

Prague Institute of Planning and Development  
Capital City of Prague

---

REVITALIZATION OF CHARLES SQUARE  
stage II. – the park

---



# Invitation to participate in the competitive dialogue



IPR  
PRAHA

[ November 2017 ]





INSTITUT PLÁNOVÁNÍ A ROZVOJE  
HLAVNÍHO MĚSTA PRAHY  
příspěvková organizace

Your letter ref.	Ref. No. IPR	Responsible person/dept./extension	Date
	<b>14358/2017 vl.</b>	<b>Minksová/PRAV/5671</b>	

The Prague Institute of Planning and Development (IPR Prague), a public-benefit organization in accordance with provisions of Section 68 paragraph 4 of Act No. 134/2016 Coll., on Public Procurement, as amended (hereinafter the “Public Procurement Act” or “PPA”),

**Invites you to participate in the competitive dialogue in the procurement procedure involving competitive dialogue in a project entitled:**

**“Project No. 0042804 Revitalization of Charles Square, Stage II. – proceedings involving competitive dialogue for design and engineering services”**

(hereinafter the „**Public Contract**“)

**VU 17-0047**

**1. Information on the Contracting Authority:**

**Prague Institute of Planning and Development (IPR Prague), a public-benefit organization**

Represented by: Mgr. Ondřej Boháč, Director

Offices: Vyšehradská 57/2077, 128 00 Praha 2

Registered in: Commercial Registry maintained by the City Court in Prague, Section Pr, file 63

ID: 70883858

Tax ID: CZ70883858

Contracting Authority profile:

<https://www.tenderarena.cz/profily/IPRPraha>

Data box ID: c2zmahu

Contact person: Mgr. Lukáš Marek

phone: +420 236 004 538, e-mail: [marek@ipr.praha.eu](mailto:marek@ipr.praha.eu)

(hereinafter “**IPR Prague**”)

and

### The Capital City of Prague

Represented by: Ing. Karel Prajer,

Director of the Strategic Investment Department

Offices: Mariánské náměstí 2/2, 110 01 Praha 1

ID: 00064581

Tax ID: CZ00064581

Contracting Authority profile: <https://www.tenderarena.cz/profil/HlavniMestoPraha>

Data box ID: 48ia97h

(hereinafter “**City of Prague**” or “**City**”)

IPR Prague and City of Prague have concluded an Agreement on 24 February 2017 to jointly commission / assign a public contract for “Project No. 0042804 Revitalization of Charles Square, Stage II (park)” in accordance with provisions of Section 7 paragraph 2 Act No. 134/2016 Coll., on Public Procurement, as amended, and pursuant to Act No. 89/2012 Coll., Civil Code. IPR Prague and City of Prague will be referred to hereinafter as the “**Contracting Authority**” or “**Contracting Authorities**”.

### **2) Link to the published Notification of commencement of a procurement procedure**

The competitive public procurement procedure entitled “Project No. 0042804 Revitalization of Charles Square, Stage II – proceedings involving competitive dialogue for design and engineering services” was commenced on 9 August 2017 by publication of the *Notification of commencement of a procurement procedure* on the Contracting Authority’s profile. The *Notification of commencement of a procurement procedure* is available via this link:

<https://www.tenderarena.cz/profil/zakazka/detail.jsf?id=96325> The complete version of the *Notification of commencement of a procurement procedure* forms Annex 1 hereto.

### **3) Information about access to the tender documentation**

The tender documentation is available on the Contracting Authority’s profile:

<https://www.tenderarena.cz/profil/zakazka/detail.jsf?id=96325> In addition to this invitation, the tender documentation comprises the following:

- Annex 1 – Full wording of the *Notification of commencement of a procurement procedure*, excluding annexes
- Annex 2 – Binding template for filling in the *Professional approach* (pdf, indd, idml, dwg)
- Annex 3 – Binding template for filling in the *Reference portfolio* (pdf, indd, idml, dwg)
- Annex 4 – Example of a filled-in *Professional approach* template

#### **4) Information on the course of competitive dialogue, including the date of commencement of dialogue, and language that the dialogue will be conducted in**

The competitive dialogue is the second of the three phases of the procurement procedure as these phases have been described in the *Notification of commencement of a procurement procedure* (Annex 1). The competitive dialogue will be taking place at this stage of the process.

The course of the competitive dialogue is in detail described in the *Notification of commencement of a procurement procedure* that form Annex 1 hereto.

The competitive dialogue will be held in Czech and interpreted into English.

