

**Landscape and Architectural Competition for
a proposal "Lety u Písku. Memorial to the
Holocaust of the Roma and Sinti in Bohemia"**

Competition Protocol

Contents

- 1. Minutes of the constitutional meeting of the Jury3
- 2. Attendance list from the constitutional meeting of the jury.....7
- 3. Report on explanations of the Competition Terms in the first round8
- 4. Report from the examination of the designs in the first round 19
- 5. Minutes of the jury deliberations assessing the designs in the first round 27
- 6. Assessment of proposals designated for the second round 39
- 7. Assessment of proposals excluded from competition 51
- 8. Attendance list from the first assessment session of the jury 72
- 9. Report on explanations of the Competition Terms in the second round..... 74
- 10. Report from the examination of the designs in the second round 78
- 11. Minutes of the jury meeting assessing the designs in the second round 80
- 12. Attendance list from the second assessment session of the jury 97

1. Minutes of the constitutional meeting of the Jury

September 24, 2019

The constituent meeting of the Jury took place at the seat of the competition organizer, ONplan lab, s.r.o., at Františka Křížka 362/1, Prague 7, 170 00

the meeting opened at 10:10 am

present: full members of the Jury dependent – Jana Horváthová, Martin Martínek,
full members of the Jury independent – Josef Pleskot, Vladimír Sitta, Emilia Rigová, Rostislav Koryčánek
alternate Jury dependent – Anna Míšková, Rudolf Murka
alternate Jury independent – Regina Loukotová
competition organizer – Petr Návrat, Karolína Koupalová

1 / Opening of the meeting

Petr Návrat, representative of the competition organizer, welcomed the participants, explained the program of the Jury's constituent meeting and introduced the individual members of the Jury.

2 / Election of the Jury Chairman and Vice-Chairman

Josef Pleskot was nominated as Chairman of the Jury. The Jury voted on this proposal.

Votes: for:7 against: 0 abstentions: 1

Josef Pleskot was elected Chairman of the Jury.

Emilie Rigová was nominated as Vice-Chairwoman of the Jury. The Jury voted on this proposal.

Vote: for: 6 against: 0 abstention: 2

Emilie Rigová was elected Vice-President of the Jury.

(The vote was attended by all members of the Jury present, absent members of the Jury expressed their views on the election of the Chairman and Vice-Chairwoman in writing)

3 / Presentation of the competition assignment and documents

Petr Návrat presented the process of preparing the competition.

Jana Horváthová, Director of the Museum of Romani Culture, briefly summarized the history of the place – the topics of the Memorial.

Karolína Koupalová introduced the proposed area, the basic theses of the assignment.

Discussion on the presented assignment:

layout of the camp

The layout of the camp, which is the result of an archaeological survey, does not correspond to an axonometric view of the camp (line drawing from 1943). There was

a request to explain this contradiction – the Head of the archaeological survey in Lety Pavel Vařeka will be asked to give an explanation. The answer will be a part of the assignment, or it will be prepared as an answer to questions of competitors.

operation and maintenance of the Memorial

The maximum amount that will be available for maintenance and operation of the memorial site (excluding wages) should be stated in the assignment. Establishing this amount is not easy – a proposal was made to provide the information that an amount of 10–15% of the total investment costs for the first stage of construction is provisionally foreseen for the operation and maintenance of the memorial complex.

degree of flexibility of assignment

There was a discussion over the degree of flexibility of the assignment, especially in the question of preservation of the pig farm, or the possibility of an unconventional institutional framework for the operation of the premises, e.g. in cooperation with other business and non-profit entities (e.g. horticulture). The organizer and the Contracting Entity pointed out that the assignment was loose enough to allow different solutions. It is up to the Jury to choose the solution. The Director of the Museum of Romani Culture drew attention to a possible contradiction in the view of the solution of the Memorial, or the use of the pig buildings by the bereaved, the museum and the view of the independent part of the Jury. The contest organizer expressed his conviction that in the discussion of the individual proposals, there would be agreement on the selection of the proposals that would proceed to the 2nd phase and the selection of the proposals to be awarded.

connection with the municipality Lety u Písku

In the Jury discussion it was said that the assignment should describe the possible community aspect of the project, the connection with the municipality. The assignment states: "The building of the municipal office is connected to a restaurant with a large social hall. In the past, events connected with the Memorial in Lety were held here. In the future there is an opportunity to use this hall for larger cultural events, which will not be suitable to be held in the Memorial, which is a place of piety. These may be, for example, meetings of the younger generation with a view to intercultural dialogue or related cultural programs. The mayor of Lety will be invited to join some of the jury's meetings as she is an expert on local connections.

discussing the plan with the Schwarzenberg family

The question whether the Schwarzenberg family (with regard to the fact that the area concerned directly affects land in their possession) was discussed with the intention to announce the competition, the assignment of the competition. The organizer contacted the family property manager and consulted the plan. A recommendation was made to invite the Schwarzenberg family representative to a meeting of the Jury or to the ceremonial announcement of the competition.

Refreshments from 13:15 to 13:45

4 / Competition Terms and Conditions

(At this stage of the meeting, only full members of the Jury voted. Absent Mr. Čeněk Růžička was represented by Mr. Rudolf Murka)

The Jury went through the individual points of the competition conditions and proposed their modification in the following points:

competition schedule

The Jury recommended a timetable with submission of proposals in the first round on January 17 2020. The Director of the Museum of Romani Culture confirmed that the postponement of the Jury's evaluation session in the first round of the competition is acceptable for them.

point 2.4. Competition assignment

There is no objection to the definition of binding requirements for the solution of the subject of the competition. The value of VAT (21%) will be added in the definition of the investment cost limit of the first stage of the Memorial realization.

point 2.5 Language of the competition

There was a discussion whether the proposals should be submitted in English or Czech. The outcome of the discussion is a recommendation in the first round to allow submission in either language, in the second round to request the submission of the proposal in Czech.

The competition organizer will check this option with Czech Chamber of Architects and the public procurement specialist. If this recommendation is in accordance with the law and competition rules, it will be incorporated into the competition conditions.

point 4.1. Conditions for participation in the competition

par.e) Discussed was the requirement for team composition – authorized architect, landscape designer

and a person experienced in creating expositions. The result of the discussion is the recommendation of the Jury in the first phase not to require authorization at all, in the second phase to request an authorized person.

The competition organizer will check this option with the Czech Chamber of Architects and the public procurement specialist. If this recommendation is in accordance with the law and competition rules, it will be incorporated into the Competition Terms and Conditions. If it is not, the Competition Terms and Conditions will leave the requirement to prove the authorization in the field of architect and landscape designer to be done in the first round.

par. f) The requirement to substantiate reference contracts is discussed.

At the end of this discussion, the Jury voted on the recommendation for the contracting authority to delete the requirement to substantiate the reference contracts.

votes in favor: 6 against: 0 abstentions: 1

The requirement to substantiate reference contracts will be omitted from the competition conditions.

At 2 pm Mr Rudolf Murka left the meeting and Mr Čeněk Růžička was represented by Mrs. Anna Mišková.

point 6.4. Tour of the competition site

The Jury recommended a tour of the site before half time of the deadline for submission of proposals in round 1 – from October 18 to 22. This recommendation will be taken into account in the Competition Conditions.

Information will be added that the area is freely accessible with the exception of the pig farm, which, however, can be circumvented along the fence and viewed from all sides.

point 7.3. Graphic and textual part of the "Panels" design – competition design in the 1st round

Discussion about panel content requirements. It will be stated in the Competition Terms and Conditions that the proposal in the 1st round should be submitted on 1 or 2 panels in A1 format. Requirements for panel content will be recommended.

At the end of the discussion on the Competition Terms and Conditions, the Jury voted to approve the wording of the Competition Terms and Conditions as discussed and the recommendation to submit them to the Czech Chamber of Architects together with the application for the fairness of the competition.

Votes in favor: 7 against: 0 abstentions: 0

The Jury agrees with the wording of the Competition Terms and Conditions as discussed and recommends the submitter to submit them to the Czech Chamber of Architects together with the application for the fairness of the competition.

5 / The request of the Museum of Romani Culture to record a video of the Jury's evaluation

The director of the Museum of Romani Culture asked for the Jury's consent to the filming of the video from the Jury's evaluation meetings and explained that the recordings will not be published, they will be used for the minutes of the Jury meetings and will be stored for documentation of the museum's activities.

The Jury voted on the consent to the filming of the audio recording of the Jury's evaluation.

