

## **B**

# **Protocol from the jury meeting no. 1**

according to § 124 par. 7 of Act no. 343/2016 Coll. on Public Procurement and on Amendments to Certain Acts  
(hereinafter referred to as “PP”)

## **„Grössling“**

### **A. Identification of Public Procurement:**

<b>Type of contract:</b>	Services
<b>Financial limit:</b>	Above the limit
<b>estimated value of the contract:</b>	1 060 000 EUR without VAT
<b>Procedure:</b>	Design competition pursuant to § 119 et seq. PP based on ZVO type of competition: project, public, architectural, two rounds
<b>Journal:</b>	2020/S 055-130909, 18.03.2020 63/2020, 19.03.2020, mark 11697 – MNA

### **B. Competition announcement:**

The Slovak Chamber of Architects issued a certificate of regularity no. KA-94/2020 of 10.03.2020.

### **C. Jury:**

#### **1. Full members of the jury**

Independent of the announcer:

Ilja Skoček, Chairman of the jury

Lászlo Kovács

Adam Halíř

Henrieta Moravčíková

Dependent on the announcer:

Peter Lényi

#### **2. Alternate jury members**

Independent of the announcer:

Peter Fejerdy

Zuzana Zacharová

#### **3. Experts**

Zolltán Kalászi – architect (competition brief – City Bath)

Gábor Bindics, Martina Vnenková, Katarína Bergerová – MIB Department of the City Public Spaces (competition brief)

Martin Gajdoš - architect, representative in the urban government Bratislava Staré Mesto (public spaces in Staré Mesto)

Lubomír Augustín – The Monuments Board of the Slovak Republic

Ivo Štassel – Municipal Monuments Preservation Institute in Bratislava

Zuzana Palicová – Department of Culture of the Capital (competition brief - library)

Lukáš Kramarčík – structural engineer

Ján Kubovčák – construction budgeting  
Peter Bohuš – energetics

#### **4. Subsidiary bodies of the jury**

Secretary:

Ondrej Marko

Verifier:

Marian Szakáll

#### **D. Submission of proposals**

1. Within the deadline for submission of proposals - 19.06.2020, 5 PM, 77 participants submitted their proposals, 76 of them did so through the standard functionality of the Josephine system for submission of the tender proposal and one participant submitted the proposal through the communication channel of the Josephine system. Two proposals were received after the deadline as the system blocked their submittal. One proposal was delivered to the e-mail address [info@mib.sk](mailto:info@mib.sk).
2. The proposals were assigned serial numbers according to the date and time of their submission via IS Josephine with the exception of those submitted later, or by email.

#### **E. Verification of tender designs**

1. The verification of the tender designs was divided into the sections "Accompanying documentation" and "Architectural design" following the submission of proposals.
2. The verification of the Accompanying Documentation part consisted in the assessment of the completeness of the submitted documents and their proper completion, as stated in Art. VI. Point 2. Competition conditions.
3. The verifier evaluated all submitted documents from the participants and informed the jury of the fact that proposals no. 3, 6, 9, 63 and 71 contain formal deficiencies concerning the accompanying documentation which can be remedied simply by requesting clarification.
4. Due to the fact that it is an anonymous design contest, i. e. the jurors do not know and cannot know the identity of the participants, the verifier verified their possible conflict of interest within the extent of publicly available information about the members of the jury in relation to the participants through information available on the Internet. No real conflict of interest was identified. At the same time, members of the jury were acquainted with the issue of conflict of interest, which is defined in more detail in the signed affidavit of the members of the jury.
5. The verification of the 'architectural design' part consisted in assessing the scope and form of the tender as referred to in Article VI. point 3.1. architectural design of the 1st round of the Competition Conditions. Based on the assessment of all the proposals submitted, no serious conflict was identified.