This phase will take place in these gradual steps:

##### **6 Dec. 2017     Deadline for submitting the *Professional approach* and *Reference portfolio***

13 December 2017	Meeting of the Evaluation Committee to select five participants in the tendering procedure
8 – 9 February 2018	Workshop I (final details of assignment)
5 April 2018	Workshop II (presentation of concepts)
1 June 2018	Deadline for submitting proposals for expert evaluation
21 – 22 June 2018	Workshop III (presentation of proposals)

Participation in the workshops is obligatory for those team members listed as authors or have contributed as authors to the projects presented as proof of technical qualification.

**The Contracting Authority sets the moment of commencement of the competitive dialogue as the ultimate deadline for submitting the *Professional approach*, i.e., by 6 December 2017, 6:00 p.m.** Please note that the deadlines that follow 6<sup>th</sup> December are only preliminary and the competitive dialogue timetable may still change.

#### **5) *Professional approach to creating the proposed solution with the Reference portfolio***

##### ***Professional approach to creating the proposed solution***

The *Professional approach to creating the proposed solution* is the first evaluated output of the proceedings with competitive dialogue. It shall be in writing, and assertions made in the text shall be backed by specific examples of use in the selected projects. **Please note that all the required text fields in the evaluated *Professional approach* need to be filled in diligently. For the evaluation of the *Professional approach*, it is vital that the principles described in the text be backed by the displayed references from the selected projects, which will be used to demonstrate the method and quality of their execution.** Only projects that are part of the *Reference portfolio* can be used as references.

##### ***Reference portfolio***

The *Reference portfolio* is part of the *Professional approach*. The *Reference portfolio* serves as an overview of the projects set out in the *Professional approach*. It shall comprise **no more than 6 projects. Projects that were presented by the participants in the tendering procedure as proof of technical qualification in the application to participate shall form a mandatory part thereof.** Participants in the tendering procedure may list other projects in the *Reference portfolio* at their discretion (no more than 6 may be presented). Even unexecuted projects may be presented. At least one person from the Supplier's team has to be the author/co-author of the projects listed in the *Reference portfolio*.

### **Instructions for drawing up the *Professional approach to creating the proposed solution and the Reference portfolio***

The main part of the *Professional approach to creating the proposed solution* is the text on the front page. Here you will describe **the themes you consider essential for the revitalization of Charles Square and your approach to these themes.** This main text (no more than 1,800 characters, including spaces), shall be supplemented with separate sections on each theme that directly pertains to the revitalization of Charles Square, are the subject of the assessment and are based on the evaluation criteria described in the *Notification*. There are a total of 7 themes, and these are follows:

- A. Design approach to the solution of urbanistic relations
- B. Design approach to landscaping modifications and park design
- C. Design approach to the architectonic solution and solution of the public spaces
- D. Design approach to listed objects
- E. Design approach to infrastructure – especially transport and rainwater management system
- F. Design approach to efficiency and economy of the solution
- G. Professional approach to the process of revitalization of Charles Square

One double page has been set aside for each theme A-F. The main text part (no more than 1,000 characters, including spaces) shall comprise two paragraphs: in the first paragraph describe what your design approach to the respective theme consists of when designing public spaces or publicly accessible buildings; in the second paragraph, focus on the approach to the selected reference project. Back your assertions with visual documentation, which you will add into the presented layout. For each theme, select one main reference project from the *Reference portfolio*. If required, it is possible to show up to 2 different projects to each theme on one double page. A single project can serve as the main reference project for several themes.

The final theme – G, *Professional approach to the process of revitalization of Charles Square* – corresponds to the evaluation criterion *Expediency of chosen professional approach - proposed performance*, and pertains to the method of executing the contract, not the architectonic – landscape solution. It can be found on the last page of the document (pg. 13). Of primary importance is the text section (no more than 1,800 characters, including spaces), which is structured into two paragraphs: in the first paragraph, describe your **general professional approach to the process**; in

the second paragraph, describe its application to your specific project (this project also has to be part of the *Reference portfolio*). Claims may be backed by any graphical materials (tables, diagrams, graphs etc.) in the grey box beside the text.

The binding layout of the *Professional approach* and *Reference portfolio* are available in *idml*, *indd* and *dwg* format. Previews of the layouts are also included in *pdf* format. Please note that the original layouts found in the annexes to the Notification were preliminary in nature. **The only valid layouts are contained in the annex hereto.**

**Instructions for filling in the *Professional approach* and *Reference portfolio* layouts:**

1. Detailed instructions can be found on the last page (pg. 13) of each layout template.
2. When filling in the documents, please comply with the pre-set layout. Each grey box allows for several alternatives of filling in. Press (W) to view the guiding lines. Please delete the boxes in grey.