Votes in favor: 7 against: 0 abstentions: 0

The Jury agrees to make an audio recording of the jury's evaluation.

6 / Remuneration of the independent members of the Jury

At 14:40, Mr. Josef Pleskot left the meeting and he was further represented in the vote by Regina Loukotová.

The Jury voted on the amount of remuneration of independent Jury members as proposed by the Museum of Romani Culture – 800, - CZK / hour excluding VAT. Travel expenses and accommodation of the judges will be paid separately.

Votes in favor: 7 against: 0 abstentions: 0

The Jury agrees with the proposed amount of remuneration of members of the independent part of the Jury in value of 800, - CZK / hour excluding VAT.

The members of the Jury present signed a commitment to participate in the Jury and accept the Terms and Conditions of competition as discussed at this meeting.

The Jury session was closed at 15:00.











Minutes taken by
Karolína Koupalová

2. Attendance list from the constitutional meeting of the jury

Prezenční listina

Krajinářsko-architektonická soutěž o návrh
„Lety u Písku. Památník holokaustu Romů a Sintů v Čechách“

Ustavující jednání poroty 24. 9. 2019

řádní členové poroty závislí	
PhDr. Jana Horváthová ředitelka Muzea romské kultury	
Čeněk Růžička předseda Výboru pro odškodnění romského holokaustu	omluven
Martin Martínek, M.A. zástupce Ministerstva kultury ČR	
řádní členové poroty nezávislí	
Ing. arch. Josef Pleskot architekt	
Ing. Vladimír Sitta krajinář	
Mgr. Emílie Rigová výtvarná umělkyně	
Mgr. Rostislav Koryčánek kurátor Moravskoslezské galerie v Brně	
náhradníci poroty závislí	
Mgr. Anna Míšková historička Muzea romské kultury	
Rudolf Murka zástupce pozůstalých po obětech tábora	
náhradníci poroty nezávislí	
Ing. arch. Regina Loukotová architektka	
Ing. arch. Igor Marko architekt	omluven
organizátor soutěže – ONplan lab s.r.o.	
Ing. Petr Návrat, MSc. přezkušovatel soutěžních návrhů	
Ing. Karolína Koupalová sekretář soutěže	

3. Report on explanations of the Competition Terms in the first round

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms No. 1:

points 4.2. - 6.6.2 - 7.5) it is not clear to me how to deliver the PF2 document (fulfilment of the conditions): should the document be digitally signed? With what kind of digital signature? Where should it be uploaded to the National Electronic Tool website?

Answer No. 1:

According to the Public Procurement Act (§ 211 par. 3), the PF2 document is to be handed in via the electronic tool of the Contracting entity NEN (<https://nen.nipez.cz>) in the first round of the competition. Prior registration is needed.

Further information on individual steps of working with NEN can be found in the user manuals under the following

link: <https://nen.nipez.cz/UzivatelскеInformace/UzivatelскеPrirucky>. User manuals in English are available in Chapter 18.

A digital signature is not necessary when submitting the form PF2, but it is necessary when registering in NEN. The NEN customer support line (+420 841 888 841) and the Hotline@nipez.cz help desk is ready to solve any problems with registration with applicants individually, in Czech or English.

PLEASE DO NOT HESITATE TO CONTACT THE NEN CUSTOMER SUPPORT SERVICE AND DO NOT BE DISCOURAGED IF ANY COMPLICATIONS OCCUR.

As mentioned in Chapter 6.6.3 of the Competition terms, it is crucial to submit the competition proposal in paper form - the panels and "contact details" envelope - in order to meet the deadline. This means that a failure to submit the PF2 form to the NEN platform by January 17 2020 at 15.00 CET will not constitute a reason for exclusion of the proposal from assessment by the jury in the first round of the competition.

The Contracting Entity will in this case (according to point 4.3 of the Competition Terms) invite the participant who failed to deliver the form PF2 within the deadline to subsequently provide the required document. This can be done multiple times, the deadline may also be extended or set aside. In case of further failure to deliver the required document, the Contracting Entity excludes the participant from the competition.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms No. 2:

point 6.3) is registration in the NEN mandatory for foreign professionals? What is the deadline for registration in the NEN?

Answer No. 2:

As mentioned in Answer No. 1, prior registration is necessary in order to submit the PF2 form through the electronic tool of the Contracting Entity NEN. Every participant of the competition is required to do so, even international participants.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms No. 3:

point 7.2) Can the panels be folded, in order to simplify the delivery? Should they be mounted on a rigid support (eg paper board, forex or other)?

Answer No. 3:

The Competition terms do not specify if it is or isn't possible to submit the panels in a folded A1 format, this decision is up to you. Keep in mind though that the panels will be used in an exhibition of competition proposals after the end of the competition. It is therefore necessary that the technical construction of the panels allows a dignified presentation of the proposal even after repeated use (examination and evaluation, jury assessment meeting, move to exhibition space...).

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms No. 4:

point 7.3.2) What is the deadline for submitting the proposal in digital form? When the assessment meeting of the jury will be communicated?

Answer No. 4:

It is not possible to set the precise date of the Jury assessment meeting (after the second round of the competition) in advance. The contestants will be invited to send the digital versions of the competition proposals personally by the Secretary of the Jury.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms No. 5:

point 7.6) According to Italian law, it is not allowed to write and sender's address other than his own. Is it possible to insert the real sender's address if this appears only on the delivery / shipping note?

Answer No. 5:

It is important that the Secretary of the Jury not receive a competition proposal (even the packaging) that would allow the identification of the author of the proposal. A breach of the anonymity conditions will result in exclusion of the proposal from the Jury assessment.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms No. 6:

I was wondering if interior/exhibition design for the memorial is included in the scope of the present competition found online at https://nen.nipez.cz/Zadavaci_postup/N006-19-S00000006 or if there are plans to hold a separate procurement procedure for exhibition design once an architect is hired.

Answer No. 6:

The object of the competition is the concept of the whole memorial, which will include the design of the exhibition space, not the design of the exposition itself. The Competition assignment states: The exhibition space will be solved in detail in close cooperation with the authors of the exhibitions in the subsequent stages of the project.

The Museum of Romani Culture is currently implementing a grant project supported by IHRA, which aims to design an exhibition for the Lety Memorial. The Museum is now familiarizing itself with the newest procedures, expositions and technologies around the world and is prepared to work closely next year with the team of architects that will sign

a contract for all stages of the memorial project to develop the final form of the exhibition.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms No. 7:

We would like to know if the November 18 guided tour is mandatory to participate in the contest.

Answer No. 7:

Participation in the November 18 guided tour is merely optional for people interested in the competition, it is not mandatory for participation.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms No. 8:

A Question regarding the Competition terms, specifically point 4.1.e) – regarding authorised persons. Which authorisation is suitable for participation in the competition:

Is the authorisation A.0 – for general activity – sufficient?

Is the authorisation A.1 – for architecture – alone sufficient?

Is the authorisation A.3 – for landscape architecture – alone sufficient?

Is only a combination acceptable where a team consists of at least two people authorised in two areas, i.e. A.1 + A.3 (or A.0 + A.3)?

Answer No. 8:

According to Czech law a team with the following members meets the conditions of participation of the Competition Terms:

one member has the authorisation A.0 – for general activities

OR

the team has one member with the authorisation A.1 for architecture and simultaneously one member with the authorisation A.3 – landscape architecture.

A team also meets the conditions of participation mentioned in point 4.1 e) of the Competition Terms, if its member / members are authorised pursue these activities under the law of the State where they carry them out.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms No. 9:

We will like to do the competition, but It is not possible to mix a dead people Memorial with a dismissed pig farm. It is not respect. If you mix them, it could seem that pigs were eating human bodies, an option sometimes used by criminals to hide bodies.

Is it possible to totally demolish PIG farm?

Answer No. 9:

The Contracting Authority states in the competition assignment: The use of the premises and individual buildings of the former pig farm for the presentation of the Memorial themes is at your discretion. The ordering party considers keeping parts of the buildings, equipment, etc. of the pig farm (but not a large part) as a proof of one stage of the history of the story of Czech Roma and Sinti, the story of the place, as appropriate.

The Contracting Authority leaves the decision to use or not use existing structures of the pig farm at the discretion of the contestants. The Contracting Authority merely states that it deems keeping a part of the structures or their memento to document a period of the site's history appropriate.

