

# PROTOCOL

From the meetings on December 17 and 18, 2011, of the international jury appointed by order RD.09.01-483/14.12.11 by the mayor of Sofia Municipality for the contest “Development of an Architectural Project in the Preliminary Phase for Metro Station 20 on Metro Line 1 of the Sofia Metro System”

Today, December 17, 2011, the first session of the international jury was held, consisting of:

Chairman – architect Petar Dikov, chief architect for the Sofia Municipality, with the members:

architect Elena Paktiawal, architect Anna Tilova, architect Bart Lens, architect Petar Tornyov, architect Adam Hatvani, architect Eduardo Gutierrez, architect Andrey Velinov, architect Georgi Kutov and the observer – chief attorney Boris Milchev. Others present at the meeting were: architect Orlin Manolov, who prepared the contest assignment, and members of the Technical Committee appointed for the contest: Boryana Zafirova, Martin Angelov, and urban planner Zlatko Terziev.

The meeting began at 10:30 a.m. in the hall on the first floor of Perform Business Center (2 Pozitano Square). The following documents were presented to each of the ten jury members: the rules regarding the contest program and the contest assignment, the Technical Committee’s report regarding the projects received for participation in the contest and the official, original order for appointing the jury by the mayor of Sofia Municipality.

The jury decided to allow consideration of all 130 (one hundred and thirty) projects received for participation in the contest. The jury judged that all projects received (one hundred and thirty) conformed to the requirements of the contest program and gave sufficient information for the draft project stage, for which reason they decided to replace criterion (c) “conformity to the requirements of the assignment” with the criterion “originality.” The jury established that the projects were arranged in a manner convenient for evaluation, and that the anonymity of the project authors was preserved through the numbering system applied by the Technical Committee, running from number 001 to number 130, and they announced the beginning of their working process.

Methodology for selecting the projects:

First Selection:

The jury decided that every member of the jury would select up to 30 (thirty) projects from the whole 130 (one hundred and thirty) within the period of an hour and a half. The projects which received 3 (three) votes or more would continue to the following round of the contest. Project(s) which received 2 (two) votes or fewer would be excluded from further consideration by the committee. Projects eliminated by such ranking could be returned for further examination if a member of the jury defended the project, in which case the project would be put to a clear vote. Such a project would continue to the next round if it received 50% + 1 “yes” votes in this clear vote.

In all, 78 projects (seventy-eight) projects were selected, of which 23 (twenty-three) received 1 (one) vote each, 24 (twenty-four) received 2 (two) votes each, 16 (sixteen) received 3 (three) votes each, 8 (eight) received 4 (four) votes each, 3 (three) received 5 (five) votes each, 1 (one) received 6 (six) votes each, and 3 (three) received 7 (votes) each.

*Appendix 1, 2, 3 and 4*

Several projects were presented for secondary examination, of which only 1 (one) received approval through a clear vote to continue on to the next round of the contest program.

The selected projects which continued on to the next round in the contest program were 32 (thirty-two) in total, bearing the following contest numbers: 007 (seven), 011 (eleven), 012 (twelve), 013 (thirteen), 014 (fourteen), 015 (fifteen), 016 (sixteen), 032 (thirty-two), 040 (forty), 041 (forty-one), 045 (forty-five), 050 (fifty), 053 (fifty-three), 055 (fifty-five), 056 (fifty-six), 058 (fifty-eight), 061 (sixty-one), 064 (sixty-four), 066 (sixty-six), 069 (sixty-nine), 078 (seventy-eight), 086 (eighty-six), 088 (eighty-eight), 093 (ninety-three), 100 (one hundred), 101 (one hundred and one), 106 (one hundred and six), 109 (one hundred and nine), 119 (one hundred and nineteen), 121 (one hundred twenty-one), 127 (one hundred twenty-seven), 128 (one hundred twenty-eight).

In the next stage of the evaluation process, every member of the jury evaluated the 32 (thirty-two) selected projects according to the method of evaluation described in the Contest Program, namely: every jury member gave a rating from 1 to 10 in each of the four criteria to every one of the (thirty-two) projects. The ratings were calculated according to a formula, arranged according to the results of the evaluation forms of every member of the jury, printed out and handed back to the members of the jury. *Appendix 5*

On the basis of their own evaluations and the results received, the members of the jury individually determined their own rankings from 1 to 10, with the project ranked in first place receiving 10 points, and the project ranked in tenth place receiving 1 point.