3. For clarity, the project shown on the first page of both documents has to be the same.
4. The text in black italics is for explanation only. Please delete such text when filling in the layout.
5. The text in black outside the boxes is to be left unchanged or filled-in, as appropriate.
6. The text in red is to be deleted and replaced with text in black according to the description.
7. The font type and size must not be change. The text shall be written in black. Please us Calibri Regular, 12 points, black for comprehensive textual parts.
8. A team logo may be placed opposite the name of the team, but this is not compulsory.
9. Please delete the instructions on the back pages of the layout templates.

An example of a filled-in *Professional approach* forms Annex 4 hereto.

**6) Submission of the *Professional approach* and *Reference portfolio***

Participants in the tendering procedure are hereby asked to submit the filled-in *Professional approach*, including the *Reference portfolio*, both of which need to be filled in and formatted according the templates that form Annexes 2 and 3 hereto and submitted in pdf format (each document may be no more than 20 MB in size) no later than by **Wednesday, 6 December 2017, 6:00 p.m., electronically to the e-mail address [hajkova@ipr.praha.eu](mailto:hajkova@ipr.praha.eu).**

Please note that in accordance with the *Notification of commencement of a procurement procedure*, participants in the proceedings who submitted this first output do not have any right to be reimbursed for their expenses relating to the preparation thereof.

If the *Professional approach* and *Reference portfolio* are not delivered to the Contracting Authority by the stipulated deadline, the party to the tendering procedure shall be eliminated from the tendering procedure pursuant to Section 48(2)(a). If the *Professional approach* and *Reference portfolio* are not submitted in the manner and format stipulated in part 5) hereto, the party to the tendering procedure may be asked to explain or supplement the submitted documents by the specified deadline or be eliminated from the tendering procedure.

### **7) Reduction of the number of solutions**

After the *Professional approach* is submitted, the Evaluation Committee will, based thereon, reduce the number of solutions pursuant to Section 69(4) PPA in the manner set out in Section 112 PPA.

Reduction in the number of solutions pursuant to Section 112 PPA shall take place as follows:

In the *Notification of commencement of a procurement procedure*, the Contracting Authority reserved the right to conduct the competitive dialogue in several phases in order to reduce the number of solutions, which shall be processed pursuant Section 69(4) and Section 112 PPA.

In the *Notification on commencement of a procurement procedure*, the Contracting Authority also set the minimum number of solutions which need to remain in the process after reduction to 5, provided there will be a sufficient number of solutions.

**In order to reduce the number of solutions, the Contracting Authority defined the following quality-based criteria for this procedure:**

#### **Solution of urbanistic relations (maximum 7 points)**

The following shall be evaluated:

- adequacy of the proposed solution
- integration of the proposal into the context of the city or its part
- protection and development of the site-specific values
- support to the permeability of the site

*Notes for the evaluation:*

*Adequacy shall be understood, in terms of urban relations, primarily as a correct estimate of programme content / facilities and the chosen urbanistic-architectonic typology in comparison with other sites within the neighbourhood and the city. A good quality proposal, well integrated into the context of the city, shall be understood as a proposal which takes into consideration broader urbanistic composition principles (historical and current) or natural configurations, and which will work well with their potential connotations. Positive evaluation will be awarded to the demonstrated*

*ability to integrate the proposal into the context of social and cultural discourses at the site and to conscious work with such discourses as well as to good understanding of broader traffic-related and technical contexts, their problems and opportunities and the participant's ability to accommodate such circumstances in their proposal.*

**Landscaping modifications and park design (maximum 7 points)**

The following shall be evaluated:

- adequacy and expediency of the proposed solution
- integration of the proposal into the context and character of the site
- technical and aesthetical quality of the proposal
- recreational and spatial quality of the space
- utility and variability of the space
- technical, functional and aesthetical quality of details within the proposal

*Notes for the evaluation:*

*Adequacy shall be understood, in terms of landscaping modifications and park design, as a corresponding choice and parameters of individual park elements (such as the size and location of paved surfaces, urban furniture, play areas / elements, terrain modifications etc.) in relation to the programme and the currently existing values. Furthermore, as adequate use of materials (types of paving, shape and species of vegetation, elements of newly planted vegetation etc.) in relation to the programme and the existing character of the perceived environment, appropriateness of the chosen typology with regard to the site and adequacy of the proposed elements in relation to the chosen typology. Adequacy shall be also understood as appropriate choice of quality of materials or furnishings from the perspective of their price and , potentially, their perceived hierarchy in relation to the economic potential of the city, prior conventions and the importance/significance of the site. Integration into the context shall be understood as the ability to correctly evaluate the specific character resulting from the evolution of the site and its suitable reflection in the proposal.*