A complete demolition of the pig farm is therefore possible.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms No. 10:

I don't understand what the following means:

October/November 2019 – registration of applicants in NEN

Does it mean:

“Registration of our atelier in the NEN register of suppliers”?

or

does it mean: “Registration of our atelier in the register of NEN suppliers and at the same time for Participation in the register of competitions for proposals in NEN”?

The NEN page for “Landscape and architectural competition Memorial to the Holocaust of the Roma and Sinti in Bohemia” doesn't show the “call for participation” option in the “Actions of the supplier” menu.

I am asking because we recently encountered a similarly unclear assignment, left out the first step in the NEN register and lost our chance to participate in the competition.

If I understand correctly in order to participate in the competition, we need to do the following actions:

- A. Registration of our atelier in the NEN register of suppliers – (we have already met this condition – we are listed in this register as a supplier)
- B. Submitting the competition design by January 17 2020 – the text part by post and part of the forms locked with our electronic signature submitted via NEN

Could you, please, confirm per email, that I have understood actions A. and B. correctly and there are no further deadlines to meet or actions to fulfil to participate in the competition?

E.g. We don't have to apply to you as the contracting authority?

Answer No. 10:

The Competition terms in par. 6.3 state: „To participate in the competition, it is necessary to register in advance as a supplier in the National Electronic Tool (NEN) <https://nen.nipez.cz/>.”

Furthermore, par. 6.6.2 states: „The Participant is obliged to protect the submitted offer electronically from unauthorized reading by encrypting its content. For the purposes of encryption, the Participant shall use the public key certificate, which is specified in the details of the relevant tender procedure of this competition in the National Electronic Instrument NEN in the section Tender Documentation.”

In regards to the National Electronic Tool NEN the following actions are necessary for participation the first round of the competition:

- A. Registration of the applicant as a supplier in the National Electronic Tool NEN. If the applicant is already a registered supplier in NEN, this condition has already been met.
- B. Submitting the proposal – specifically the document proving the fulfilment of the Competition Terms – the PF2 Form via the National Electronic Tool NEN until January 17 2020.

No further registration of the applicant is necessary.

As mentioned in the Competition Terms, par. 6.6.3, the submission of the competition proposal – the panels and the sealed envelope “contact details” is crucial in order to meet the deadline. That means, that if by January 17 2020 15:00 CET the applicant hasn't submitted the PF2 form or has submitted it with a coding error, it will not be a reason for expulsion of the design by the jury from the competition in the first round.

Subsequently (par 4.3 of the Competition terms) the Contracting Authority will invite the participant who has failed to submit the signed PF2 form to provide the required document. The Contracting Entity may make such a request repeatedly and may also extend or set aside the deadline. If the participant fails to deliver the required documents by this deadline, the Contracting Entity excludes the participant from the competition.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms No. 11:

I am an architect who holds a BArch degree, Licensed to practice in my country as an architect as well as a landscape designer. The same is my partner. Could you please confirm if we both together are eligible for the competition as a team?

Answer No. 11:

According to the Competition Terms, point 4.1 e) the terms and conditions of participation in the competition are met by natural persons or legal entities and/or their companies that: are authorized persons in the field of architecture and landscape architecture pursuant the Act on the Pursuit of the Profession, or by persons authorized to pursue such activities under the law of the State where they carry out such activities.

If you have a licence that authorises you to pursue activities in the field of architecture and landscape architecture / design in the State where you pursue these activities, you have met the necessary professional qualifications for participation in the competition.

It is necessary to call to attention point 3.5 that states that the author of the winning design in the second round has to prove his / her authorisation according to Czech law, or bring evidence of a joint venture with another person who complies with this condition before signing the contract for the subsequent stages of the project.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms No. 12:

How much is the prize money awarded to selected 7 teams for participating in the final stage?

Answer No. 12:

As per point 10 of the Competition Terms, a sum of 520 000 CZK will be distributed among the 7 participants chosen to move on to the second round of the competition in the following way:

- 1st award will be remunerated with CZK 150 000
- 2nd award will be remunerated with CZK 120 000
- 3rd award will be remunerated with CZK 90 000
- An amount of CZK 160,000 will be distributed among other participants who were not awarded in the 2nd round and who were not excluded from the competition, a maximum, however, of CZK 40 000 per one competition proposal.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms No. 13:

We are a Japanese Supplier based in Tokyo interested to register ourselves for the LETY Romani Culture Memorial Competition. However, after multiple attempts we haven't been successful in registration and we receive an error message saying NEN-349525: Result of Control @ 0. Also, we noticed that you only listed European security certificates in your Instruction Manual and whenever we do a Security Certificate Check Test it gives us a message saying wrong Security Publisher.

Does this mean that only European Suppliers are eligible to register? Kindly let us know since the deadline for registration is drawing close and we wish to participate.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms No. 14:

It is necessary the Registration of the applicant as a supplier in the National Electronic Tool NEN before the end of November, or we can do it any time before January 17. 2020?

Answer No. 13 and 14:

NO PRIOR REGISTRATION IS REQUIRED TO PARTICIPATE IN THE COMPETITION, ONE BECOMES A PARTICIPANT BY SUBMITTING A COMPETITION DESIGN.

A part of the design has to be submitted electronically, via the National Electronic Tool – NEN. This requires prior registration as a supplier in NEN. THE REGISTRATION DOES NOT HAVE A DEADLINE IN NOVEMBER 2019!!!

The information on the competition website and in the abstract of the Competition Terms stating that the registration in NEN is set for October/November 2019 was misleading. It did not mean registration for the competition, but registration as a supplier in NEN. Since this process is complicated, even more so for non-czech suppliers, the period November/October 2019 was set as a suggestion to ensure enough time to solve potential problems in the administrative process.

Solving specific problems and errors that occur during the process of registration as a supplier in NEN does not lie within the competency of the Contracting Authority and the Competition organiser.

WE STRONGLY ADVISE EVERYONE TO CONTACT THE CUSTOMER SUPPORT LINE OF NEN: +420 841 888 841, WHICH IS OPERATIONAL WEEKDAYS FROM 7.00 -18.00 AND WHERE YOU WILL FIND HELP WITH OBTAINING THE NECESSARY SECURITY CERTIFICATE, EVEN IF YOU ARE A NON-EUROPEAN SUPPLIER. THE CUSTOMER SERVICE LINE IS AVAILABLE IN CZECH AND ENGLISH.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms – competition subject / assignment details no. 15:

Is it possible to provide contour lines of the area (ortophoto_contour_lines.pdf) in dwg format or curves? Or better yet via point cloud?

The next question is regarding the same topic:

We would like to kindly ask you to provide the following Assignment details: Digital contour lines in register with a different background – detachable.

Answer No. 15:

The Assignment details include (in folder P.04) a drawing of the area of the pig farm including altitudes.

A geo-referenced drawing of contour lines in dwg and tif format has been uploaded to the cloud and to NEN.

The Contracting authority does not have any other documents available at the moment.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms – competition subject / assignment details No. 16:

Is there any dendrological research of the area available or a different document describing the current vegetation in the area?

Answer No. 16:

There has not been conducted any dendrological research of the area.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms – competition subject / assignment details No. 17:

The document MONUMENT_SITUATION.dwg is missing references (see layer "podklad"). Would it be possible to supply them?

Answer No. 17:

The document MONUMENT_SITUATION.dwg was taken from project documents for the assignment of „Monument Lety“ conducted 10 years ago.

The Contracting authority does not have any other document available at the moment.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms – competition subject / assignment details No. 18:

The Assignment details are missing data regarding the model and coverage of the camp (drawings of the camp and its excavations) as well as historic ortophotomaps showing the Camp's location, as mentioned in the guided tour of the area. Is it possible to supply them?

The next question is regarding the same topic:

We would like to ask you to supply the following documents:

- A digital document displaying the estimated positions of the Camp buildings, the Assignment details only contain a raster file.
- A digital drawing of the archaeological research – the locations of the probes. Documents displaying new information were promised to be supplied during the guided tour.

Answer No. 18:

A brief summary of the archaeological research conducted the site conducted in September – November 2019 can be downloaded on the Competition website and in NEN.

A drawing of the archaeological probes in dwg format has also been uploaded to the cloud and to NEN.

The Contracting Authority does not have any other documents available at the moment.

Historic Orthophotomaps showing the floor plan of the camp are available at https://lms.cuzk.cz/lms/lms_prehl_05.html.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms – competition subject No. 19:

A part of the Camp lies outside of the buildable area according to the zoning plan, does this mean that it's not possible to build any buildings in this area?