**F. The meeting of the jury on the first day took place in the Old Market (SNP square 25, Bratislava) on June 29, 2020**

09:00 The meeting begins, the following are present:

- All full members of the jury, alternates, secretary and verifier

1. The secretary of the competition informed the jury of the planned course of the meeting, briefly recapitulated the award of the competition and the evaluation of the submitted proposals. The Secretary recapitulated the requests for clarification and the replies submitted by the deadline for submission of tender designs.

2. In association with the point D of these minutes, the verifiers informed the jury of the results of the verification of the tenders.

3. The jury voted that two proposals received after the deadline for submission of proposals and one proposal received by e-mail will be excluded from the competition. Proposals received after the deadline for submission of proposals are not made available by the Josephine system settings. The setting up of the system in this case reflects the amendment to the Public Procurement Act, which does not allow the evaluation of proposals submitted after the deadline for submission of proposals. In the case of a proposal submitted by e-mail, the reason for exclusion from the design contest is the fact that the design was not delivered in the manner required by the competition conditions. In addition, submission through the Josephine system includes the obligation to authenticate, i.e. verification of the relevance of the participant itself. Thus, the proposal submitted by e-mail not only did not meet the method required by the competition conditions, but was also submitted by an entity that was not authenticated (as opposed to those that proceeded in accordance with the announcer's requirements).

FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0 ABSTAINED: 0

These proposals were excluded from the competition.

4. The jury voted on whether proposal no. 77 will be evaluated by the jury in the competition despite the fact, that it was not submitted by the standard functionality of the Josephine system, but through the communication platform of the Josephine system within the deadline for submission of proposals. The verifier contacted the Josephine system operator, who confirmed that this participant had been authenticated by the system and was therefore entitled to submit a proposal through the Josephine system. Although the participant did not use the functionality intended for the submission of the proposal, they submitted the proposal within the deadline for the submission of proposals via the communication functionality. In accordance with the principle of proportionality, the verifier proposed to the jury to evaluate the proposal of this participant.

FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0 ABSTAINED: 0

Proposal no. 77 was included in the evaluation.

5. The verifier informed the jury that in the period between the deadline for the submission of tenders and the beginning of the evaluation meeting of the jury, the verifier addressed the announcer with the question whether his proposal had been received. The announcer verified and confirmed the fact that the proposal was not submitted within the deadline for submission of proposals. The participant claimed to have delivered it the day before the deadline for submission of proposals. The verifier contacted the Josephine system operator stating that the participant had also been authenticated, but the system did not record any attempts to submit a proposal. The system was available on the day the participant claims to submit the proposal, however the participant did not contact neither the announcer nor the owner of the Josephine system about any issue.

The jury took note of this fact. The participant will be informed that his complaint has been examined, but it has been demonstrated that his proposal has not been submitted and that the Josephine system was operational at that time.

6. The jury took note of the information of the verifier, according to which proposals no. 3, 6, 9, 63 and 71 contain formal, easily remediable deficiencies by request for clarification (eg missing signature of one of the authors of the proposal, document "Consent of the participants and authors" scanned so that the full name of the author of the proposal was not visible, etc.). The jury discussed whether it was necessary to ask these participants for an explanation of the proposal and at what stage of the evaluation of the proposals.

The jury decided that in the event that any of these proposals proceed to the second round of the competition, it will be necessary to ask for an explanation or to eliminate formal deficiencies in the documents submitted.

The jury voted on the proposal that these were formal shortcomings that could be easily remedied and did not justify the exclusion of the proposals. Therefore, in accordance with the principle of procedural economy, as well as in accordance with the procedural economy of the design contest, they agreed to ask the participants to remove them only if they advance to the next stage of the competition.

FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0 ABSTAINED: 0

The proposal was accepted.

7. At the same time, the jury agreed on the need to verify the relevance of affidavits proving compliance with the condition set out in point IV. Point 3 of the competition conditions, according to which only an entity with authorization for architectural practice may advance to the next stage of the competition.

FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0 ABSTAINED: 0

The proposal was accepted.