**Architectonic solution and solution of the public spaces – streets and the square (maximum 7 points)**

The following shall be evaluated:

- adequacy and utility of the proposed solution
- integration of the proposal into the context and character of the site
- technical and aesthetic quality of the proposal
- recreational and spatial quality
- utility and variability

technical, functional and aesthetic quality of the details in the proposal

*Notes for the evaluation:*

*Adequacy shall be understood, in terms of architectonic solution and public space-related solutions, similar as in the case of landscaping modifications with the difference that in this case the subject of evaluation will be building and constructions and spatial solutions of street adjoining the park.*

### **Quality of adaptation/regeneration of the listed objects (maximum 7 points)**

The following shall be evaluated:

- manifested sensitivity to the listed object
- successful adaptation to the current conditions
- coherence and strength of the chosen architectonic language
- quality of the dialogue between the current context and the listed object / landmark

*Notes for the evaluation:*

*Coherence and strength of the architectonic language shall be understood as overall lucidity and content quality of the proposal using architectonic and graphical means.*

### **Suitable concept of infrastructure (especially transport and rainwater management system) (max. 7 p.)**

The following shall be evaluated:

- suitability of the transport measures in view of the objectives of the revitalization, broader context and feasibility
- suitability of the rainwater management system in terms of preventing flooding of streets and erosion, and in terms of minimising the outflow into sewerage
- suitability of the rainwater management system in terms of irrigating vegetation, and in terms of the cooling function of the evaporating water
- suitability of the rainwater management system in terms of the system's efficiency and incorporation in the overall design of the square
- creative approach to issues related to technical infrastructure"

### **Efficiency and economy of the solution (maximum 7 points)**

The following shall be evaluated:

adequacy of the cost

economy of the proposal from the perspective of long-term management and maintenance of the park

### **Expediency in the choice of professional approach – proposed performance (maximum 7 points)**

Choice of the required steps and methods, which will result in high quality of the public park, including definition of the role which is taken in this process by architect (as the author of the design and project documentation).

The following shall be evaluated:

knowledge and understanding of professional specifics related to revitalization of a public park

appreciation of the architect's role within the process

strength of choice of methods and steps to be taken in order to achieve high quality public space

Evaluation will be carried out by the Evaluation Committee. The evaluation shall take place as follows:

Each individual professional solution will be awarded points, for each partial criterion, reflecting the success of the proposal within the partial criteria. Each of the seven criteria shall be evaluated by the Evaluation Committee using a point scale from 0 to 7. Based on the number of points awarded, the total average quality of the proposal will be determined: the total average quality multiplied by 10 will determine the number of % for the qualitative criteria.

The average will be rounded to three decimal places. All submitted proposals will be ranked according to the average (percentage) from the highest to the lowest.

Participants in the tendering procedure who place in the first five positions will be asked to take part in the next part of the competitive dialogue. The other participants in the tendering procedure will be eliminated from the tendering procedure in accordance with Section 112(4) PPA.

### **8) Bid evaluation criteria**

The Contracting Authority states that in accordance with Section 114(1) PPA, the bids submitted in the 3<sup>rd</sup> phase of the tendering procedure will be evaluated on the basis of their economic expediency.

Contracting Authority determined the following weight of partial criteria in per cent:

A. Quality criterion = 70%

B. Bid price 30%

**A. Quality criterion = 70%**

**Solution of urbanistic relations (maximum 7 points)**

The following shall be evaluated:

- adequacy of the proposed solution
- integration of the proposal into the context of the city or its part
- protection and development of the site-specific values
- support to the permeability of the site

*Notes for the evaluation:*

*Adequacy shall be understood, in terms of urban relations, primarily as a correct estimate of programme content / facilities and the chosen urbanistic-architectonic typology in comparison with other sites within the neighbourhood and the city. A good quality proposal, well integrated into the context of the city, shall be understood as a proposal which takes into consideration broader urbanistic composition principles (historical and current) or natural configurations, and which will work well with their potential connotations. Positive evaluation will be awarded to the demonstrated ability to integrate the proposal into the context of social and cultural discourses at the site and to conscious work with such discourses as well as to good understanding of broader traffic-related and technical contexts, their problems and opportunities and the participant's ability to accommodate such circumstances in their proposal.*