Answer No. 19:

There is no zoning plan for Lety u Písku. Only buildable areas are defined, in this case copying the area of the pig farm and the land connected to it – mainly the connecting roads. The area of the so-called Gypsy Camp lies partially outside of the area of the pig farm and therefore outside of the buildable area.

Placing the visitor centre on land which is in the property of the Museum of Romani Culture (e.g. The pig farm and the land connected to it) and at the same time is categorised as buildable area is a binding requirement of the Competition Assignment. This requirement does not apply to buildings with the purpose of remembrance of the former so-called Gypsy Camp.

According to the Building Act it is possible to build outside of buildable areas among other reasons if the planned buildings improve the area for the use of recreation or tourism.

The Contracting Authority assumes and the Building Act allows that the memorial design will include a place of remembrance of the victims of the so-called Gypsy Camp that will lie at least partially outside of the buildable area, outside of the land owned by the Museum of Romani Culture.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms – competition subject No. 20:

Are there any protected zones (wetlands, forest, roads, power lines etc.) that would condition the positioning of buildings?

Answer No. 20:

The limits of the area are explained in the Competition Assignment on page 78.

A more detailed coordination of the winning memorial design with the limits of the site will take place in later stages of planning in conversation with the affected authorities.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms – competition subject No. 21:

The budget doesn't include the demolition of the pig farm buildings and the subsequent landscaping, how will the removal of any environmental burdens be done (e.g. slurry lagoon and sinkholes)?

Answer No. 21:

The Competition Assignment states: Demolition of the pig farm, including the final alteration of the premises will be financed from other sources. Landscaping after the demolition will be implemented and financed during the demolition of the pig farm.

The Museum of Romani Culture has prepared a project of the full demolition of the pig farm including the final landscaping. This project includes all aspects of the demolition including the removal of the environmental burden.

The Contracting Authority expects the demolition work to start in 2020, after the end of the Competition. The demolition itself will be coordinated with the winning memorial project. A clean-up of the area in coordination with the design of the Memorial, rough landscaping and grassing of the area can be expected to be finished before the construction of the memorial. The demolition will therefore precede the first stage of construction of the memorial.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms – competition subject No. 22:

The Competition Assignment mentions a large and small visitor circuit, would it be possible to elaborate on this? Does the small circuit include interior exhibition spaces and the large circuit external ones?

Answer No. 22:

The Construction Programme in the Competition Assignment sets the requirement to design a road network connecting individual places of the Memorial and creating logical visitor circuits with a navigation and information system – a small visitor circuit around the Memorial site and a large visitor circuit connected to sites associated with the history of the camp. Further specification of the circuits is not set by the Competition Assignment and is left to the discretion of the participants.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms – competition subject No. 23:

Is the concept of the interior and exterior exhibition spaces left to the discretion of the competition participants? Is there a libretto?

Answer No. 23:

The concept of the exhibition is left to the discretion of the competition participants, but, as mentioned in the Competition Assignment, all work on the memorial design will be coordinated with the work on the exhibition, both projects will be influencing one another strongly.

The Libretto of the exposition has not been made yet, it will follow the theme of the memorial, which is a part of the Competition Assignment, and will be coordinated with the winning memorial design.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms – competition subject No. 24:

Is the nature trail expected to prevail? Are we to understand this as the exterior exhibition?

Answer No. 24:

The Competition Assignment states: The use of existing structural changes linked to the cultural Memorial Lety (parking lot with access road, amphitheatre, nature trail and others) is at your discretion.

The existing nature trail is thereby not meant as the exterior exhibition and its use is left to the discretion of the competition participants.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms – competition subject No. 25:

Is it necessary to keep the current forest road and entrance, amphitheatre and pavement? Does the new entrance to the site of the memorial have to be where the current entrance to the pig farm is?

Answer No. 25:

The current forest road leading to the cultural monument Lety (cemetery of the Camp's victims) will be preserved for the upkeep of the memorial. This road is simultaneously part of the forestry road network used by the municipality.

The Contracting Authority expects the main entrance to the memorial to be connected to road I/19, as mentioned in the construction programme. However this is not a binding requirement, which would lead to exclusion from the competition if breached.

It is important to mention that the road leading to the pig farm and the forest road leading to the cultural monument Lety are the only roads leading to the memorial that are property of the Museum of Romani Culture.

Any prospective use of the northern part of the area as an entrance point (the way the camp was historically designed) is strongly opposed by the residents of the municipality, who wish the area to the north of the camp to stay quiet, not interrupted by traffic (read more about the meeting with residents of surrounding villages at <https://www.newmemoriallety.com/preparation-of-competition/>)

Additional information No. 1

A guided tour of the site will take place on Monday 18 November 2019. Participants of the tour will meet at 1:00 p.m. at the car park by the cultural monument Lety, the estimated end is at 4:00 p.m.

Čeněk Růžička – representative of the bereaved, Dušan Slačka – historian of the Museum of Romani Culture, Pavel Vařeka – head of archaeological research of the area and Štěpán Štarha – investment technician of the Museum of Romani Culture will be explaining the individual topics of the competition assignment.

Before the tour we recommend having lunch at the restaurant in Lety and afterwards taking a stroll down the nature trail leading directly from the restaurant to the cultural monument itself – the cemetery for the victims of the co-called Gypsy camp.

Please register for the tour by sending an e-mail to the Secretary of the jury at the following address: koupalova@onplanlab.com.

4. Report from the examination of the designs in the first round

1. Reception of proposals for the first round

A total of 41 proposals in paper form were delivered to the seat of the jury secretary by the deadline for submission of proposals in the first round. The proposals were marked with a serial number and the date and time of receipt.

After the deadline expired for submission of proposals in the first round, one proposal was submitted only electronically, not in paper form.

2. Examination of proposals for the first round

The examination of the proposals for the first round took place at three times.

On 17 January 2020, all 41 proposals submitted in paper form were unpacked by the jury secretary, and the panels and the design and envelope "contact details" were renumbered with randomly generated numbers. Envelopes with the contact details of the competitors were not unpacked and were stored in a sealed box with a trusted person of the contracting authority.

On 24 January 2020, all 42 submitted proposals were examined in terms of the binding requirements for the manner and form of submission and the requirements for addressing the competition subject set out in the terms of competition.

On 27 January 2020, a report on the examination of the proposals was prepared.

The proposals were examined by design examiner Petr Návrat and competition secretary Karolína Koupalová.

3. Results of the examination of proposals in the first round

Details of the examination of each proposal are listed in separate examination records that are part of the tender documentation and are available for inspection from the contracting authority.

Summary of the results of the examination of the individual proposals

design No.	result of the design examination
1	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
2	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
3	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
4	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
5	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms. The method of submitting the proposal involved a partial formal deficiency: the submitted A1-format drawings were not on panels made of solid material as required in paragraph 7.3.1 of the Terms of Competition.
6	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
7	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms. The method of submitting the proposal involved a partial formal deficiency: in paper form, along with the panels submitted, an estimate of the construction cost was submitted on a sheet of A4 paper, information that was not also shown on the panels themselves, which is in conflict with the requirement that textual components be submitted as part of the panels, as referred to in paragraph 7.3.1 of the Terms of Competition.
8	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
9	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
10	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
11	The form and the method of submitting the proposal meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals set out in the Competition Terms. The proposal does not meet the binding requirements for addressing the competition subject set out in paragraph 2.4 of the Competition Terms. The

	submitted drawing does not show or deal with broader relations outside the pig farm and the so-called Gypsy camp. Therefore, the proposal does not, in breach of paragraph 2.4 of the competition conditions, address the location of the cemetery of the camp victims. Further more, it does not address the connection of individual parts of the memorial, transport access of the memorial and setting of the memorial in the surrounding landscape.
12	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
13	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
14	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
15	<p>The form and the method of submitting the proposal meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals set out in the Competition Terms.</p> <p>The proposal does not meet the binding requirements for addressing the competition subject set out in paragraph 2.4 of the Competition Terms. The authors of the design probably did not understand the location of individual parts of the memorial in the territory. Although the proposal does address the remembrance of the so-called Gypsy camp and adjacent cemetery for the camp's victims, they are addressed in the wrong context geographically. The proposal places a visitor centre on the victim's burial site, which is classified as a cultural monument, and therefore does not abide by the legal limits as stated in paragraph 2.4 of the competition conditions. The visitor centre is situated on land owned by the Museum of Romani Culture, but in an area unsuitable for construction, which conflicts with paragraph 2.4 of the competition conditions.</p>
16	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
17	<p>The form and the method of submitting the proposal meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals set out in the Competition Terms.</p> <p>The proposal does not meet the binding requirements for addressing the competition subject set out in paragraph 2.4 of the Competition Terms. In this design, the facilities for those servicing the memorial and for visitors are in more than one building. Some visitor facilities along with the exhibition are, therefore, located beyond the grounds of the former pig farm, which contravenes paragraph 2.4 of the Terms of Competition, specifically this requirement: "The design of the building of the visitor centre must be situated on land owned by the Museum of Romani Culture (i.e. the pig farm and adjacent land) and allows development." The extent of the Museum of Romani Culture's property was clearly marked in the property relations scheme on page 78 of the assignment of the competition.</p>

18	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
19	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
20	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
21	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
22	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
23	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
24	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms. The method of submitting the proposal involved a partial formal deficiency: the submitted A1-format drawings were not on panels made of solid material as required in paragraph 7.3.1 of the Terms of Competition.
25	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
26	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
27	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms. The method of submitting the proposal involved a partial formal deficiency: the two submitted drawings were in a format larger than A1, which contravenes paragraph 7.3.1 of the Terms of Competition.
28	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
29	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
30	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.