8. The number of competition designs accepted for evaluation was 77.
9. 11:00 - 19:00 Individual study of all competition designs.
10. The evaluation of the submitted designs was carried out in accordance with the Competition Conditions, Chapter X.

Criterion according to point X.1 of the Competition Conditions: quality of the architectural solution in relation to the assignment.

Application method of the criteria in the 1st round of the tender according to point X.3 of the Competition Conditions: Based on a majority vote, the jury shall assign points to each design according to the criterion in section X.1. A higher number of points means a better evaluation of the design; a lower number of points means a worse evaluation of the design. The five designs with the highest number of points shall qualify to the second round. In case the jury finds the number of evaluated designs or their quality low, the number of designs in the second round may be reduced to at least three designs. Such a decision must be justified in writing in the minutes from the evaluation meeting in the first round of the competition.

11. The jury voted that the proposals no. 3, 7, 8, 10, 14, 20, 24, 26, 29, 30, 31, 35, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 49, 50, 52, 55, 59, 61, 62, 66, 67, 71, 72, 73, 75, 77 will be awarded equally 1 point.

FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0 ABSTAINED: 0

The proposal was accepted.

12. The jury voted that the proposals no. 19, 23, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 39, 54, 63, 64, 69, 74 will be awarded equally 2 points.  
FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0 ABSTAINED: 0  
The proposal was accepted.
13. The jury voted that the proposals no. 1, 2, 4, 5, 25, 51, 57, 58, 68 will be awarded equally 3 points.  
FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0 ABSTAINED: 0  
The proposal was accepted.
14. The jury voted that the proposals no. 11, 12, 16, 17, 48 will be awarded equally 4 points.  
FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0 ABSTAINED: 0  
The proposal was accepted.
15. 19:00 End of the first day of the meeting.  
On the first day, the jury awarded points to the above proposals. The jury considered the remaining proposals to be of better quality and decided to evaluate them the next day.  
FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0 ABSTAINED: 0  
The proposal was accepted.

**G. The meeting of the jury on the second day took place in the Old Market (SNP square 25, Bratislava) on June 30, 2020**

10:00 The meeting begins, the following are present:

- All full members of the jury, alternates, experts, secretary and verifier

1. 10:00 – 12:30 discussion with the jury's experts on the proposals
2. 12:30 - 13:30 break
3. 13:30 The jury voted that the proposals no. 13, 15, 21, 22, 46, 47, 53, 60, 65 will be awarded equally 5 points.  
FOR: 5    AGAINST: 0    ABSTAINED: 0  
The proposal was accepted.
4. 14:30 The jury voted that the proposals no. 9 and 18 will be awarded equally 6 points.  
FOR: 5    AGAINST: 0    ABSTAINED: 0  
The proposal was accepted.
5. 14:30 The jury voted that the proposals no. 6, 36, 56, 70, 76 will be awarded equally 6 points and proceed to the 2nd round of the competition.  
FOR: 5    AGAINST: 0    ABSTAINED: 0  
The proposal was accepted.

None of the members of the jury exercised the right granted to him by the provisions of § 7 par. 3 of the Decree of the Public Procurement Office no. 157/2016 Coll., Which lays down details on the types of design competitions in the field of architecture, spatial planning and civil engineering, the content of the competition conditions and the activities of the jury - state own opinion, if different from the majority opinion, state the reasons for your vote and do not sign the minutes.

