individual participants, concluded that the Concepts of all participants in the Public Contract have provided stimulating proposals for an urban, architectural, landscape or transport approach to the subject of the Public Contract and the Evaluation Committee hereby thanks also the non-progressing participants for the work in the preparation of the Concepts.
18. The Chairman of the Evaluation Committee then asked those present if any of them had a proposal for a revocation. No such proposal was made.

19. Finally, the secretary of the Competitive Dialogue asked if anyone present was interested in recording any comments or dissenting opinions in the Minutes. No one present made such a request. After the end of the Evaluation Committee meeting, at the time when the Protocol was being prepared, Ing. arch. Mgr. Klára Brůhová, Ph.D. requested to record her comment below in the Protocol, referring to the fact that she had already made this comment at the Evaluation Committee meeting itself.

The Comment of Ing. arch. Mgr. Klára Brůhová, Ph.D.:

I find it very problematic that the participants in the competition have not yet been provided with the historical building survey of the NOH, which, according to the approved tender documentation, should have been part of document P13.4 HISTORICAL BUILDING SURVEY OF THE AREA (PARK + NOH) and should have been provided together with the CALL FOR THE SUBMISSION OF THE CONCEPT, i.e. no later than September 22, 2022. However, the competitors were only provided with a document relating to the park (P13.3 Historic Park Survey), not a document relating to the New Terminal Hall. Thus, the competitors had virtually no official documentation available to them that would have highlighted the value of the New Terminal Hall in terms of heritage conservation, architectural history and cultural heritage care in general. Unfortunately, in my opinion, this may also have had an impact on the concepts delivered. For myself, I have to say that in this respect I cannot among other things identify with the current form of the advancing concept of Henning Larsen Architects A/S.

20. The secretary of the Competitive Dialogue further stated that the course of the Evaluation Committee meeting will be summarized in the Minutes, which will be received by all members/alternates of the Evaluation Committee present at the meeting, with the proviso that in the event of any comments or suggestions for modification of the Minutes, the addressees of the Minutes will be able to do so within a specified time. Subsequently, after the finalization of the Protocol (in case of any comments or objections to the Protocol modification), the members/alternates of the Evaluation Committee voting at the meeting of the Evaluation Committee on December 7, 2022, will be invited to agree on the final version of the Protocol per rollam, while confirming the result of the scoring of the Concepts of the individual participants of the Public Contract by their consent.
21. In view of the exhaustion of the subject of the Evaluation Committee meeting of the day of December 7, 2022, the Chairman of the Evaluation Committee thanked all those present for their work and declared the meeting of the Evaluation Committee on December 7, 2022, at 2:30 p.m. closed.

Annexes to the Protocol:

1. Attendance list of December 6, 2022
2. Attendance list of December 7, 2022
3. Verbal evaluation of the Concepts (specific verbal evaluation of the non-progressing Concepts)
4. Recommendations of the Evaluation Committee and invited experts for the refinement of the Concepts into a Draft Design (separately for each of the advancing participants)

The Minutes of the Day 2 of the Evaluation Committee meeting were drawn up by Mgr. Kamila Kulhánková