31	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
32	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
33	<p>The proposal does not meet the binding requirements for addressing the competition subject set out in paragraph 2.4 of the Competition Terms. V návrhu nejsou zobrazeny širší souvislosti, z kterých by bylo možné zodpovědně posoudit přesné umístění návštěvnického centra. V návrhu je zobrazen hřbitov obětí tábora a nově navržené návštěvnické centrum, avšak s největší pravděpodobností zcela mimo reálnou situaci. V návrhu není zobrazen a řešen prostor bývalého tzv. cikánského tábora. V návrhu tedy není, v rozporu s odstavcem 2.4 soutěžních podmínek, řešeno místo tzv. cikánského tábora, propojení jednotlivých částí památníku a zasazení památníku do okolní krajiny.</p> <p>The method of submitting the proposal involved partial formal deficiencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the submitted A1-format drawings were not on panels made of solid material as required in paragraph 7.3.1 of the Terms of Competition, - in paper form, along with the panels submitted, an estimate of the construction cost was submitted on a sheet of A4 paper, information that was not also shown on the panels themselves, which is in conflict with the requirement that textual components be submitted as part of the panels, as referred to in paragraph 7.3.1 of the Terms of Competition.
34	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
35	<p>The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.</p> <p>The method of submitting the proposal involved partial formal deficiencies: In paper form, along with the panels submitted, an estimate of the construction cost was submitted on a sheet of A4 paper, information that was not also shown on the panels themselves, which is in conflict with the requirement that textual components be submitted as part of the panels, as referred to in paragraph 7.3.1 of the Terms of Competition.</p>
36	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
37	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
38	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.

39	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
40	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms.
41	The proposal, the method and form of its submission meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms. Note: The transportation connection in the proposal is designed as extending from the existing road to the cultural monument. Parking is designed to follow in the footsteps of the existing parking lot at the cultural monument. If this proposal progresses to the second round, we recommend requesting a more detailed elaboration of the transportation connection so that the requirements of the construction program can be met during the subsequent stages of the project development.
42	The method and form of submitting the proposal do not meet the binding requirements for the submission of competition proposals set out in the Competition Terms.

1.2 Conclusion from the examination of the proposals

A. Designs that fulfil the mandatory requirements

Designs nos. **1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41** fulfil the mandatory requirements for submission to the competition as established by paragraph 7 of the Terms of Competition, and for addressing the competition subject as established by paragraph 2.4 of the Terms of Competition.

B. Designs that feature partial formal deficiencies with respect to the manner of submission according to paragraph 7 of the Terms of Competition

Proposals nos. **5, 7, 24, and 35** meet the binding requirements for the submission of proposals and for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms. The method of submitting the proposals involved a partial formal deficiency.

Designs nos. **5** and **24** – the submitted A1-format drawings were not on panels made of solid material as required in paragraph 7.3.1 of the Terms of Competition.

Design no. **27** – the two submitted drawings were in a format larger than A1, which contravenes paragraph 7.3.1 of the Terms of Competition.

Designs nos. **7** and **35** – In paper form, along with the panels submitted, an estimate of the construction cost was submitted on a sheet of A4 paper, information that was not also shown on the panels themselves, which is in conflict with the requirement that textual components be submitted as part of the panels, as referred to in paragraph 7.3.1 of the Terms of Competition.

C. Designs that do not fulfil the mandatory requirements for addressing the subject matter of the competition according to point 2.4 of the Terms of Competition

Proposals nos. 11, 15, 17 and 33 do not meet some of the binding requirements for addressing the subject of the competition.

Design no. **11** – The submitted drawing does not show or deal with broader relations outside the pig farm and the so-called Gypsy camp. Therefore, the proposal does not, in breach of paragraph 2.4 of the competition conditions, address the location of the cemetery of the camp victims. Furthermore, it does not address the connection of individual parts of the memorial, transport access of the memorial and setting of the memorial in the surrounding landscape.

Design no. **15** – The authors of the design probably did not understand the location of individual parts of the memorial in the territory. Although the proposal does address the remembrance of the so-called Gypsy camp and adjacent cemetery for the camp's victims, they are addressed in the wrong context geographically. The proposal places a visitor centre on the victim's burial site, which is classified as a cultural monument, and therefore does not abide by the legal limits as stated in paragraph 2.4 of the competition conditions. The visitor centre is situated on land owned by the Museum of Romani Culture, but in an area unsuitable for construction, which conflicts with paragraph 2.4 of the competition conditions.

Design no. **17** – In this design, the facilities for those servicing the memorial and for visitors are in more than one building. Some visitor facilities along with the exhibition are, therefore, located beyond the grounds of the former pig farm, which contravenes paragraph 2.4 of the Terms of Competition, specifically this requirement: "The design of the building of the visitor centre must be situated on land owned by the Museum of Romani Culture (i.e. the pig farm and adjacent land) and allows development." The extent of the Museum of Romani Culture's property was clearly marked in the property relations scheme on page 78 of the assignment of the competition.

Design no. **33** – The proposal does not show a wider context from which to accurately assess the exact location of the visitor centre. The design shows the cemetery of the camp victims and the newly designed visitor centre, but most likely far from the actual location. The design does not depict or deal with the former Gypsy camp. Therefore, the proposal does not, in breach of paragraph 2.4 of the competition conditions, address the location of the so-called Gypsy camp, the interconnection of individual parts of the memorial, and the setting of the memorial in the surrounding landscape.

D. Design that fails to fulfil the mandatory requirements for submission.

Design no. **42** – The design was not submitted in paper form, instead submitted via the NEN electronic tool as well as by e-mail to the competition secretary. The proposal was submitted as an objection on 17 January 2020 at 15:42 via NEN, then delivered by email to the secretary of the jury on 17 January 2020 at 16:32. This method of submission identified the author of the proposal and thus violated the conditions of anonymity of the competition proposal according to paragraph 7.6 of the Competition Terms. By submitting the proposal in electronic form only, there was a violation of paragraph 6.6.1 of the Terms and Conditions, when the paper form required the delivery of the competition proposal on panels as well as the envelope labelled

"Contact Information". At the same time, the proposal was submitted after the deadline for submission of proposals in the 1st round set out in paragraph 6.6.3.

4. Checking parts of the design submitted electronically through the National Electronic Tool (NEN)

As of 17 January 2020, 3 PM, 32 submitted documents were registered in the NEN system. The documents were not opened, so the correctness of the PF2 forms was not checked.

After the jury meeting, the person authorized by the Contracting Authority (not the secretary and not the examiner, but an external collaborator of ONplan) will open the "contact details" envelopes of the proposals selected by the jury for the second round and will check the NEN system as follows:

- Check the presence of the PF2 document for those selected proposals.
- In case of non-submission, incorrect completion, or incorrect encryption of the PF2 document, the authorized person will proceed according to the Competition Terms, chapter 4.3, and will invite the participant to deliver the correct version of the PF2 document.

In Prague, January 27 2020

Examiner of Proposals
Ing. Petr Návrat MSc.

5. Minutes of the jury deliberations assessing the designs in the first round

The deliberations of the jury took place in the Auditorium of the National Gallery at Veletržní palác (the Trade Fair Palace) in Prague.

Jury deliberations day one, 6 February 2020

1/ Beginning of Day 1 of the jury deliberations

The jury deliberations were begun at 10:10.