**Landscaping modifications and park design (maximum 7 points)**

The following shall be evaluated:

- adequacy and expediency of the proposed solution
- integration of the proposal into the context and character of the site
- technical and aesthetical quality of the proposal
- recreational and spatial quality of the space
- utility and variability of the space
- technical, functional and aesthetical quality of details within the proposal

*Notes for the evaluation:*

*Adequacy shall be understood, in terms of landscaping modifications and park design, as a corresponding choice and parameters of individual park elements (such as the size and location of paved surfaces, urban furniture, play areas / elements, terrain modifications etc.) in relation to the programme and the currently existing values. Furthermore, as adequate use of materials (types of*

*paving, shape and species of vegetation, elements of newly planted vegetation etc.) in relation to the programme and the existing character of the perceived environment, appropriateness of the chosen typology with regard to the site and adequacy of the proposed elements in relation to the chosen typology. Adequacy shall be also understood as appropriate choice of quality of materials or furnishings from the perspective of their price and , potentially, their perceived hierarchy in relation to the economic potential of the city, prior conventions and the importance/significance of the site. Integration into the context shall be understood as the ability to correctly evaluate the specific character resulting from the evolution of the site and its suitable reflection in the proposal.*

### **Architectonic solution and solution of the public spaces – streets and the square (maximum 7 points)**

The following shall be evaluated:

- adequacy and utility of the proposed solution
- integration of the proposal into the context and character of the site
- technical and aesthetic quality of the proposal
- recreational and spatial quality
- utility and variability
- technical, functional and aesthetic quality of the details in the proposal

*Notes for the evaluation:*

*Adequacy shall be understood, in terms of architectonic solution and public space-related solutions, similar as in the case of landscaping modifications with the difference that in this case the subject of evaluation will be building and constructions and spatial solutions of street adjoining the park.*

### **Quality of adaptation/regeneration of the listed objects (maximum 7 points)**

The following shall be evaluated:

- manifested sensitivity to the listed object
- successful adaptation to the current conditions
- coherence and strength of the chosen architectonic language
- quality of the dialogue between the current context and the listed object / landmark

*Notes for the evaluation:*

*Coherence and strength of the architectonic language shall be understood as overall lucidity and content quality of the proposal using architectonic and graphical means.*

**Suitable concept of infrastructure (especially transport and rainwater management system) (max. 7 p.)**

The following shall be evaluated:

suitability of the transport measures in view of the objectives of the revitalization, broader context and feasibility

suitability of the rainwater management system in terms of preventing flooding of streets and erosion, and in terms of minimising the outflow into sewerage

suitability of the rainwater management system in terms of irrigating vegetation, and in terms of the cooling function of the evaporating water

suitability of the rainwater management system in terms of the system's efficiency and incorporation in the overall design of the square

creative approach to issues related to technical infrastructure"

**Efficiency and economy of the solution (maximum 7 points)**

The following shall be evaluated:

adequacy of the cost

economy of the proposal from the perspective of long-term management and maintenance of the park

**Expediency in the choice of professional approach – proposed performance (maximum 7 points)**

Choice of the required steps and methods, which will result in high quality of the public park, including definition of the role which is taken in this process by architect (as the author of the design and project documentation).

The following shall be evaluated:

knowledge and understanding of professional specifics related to revitalization of a public park

appreciation of the architect's role within the process

strength of choice of methods and steps to be taken in order to achieve high quality public space

The sum of per cent awarded for individual criteria equals 100%.

Evaluation method:

#### Quality-based criteria

Each individual proposal will be awarded points, for each partial criteria, reflecting the success of the proposal within the partial criteria. Each of the seven criteria shall be evaluated by an Evaluation Committee using a point scale from 0 to 7. Based on the number of points awarded, the total average quality of the proposal will be determined; the total average quality multiplied by 10 will determine the number of % for qualitative criteria.

#### Bid price

For the numerical expression of this sub-criterion, where the most suitable bid has the minimum value, the evaluated bid will be awarded a point value that is multiplied by 100 and the ratio of the most suitable bid to the evaluated bid.

Individual points awarded pursuant to partial criteria will be multiplied by respective weight of each partial criterion. Based on the sums of resulting point values awarded to the quality-based criteria and bid price for individual bids, the evaluation committee will draw up a ranking of submitted bids, with the most successful bid receiving the highest value.

Mgr. Ondřej Boháč

director