Table with point evaluation and order of proposals:

number	points	order	number	points	order	number	points	order
1	3	22. – 30.	27	2	31. – 43.	53	5	8. – 16.
2	3	22. – 30.	28	2	31. – 43.	54	2	31. – 43.
3	1	44. – 77.	29	1	44. – 77.	55	1	44. – 77.
4	3	22. – 30.	30	1	44. – 77.	56	7	1. – 5.
5	3	22. – 30.	31	1	44. – 77.	57	3	22. – 30.
6	7	1. – 5.	32	2	31. – 43.	58	3	22. – 30.
7	1	44. – 77.	33	2	31. – 43.	59	1	44. – 77.
8	1	44. – 77.	34	2	31. – 43.	60	5	8. – 16.
9	6	6. – 7.	35	1	44. – 77.	61	1	44. – 77.
10	1	44. – 77.	36	7	1. – 5.	62	1	44. – 77.
11	4	17. – 21.	37	1	44. – 77.	63	2	31. – 43.
12	4	17. – 21.	38	1	44. – 77.	64	2	31. – 43.
13	5	8. – 16.	39	2	31. – 43.	65	5	8. – 16.
14	1	44. – 77.	40	1	44. – 77.	66	1	44. – 77.
15	5	8. – 16.	41	1	44. – 77.	67	1	44. – 77.
16	4	17. – 21.	42	1	44. – 77.	68	3	22. – 30.
17	4	17. – 21.	43	1	44. – 77.	69	2	31. – 43.
18	6	6. – 7.	44	1	44. – 77.	70	7	1. – 5.
19	2	31. – 43.	45	1	44. – 77.	71	1	44. – 77.
20	1	44. – 77.	46	5	8. – 16.	72	1	44. – 77.
21	5	8. – 16.	47	5	8. – 16.	73	1	44. – 77.
22	5	8. – 16.	48	4	17. – 21.	74	2	31. – 43.
23	2	31. – 43.	49	1	44. – 77.	75	1	44. – 77.
24	1	44. – 77.	50	1	44. – 77.	76	7	1. – 5.
25	3	22. – 30.	51	3	22. – 30.	77	1	44. – 77.
26	1	44. – 77.	52	1	44. – 77.			

After determining the proposals advancing to the second round, the verifier in accordance with the decision of the jury referred to in Part F, point 6 of these minutes, requested that the participant with proposal no. 6 corrects formal shortcomings of his statement (they concerned the designation of the name and surname of the authors of the proposal and their signatures). The participant rectified the formal deficiencies of the declaration within the set deadline.

Following the identification of the proposals advancing to the second round, the verifier in accordance with the jury's decision referred to in Part F, point 7 of these minutes, examined the relevance of the condition under which only an authorized architect could participate. This was verified by reviewing the relevant registers. The participants who advance to the next stage all fulfill the condition in question.

Note: Due to the requirement of maintaining the anonymity of participants, the competition will take place in the second round without disclosing the identity of participants

**Annexes:**

1. Comments on competition designs.
2. Affidavits of the members of the jury, alternates and subsidiary bodies of the jury.

In Bratislava, June 30th, 2020

Ilja Skoček, Chairman of the jury

Lászlo Kovács, full member of the jury

Adam Halíř, full member of the jury

Henrieta Moravčíková, full member of the jury

Peter Lényi, full member of the jury

Peter Fejerdy, alternate member of the jury

Zuzana Zacharová, alternate member of the jury



Design competition: „Grössling“

Ondrej Marko, secretary

Marian Szakáll, verifier

**Annex no. 1**

**Comment on the competition proposals placed on**

**44th - 77th place**

The designs met the criterion of the quality of the architectural solution in relation to the assignment to an insufficient extent.

**31st – 43rd place**

The designs met the criterion of the quality of the architectural solution in relation to the assignment to a lesser extent.

**22nd – 30th place**

The designs met the criterion of the quality of the architectural solution in relation to the assignment to a sufficient extent.

**17th – 21st place**

The designs met the criterion of the quality of the architectural solution in relation to the assignment to a good extent.

**8th – 16th place**

The designs met the criterion of the quality of the architectural solution in relation to the assignment to a very good extent.

**6th – 7th place**

The designs met the criterion of the quality of the architectural solution in relation to the assignment to an excellent extent.

**1st – 5th place**

The designs met the criterion of the quality of the architectural solution in relation to the assignment to the best of all submitted designs.