Present:

Regular members of the jury dependent	Jana Horváthová, Čeněk Růžička, Martin Martínek
Regular members of the jury independent	Josef Pleskot, Vladimír Sitta, Emílie Rigová, Rostislav Koryčánek
Alternates of the jury dependent	Anna Míšková, Rudolf Murka
Alternates of the jury independent	Regina Loukotová, Igor Marko
Invited experts	Jan Hauer, Helena Sadílková
Organizers of the competition	Petr Návrat, Karolína Koupalová

Aim and programme of the jury deliberations:

Josef Pleskot, chair of the jury, welcomed those present and explained the aim and the program of the deliberations.

Solemn declarations of the jurors

The jury members present, the secretary, and the examiner of the designs submitted to the competition for consideration all signed solemn declarations to the effect that they themselves had not participated, either directly or indirectly, in the work on the designs submitted to the competition for consideration; that they do not know the names of those who authored the designs; and that they have no conflict of interest according to Section 148 paragraph 1 of the Public Procurement Act (*Zákon o zadávání veřejných zakázek*).

Study of the designs by expert jurors

Jury secretary Karolína Koupalová informed the jury that on Wednesday, 5 February 2020 the designs were made available to the expert jurors for their study. On that day, the expert jurors present signed solemn declarations to the effect that they themselves had not participated, either directly or indirectly, in the work on the designs submitted to the competition for consideration; that they do not know the names of those who authored the designs; and that they have no conflict of interest according to Section 148 paragraph 1 of the Public Procurement Act (*Zákon o zadávání veřejných zakázek*).

Among the experts who studied the designs on 5 February 2020 were representatives of the relatives of Lety prisoners, Mr. Jan Hauer and Mr. Antonín Lagryn; a representative of the Embassy of Norway, Terje B. Englund; the head of the

archaeological survey at Lety, Pavel Vařeka; Romani Studies scholar Helena Sadílková; head of the Memorials Department at the Museum of Romani Culture Petr Oulehla; and an investment technician at the Museum of Romani Culture, Pavel Odstrčil.

Antonín Lagryn, Terje B. Englund, Pavel Vařeka, Petr Oulehla and Pavel Odstrčil provided their recommendations and statements about the designs in writing to the jury. Jan Hauer and Helena Sadílková were present on Day 1 of the deliberations of the jury and communicated their recommendations to the jury during its discussion of each design. The jury took the experts' recommendations into account and will work with them when assessing the designs.

2/ Consideration of the report from the examination of the designs

At 10:30 the jury began considering the report from the examination of the designs.

Karolína Koupalová presented the basic outcomes of the examination of the designs.

Designs that fulfil the mandatory requirements for submission to the competition and for addressing the competition subject

Designs nos. **1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41** fulfil the mandatory requirements for submission to the competition as established by paragraph 7 of the Terms of Competition, and for addressing the competition subject as established by paragraph 2.4 of the Terms of Competition.

Designs that feature partial formal deficiencies with respect to the manner of submission according to paragraph 7 of the Terms of Competition

Designs nos. **5** and **24** – the submitted A1-format drawings were not on panels made of solid material as required in paragraph 7.3.1 of the Terms of Competition.

Design no. **27** – the two submitted drawings were in a format larger than A1, which contravenes paragraph 7.3.1 of the Terms of Competition.

The examiner recommends the jury vote on whether to retain designs 5, 24 and 27 for assessment. Their deficiencies are formal and partial, they do not diminish the intelligibility of the design, they do not endanger the authors' anonymity, and they do not create an advantage for the designs.

The jury votes on retaining designs 5, 24 and 27 for assessment.

Voting: For: 7 Against: 0 Abstained: 0

The jury agrees to retain designs 5, 24 and 27 for assessment.

Designs nos. **7** and **35** – In paper form, along with the panels submitted, an estimate of the construction cost was submitted on a sheet of A4 paper, information that was not also shown on the panels themselves, which is in conflict with the requirement that textual components be submitted as part of the panels, as referred to in paragraph 7.3.1 of the Terms of Competition.

The examiner recommends the jury not look at the texts submitted in addition to the panels when assessing these designs so as not to give these submissions an advantage, and recommends that the jury vote on whether to retain these designs in the competition because this deficiency is formal and partial, does not diminish the intelligibility of the design, and does not endanger the authors' anonymity. The designs are assessable even without the information that has been presented

separately from the panels, which fulfil the mandatory conditions for the competition's subject matter.

The jury votes to retain designs nos. 7 and 35 for assessment and to not look at the texts presented separately from the panels submitted to the competition when assessing the panels.

Voting: For: 7 Against: 0 Abstained: 0

The jury agrees to retain designs 7 and 35 and to assess them and will not look at the texts presented separately from the panels submitted to the competition.

Designs that do not fulfil the mandatory requirements for addressing the subject matter of the competition according to point 2.4 of the Terms of Competition

Design no. **11** – The submitted drawing does not show or deal with broader relations outside the pig farm and the so-called Gypsy camp. Therefore, the proposal does not, in breach of paragraph 2.4 of the competition conditions, address the location of the cemetery of the camp victims. Further more, it does not address the connection of individual parts of the memorial, transport access of the memorial and setting of the memorial in the surrounding landscape.

The examiner recommends the jury exclude this design from assessment.

The jury votes on retaining design 11 for assessment.

Voting: For: 0 Against: 7 Abstained: 0

The jury disagrees with retaining design 11 for assessment and design no. 11 is, therefore, excluded from further assessment and its disqualification from competition will be proposed by the contracting authority.

Design no. **15** – The authors of the design probably did not understand the location of individual parts of the memorial in the territory. Although the proposal does address the remembrance of the so-called Gypsy camp and adjacent cemetery for the camp's victims, they are addressed in the wrong context geographically. The proposal places a visitor centre on the victim's burial site, which is classified as a cultural monument, and therefore does not abide by the legal limits as stated in paragraph 2.4 of the competition conditions. The visitor centre is situated on land owned by the Museum of Romani Culture, but in an area unsuitable for construction, which conflicts with paragraph 2.4 of the competition conditions.

The examiner recommends the jury exclude design no. 15 from assessment.

The jury votes to on whether to retain design 15 for assessment.

Voting: For: 0 Against: 7 Abstained: 0

The jury disagrees with retaining design 15 for assessment, and the design is, therefore, excluded from further assessment and the jury recommends the contracting authority disqualify it from competition.

Design no. **17** – In this design, the facilities for those servicing the memorial and for visitors are in more than one building. Some visitor facilities along with the exhibition are, therefore, located beyond the grounds of the former pig farm, which contravenes paragraph 2.4 of the Terms of Competition, specifically this requirement: "The design of the building of the visitor centre must be situated on land owned by the Museum of Romani Culture (i.e. the pig farm and adjacent land) and allows development." The

extent of the Museum of Romani Culture's property was clearly marked in the property relations scheme on page 78 of the assignment of the competition.

The examiner recommends the jury exclude design no. 17 from assessment.

The jury votes on whether to retain design 17 from assessment.

Voting: For: 0 Against: 7 Abstained: 0

The jury disagrees with retaining design 17 for assessment and the design is therefore excluded from further assessment and will be recommended for disqualification from the competition.

Design no. **33** – The proposal does not show a wider context from which to accurately assess the exact location of the visitor centre. The design shows the cemetery of the camp victims and the newly designed visitor centre, but most likely far from the actual location. The design does not depict or deal with the former Gypsy camp. Therefore, the proposal does not, in breach of paragraph 2.4 of the competition conditions, address the location of the so-called Gypsy camp, the interconnection of individual parts of the memorial, and the setting of the memorial in the surrounding landscape.

The examiner recommends the jury exclude design no. 33 from assessment.

The jury votes on whether to retain design 33 for assessment.

Voting: For: 0 Against: 7 Abstained: 0

The jury disagrees with retaining design 33 for assessment and the design is therefore excluded from further assessment and will be proposed for disqualification from competition.

Design that fails to fulfil the mandatory requirements for submission.

Design no. **42** – The design was not submitted in paper form, instead submitted via the NEN electronic tool as well as by e-mail to the competition secretary. The proposal was submitted as an objection on 17 January 2020 at 15:42 via NEN, then delivered by email to the secretary of the jury on 17 January 2020 at 16:32. This method of submission identified the author of the proposal and thus violated the conditions of anonymity of the competition proposal according to paragraph 7.6 of the Competition Terms. By submitting the proposal in electronic form only, there was a violation of paragraph 6.6.1 of the Terms and Conditions, when the paper form required the delivery of the competition proposal on panels as well as the envelope labelled "Contact Information". At the same time, the proposal was submitted after the deadline for submission of proposals in the 1st round set out in paragraph 6.6.3.