This ranking from 1 to 10 was combined into a table which added the sums of the points given to each of the ten projects by each member of the jury. *Appendix 6.*

On the basis of this classification, the 32 (thirty-two) projects were again examined. The jury decided to separate out the first 10 projects (according to the classification). If these ten projects did not include a project which a member of the jury wanted to see among the selection, an opportunity was given to the jury member to defend the project he or she felt should be included in the ten selected projects, after which the project would be put to a clear vote by members of the jury and if it received 50% + 1 vote, it would continue on in the contest program. For each project added in this way, another project that was already part of the final ten must be removed. In the end, 12 projects were selected – from the initial classification of ten projects, two projects were removed and four more were added. *Appendix 7*

The meeting on December 17, 2011, ended at 5:30 p.m.

The second session of the jury took place on December 18, 2011; present at the meeting were:

Chairman – architect Petar Dikov, chief architect for the Sofia Municipality, with the members:

architect Elena Paktiawal, chief attorney Boris Milchev, architect Anna Tilova, architect Bart Lens, architect Petar Torniyov, architect Adam Hatvani, architect Eduardo Gutierrez, architect Andrey Velinov, and architect Georgi Kutov. Others present at the meeting were: architect Orlin Manolov, who prepared the contest assignment, and members of the Technical Committee appointed for the contest: Boryana Zafirova and Martin Angelov.

The jury decided that the 12 (twelve) projects from the previous selection should be distributed amongst the members of the jury, with each jury member examining a project in detail and defending it before the other members of the jury. The distribution was made randomly.

After detailed discussion of the projects, the jury made a ranking of the first 4 (four) projects from the total 12 (twelve). The project ranked in first place received 4 (four) points, while the project in fourth place received 1 (one) point. The resulting ranking ordered the projects from first to twelfth place. *Appendix 8*

The first seven projects classified in this way were noted. The jury decided to discuss the first three projects for the positions of first, second and third prize.

After a discussion, the jury made the following

### **Decisions:**

1. To award 2 (two) first prizes to projects 016 and 088 (sixteen and eighty-eight) in the amount of a reduced first prize of 8,000 (eight thousand) leva each.
2. To award a second prize to project 007 (seven) in the amount of the original third prize – 4,000 (four thousand) leva.

To the assignor, the jury makes the following recommendations:

3. Projects 016 and 088 should be re-assigned for further development at the level of draft projects, taking into account the jury's comments on them.
4. After the reworking of the two first-place projects, they should be re-examined and the project for implementation should be selected.
5. For the purposes of making this selection, the assignor should ensure that the jury meets again and also holds at a joint meeting with the leadership of Metropolitan EAD in order to designate the final project for realization.

The jury makes the following recommendations to the first-place projects:

1. To project 016:
  - Simplification of the concrete forms with the aim of easier technological implementation and the improved financial adequacy of the project.
  - Optimization of the approaches from the street towards the foyer of the station (the existing ones should be more focused or new ones should be added).
  - To preserve the original impression of the project – the greenery, visible concrete, view towards the platform and double height.
  - To optimize the technical implementation, using the advantages and possibilities of concrete as a construction material.
  - To get rid of the decorative concrete forms above the ground.
2. To project 088:
  - The glassing-in of the atriums to be functionally improved.
  - Ensuring handicap access.
  - To further develop the green environment and if possible to rethink the symmetrical positioning of the approaches to the metro station.

Chairman:

.....  
/architect Petar Dikov /

Members:

.....  
/architect Elena Paktiawal /

.....  
/chief attorney Boris Milchev/

.....  
/architect Anna Tilvoa /

.....  
/architect Bart Lens/

.....  
/architect Petar Tornyov /

.....  
/architect Adam Hatvani/

.....  
/architect Eduardo Gutierrez /

.....  
/architect Andrey Velinov/

.....  
/architect Georgi Kutov/