The examiner recommends the jury exclude design no. 42 from assessment.

The jury votes on whether to retain design 42 for assessment.

Voting: For: 0 Against: 7 Abstained: 0

The jury disagrees with retaining design 42 for assessment and the design is therefore excluded from further assessment and will be recommended for disqualification from competition.

All the votes that were part of this section of the deliberations were attended by all regular members of the jury.

Summary of the consideration of the report on the examination of the designs

Designs nos. **11, 15, 17, 33** and **42** are excluded from further assessment.

The jury will further assess designs nos. **1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41.**

3/ Individual study of the designs

At 11:15 the jurors individually studied each design.

At 12:00 expert juror Mr Jan Hauer left the deliberations.

4/ Discussion

At 12:30 the jury discussed the designs. After that discussion, the following principles were agreed to:

- A landscape design with architectural interventions to scale makes a statement that is emotionally more forceful and more intensely expresses respect for the location and for its history;
- Despite previous assumptions to the contrary, preserving bigger parts of the pig farm does not appear to be essentially beneficial to communicating the subject matter of the memorial.

5/ Pause in jury deliberations

From 13:15 until 14:30 the chair of the jury suspended its deliberations. All of those present went to lunch outside of the meeting room.

6/ Discussion of the designs assessed

At 14:30 the jurors began discussing each design. The discussion involved all regular jury members and their alternates as well as expert juror Ms. Helena Sadílková. Karolína Koupalová read the commentaries submitted in writing by the expert jurors for each design.

At the close of the discussion of the designs, all jury members present preliminarily expressed their opinion as to whether each design should be recommended for the second round.

No jurors expressed an opinion of designs nos. 1, 3, 4, 9, 12, 13, 14, 18, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41.

Preliminary recommendations for advancing to the second round were made by at least one juror for designs nos. 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 16, 19, 20, 21, 27, 28, 32, 35, 36.

At 16:00 expert juror Ms Helena Sadílková left the deliberations.

7/ Discussion of the designs that the jury chooses for advancing to the second round of competition

At 17:30 discussion was begun about the designs from among which the jury had agreed that seven would be chosen, according to the assessment criteria, to be invited to the second round of competition.

At the close of the discussion, the jury members, both regular members and their alternates, preliminarily selected seven designs which, in their view, should advance to the second round of competition. Below is listed the number of jury members who

preliminarily expressed themselves in favour of a design advancing to the second round of competition.

Design no. 2 8 jurors in favour of advancing to the second round

Design no. 5 1 juror in favour of advancing to the second round

Design no. 6 12 jurors in favour of advancing to the second round

Design no. 7 4 jurors in favour of advancing to the second round

Design no. 8 8 jurors in favour of advancing to the second round

Design no. 10 1 juror in favour of advancing to the second round

Design no. 16 1 juror in favour of advancing to the second round

Design no. 19 3 jurors in favour of advancing to the second round

Design no. 20 2 jurors in favour of advancing to the second round

Design no. 21 8 jurors in favour of advancing to the second round

Design no. 27 7 jurors in favour of advancing to the second round

Design no. 28 1 juror in favour of advancing to the second round

Design no. 32 8 jurors in favour of advancing to the second round

Design no. 35 6 jurors in favour of advancing to the second round

Design no. 36 6 jurors in favour of advancing to the second round

Most jurors preliminarily expressed themselves in favour of the advancement to the second round of designs nos. **2, 6, 8, 21, 27, 32, 35** and **36**.

8/ Agreement on the further procedure for choosing seven designs to advance to the second round

At the close of Day 1 of the jury deliberations, the following proposal for the further procedure was discussed:

- At the beginning of Day 2 of the jury deliberations all previously assessed designs would be evaluated verbally according to the criteria for assessing designs in the first round of competition;
- All designs would be simultaneously rated by number according to the degree to which they fulfil the criteria for assessing designs in the first round. Each criterion will be assessed with a number between 0 and 10 according to the degree of its fulfilment. The greatest degree of fulfilment of a criterion will be assessed at 10 points, while an unfulfilled criterion will be assessed at 0 points.

Day 1 of the jury deliberations was closed at 18:50.

Jury deliberations day 2, 7 February 2020

1/ Beginning of Day 2 of the jury deliberations

Jury deliberations began at 9:00

Present:

Regular members of the jury dependent	Jana Horváthová, Čeněk Růžička, Martin Martínek
Regular members of the jury independent	Josef Pleskoť, Vladimír Sitta, Emílie Rigová, Rostislav Koryčánek
Alternates of the jury dependent	Anna Míšková, Rudolf Murka
Alternates of the jury independent	Regina Loukotová, Igor Marko
Organizers of the competition	Petr Návrat, Karolína Koupalová

2/Rating of all designs assessed, by points and verbally

The jury began its evaluation of the designs at 9:15.

The jurors rated each design according to the criteria for the first round of competition, both by assigning points and by verbally discussing the designs. By means of this approach they arrived at a choice of seven designs to recommend the contracting authority invite to participate in the second round.

The verbal evaluations of the designs will be used as a component of the justification for the contracting authority's decision to exclude from competition those designs not chosen for the second round.

This is the record of the points ratings for the designs per the criteria for the first round of competition on which the jurors have agreed:

design number	criteria for the first round of competition				total of points
	architectural and artistic quality of the design	degree to which it conveys and renders the memorial's subject matter	degree of respect for the culture of Bohemian Roma and Sinti	quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape	
1	0	0	2	0	2
2	9	6	9	9	33
3	3	4	4	5	16
4	3	4	4	6	17
5	5	4	4	5	18
6	9	9	9	9	36
7	5	5	7	6	23
8	9	8	3	9	29
9	4	4	3	4	15
10	6	6	4	6	22
12	4	6	5	5	20
13	3	3	3	5	14
14	6	6	6	4	22
16	6	6	5	5	22
18	4	6	6	4	20
19	6	5	4	6	21
20	6	6	6	6	24
21	8	8	8	8	32
22	4	5	5	5	19
23	1	2	2	0	5
24	3	4	3	3	13
25	4	3	3	2	12
26	2	2	0	0	4
27	7	8	8	8	31
28	5	4	5	6	20
29	3	3	3	3	12
30	2	3	4	3	12
31	2	6	5	5	18
32	8	8	8	7	31
34	2	3	2	3	10
35	7	8	8	8	31
36	8	7	6	7	28
37	2	2	2	1	7
38	3	2	3	4	12
39	4	3	4	4	15
40	3	2	2	3	10
41	2	2	3	3	10

The jury further proceeded to vote on the above-listed points rating for each design according to the criteria for the first round of competition.

The jury votes on the points rating for designs nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 according to the criteria for the first round of competition.

Voting: For: 7 Against: 0 Abstained: 0

The jury unanimously agreed to the above-listed points ratings for designs nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41.

The highest points rating per the criteria for rating designs in the first round of competition were scored by designs nos. 2, 6, 8, 21, 27, 32 and 35.

3/ Choice of designs advancing to the second round

The choice of designs recommended to advance to the second round was decided by the jury at 14:00.

Based on the results of the points rating of each design according to the criteria for the first round of competition, the jury then voted on the choice of seven designs to recommend for advancement to the second round.

The jury votes on whether to recommend designs nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 for advancement to the second round of the competition.

Voting: For: 0 Against: 6 Abstained: 1

Designs nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 are not recommended for advancement to the second round of competition.

Designs nos. 2, 6, 8, 21, 27, 32, 35 won the highest points ratings according to the criteria for the first round of competition. The jury then voted on whether to recommend those designs to proceed to the second round of competition.

The jury votes on recommending design no. 2 to proceed to the second round of competition.

Voting: For: 7 Against: 0 Abstained: 0

The jury votes on recommending design no. 6 to proceed to the second round of competition.

Voting: For: 7 Against: 0 Abstained: 0

The jury votes on recommending design no. 8 to proceed to the second round of competition.

Voting: For: 5 Against: 2 Abstained: 0

The jury votes on recommending design no. 21 to proceed to the second round of competition.

Voting: For: 7 Against: 0 Abstained: 0

The jury votes on recommending design no. 27 to proceed to the second round of competition.

Voting: For: 7 Against: 0 Abstained: 0

The jury votes on recommending design no. 32 to proceed to the second round of competition.

Voting: For: 7 Against: 0 Abstained: 0

The jury votes on recommending design no. 35 to proceed to the second round of competition.

Voting: For: 7 Against: 0 Abstained: 0

The jury recommends the contracting authority call on designs nos. 2, 6, 8, 21, 27, 32 and 35 to advance to the second round.

This part of the deliberations included all regular members of the jury and their alternates. All regular members of the jury participated in all the voting.

4/ Elaboration of the evaluation and recommendations for completing the designs chosen for the second round of competition

At 15:00 the jury began elaborating its recommendations for the completion of the designs that have been recommended for proceeding to the second round of competition.

Those verbal assessments of the designs now advancing to the second round and recommendations for their completion will be part of the call to submit designs to the second round.

5/ Defining the questions that competitors will answer during the second round of competition

At the close of the elaboration of the recommendations for completing each design, the jury defined a set of questions to be answered by competitors during the second round of the competition. These questions are a refinement of the Terms of Competition per paragraph 6.10:

- In your designs, you have an opportunity to submit a proposal for gradual implementation such that the first phase of the building of the memorial falls within the budgetary requirements. The design of the memorial is corresponds to the surrounding landscapes that will result from it, with proposing a new landscape. For these reasons, the design will change significantly over time. What will this territory look like after the realization of Phase 1 – after the memorial is open? What will this design look like 10 or 20 years from now?
- The memorial project will be coordinated with an exhibition project. What is your idea of collaboration with the team that will create the exhibition at the memorial? To what degree will it be possible, in your view, to change your design based on that collaboration?
- Where, precisely, in which parts, of your submitted design for the land, will each topic of the memorial (per the competition Assignment Details) be contained ?
- During the work on the project of this territory (during the phase of the project preparation and realization) intensive communication and close collaboration with representatives of the camp survivors will be required by the contracting authority. How do you imagine collaborating with the camp survivors? Where do you see the

most room to cooperate with them? Which specific elements and architectural details would you already prefer to consult about now with the camp survivors?

- What is your idea, given the design you have submitted, of how the annual commemorative ceremonies on this territory might unfold on this territory?

6/ Refinement of the requirements to submit designs to the second round of competition

The jury then approached refining the requirements for submitting designs per paragraph 6.10 of the Terms of Competition.

The requirements for elaboration, formatting, and designs prerequisites, along with the method of submission are stated in chapter 8 of the Competition Terms. Furthermore, the jury will state its refined requirements and recommendations for the content of the competing designs in the second round.

Refinement of the requirements for the content of the Graphic Component of the design – the "Panels" as established by point 8.3 of the Terms of Competition

The graphic component of the plan will be submitted IN PRINTED FORMAT on three to four A1 panels in portrait view made of lightweight material for exhibition purposes. The graphic layout of the panels is up to the competitors to decide.

The graphic component of a competing design in the second round will include the following content:

- a) The setting of the complex on a scale of 1:1000 demonstrating the layout of the planned spatial and functional relationships among each component of the facilities, including their operational relationships, the target state of the landscape, a design for smooth vehicle access and the principles according to which the grounds will be connected to the engineering network, including depictions of the contour lines of the existing grounds of the former pig farm and the ground plan of the so-called *former Zigeunerlager*;
- b) Cross-sections, floor plans, perspectives from different vantage points or other forms of depicting the individual parts of the memorial to demonstrate, in a comprehensible way, their overall architectural and artistic design and setting in the landscape;
- c) Visualizations characterizing the proposed solution, the overall impression the memorial will make in the territory;
- d) Visualizations demonstrating what the interiors of the visitor centre will look like and provide a framework of designer's conception of character of memorial exhibition;
- e) A schematic of the broader relationships of the design demonstrating the functional and spatial relationships between the memorial as a whole and the wider neighbourhood, the communications and road networks, the surrounding landscape, the connection to locations associated with the camp history;
- f) A schematic demonstrating the designer's idea of the phases of the construction of the design with maximum respect for the investor's economic opportunities;
- g) Other depictions and schemes are also admissible if they demonstrate various aspects of the submitted design.

By visualizations, we do not necessarily mean just 3D graphic visuals, but also other graphic renderings that will make the design proposed comprehensible to the jury and the lay public during their subsequent presentation.

It is also acceptable to augment each depiction with explanatory texts, but the condition does apply that the texts in the second round must be submitted in both Czech and English.

Refinement of the requirements for the content of the Textual Component of the design established in point 8.7 of the Terms of Competition

The textual component will be submitted ELECTRONICALLY BY WAY OF THE NATIONAL ELECTRONIC INSTRUMENT (NEN) as a .pdf file called "Textual Component" of a maximum length of 10 A4 pages (this applies to each version in the Czech and English languages)

The textual component will have the following content:

- a) A brief abstract of the proposal of no more than 500 characters including spaces.
- b) A detailed description of the design and its individual aspects and parts, the basic principles of how it approaches the construction and material aspects, of no more than 5 000 characters including spaces.
- c) A description demonstrating the principles of sustainability for the complex, including maintenance of the facility and care for the surrounding landscape, water management, waste removal, etc., with a view to minimizing all operational costs and environment impacts, of no more than 2 000 characters including spaces.
- c) A professional appraisal of the costs of investment according to the model that is part of the call for participating in the second round of competition.
- e) Answers to the questions specified by the jury in its call to participate in the second round of the competition.
- f) It is acceptable to augment the text portion with schematics, sketches, etc.

7/ Final recommendations by the jury to the contracting authority

The jury votes on these recommendations to the contracting authority:

The jury recommends the contracting authority call on the authors of designs nos. 6, 2, 8, 21, 32, 27 and 35 to submit a design to the second round of the competition under the conditions stated in the Terms of Competition.

Because they did not score enough points according to the criteria for the first round of competition, the jury recommends the contracting authority exclude the following designs from the competition: 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41.

The jury recommends the contracting authority exclude from competition designs nos. 11, 15, 17, 33 and 42 because they failed to fulfil the Terms of Competition.

Voting: For: 7 Against: 0 Abstained: 0

The jury agrees with the recommendations to the contracting authority of the competition as outlined above.

Jury deliberations were closed at 17:15.

Recorded by Karolína Koupalová
Competition Secretary

6. Assessment of proposals designated for the second round

Design No. 2

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

<p>Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:</p> <p>The jury highly appreciated the conceptual contribution and expressive expression of the design, which processed the topic of the assignment very powerfully. The crater as a deep scar in the landscape is a powerful and potentially significant symbol, a gesture. However, it should be stressed that the system must be able to function without undue explanation and the key message must be legible to visitors with different life experiences. There is a risk that the intention could be viewed as a neglect of space care. The concave form of the crater suggests a possible ritual and cyclical nature of events and offers consideration of the possible or even ritual use of this space. The jury expressed doubts about the technical aspect of the design and subsequent maintenance of the 'crater' element.</p> <p>Information about the proposed visitor centre building is rather superficial. Entry from the road with a standard parking facility is somewhat disappointing and weakens the overall solution. The jury expressed the opinion that entry into the territory is too prescriptive, it does not allow greater freedom of movement. The proposal lacks a more detailed commentary on the work with the existing landscape, the solution of the so-called Gypsy camp, the cemetery of the victims of the camp, and the work with the parts of the pig farm left.</p>
<p>The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti</p> <p>The proposal of concentration on suffering and death, on wasteland and destruction, ignores the line of memory that was at the heart of the subject. The centre of the space, of the whole design becomes the "crater" and the the so-called gypsy camp and the cemetery of the victims of the camp are side-lined.</p>

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
9	9	6	9	33

C. Recommendations of the Jury

- The jury recommends focusing on the development of the theme of memory, reminding individual stages of the history of the place, the history of the Czech Roma and Sinti.
- The jury recommends addressing the requirement for clarity of the chosen symbolism for visitors with different life experiences, without undue explanation.
- The jury recommends rethinking the crater space programme, for example in the form of an annual ritual.
- The jury recommends considering more trajectories when entering the territory without the entrance building acting as a safety valve.
- In general, the conceptual quality of the proposal in the second round needs to be supported by more specific information specifying individual aspects, elements of solution:
 - it is necessary to define materials, design and maintenance methods of the "crater" element,
 - It is necessary to define the individual aspects of the road network solution, the remembrance of the so-called Gypsy camp, the cemetery of the victims of the camp, leaving parts of the pig farm and others,
 - the authors' ideas about the visitor center and its curatorial potential should be specified,
 - it is necessary to think about and specify work with existing and new landscape elements, vegetation,
 - It is necessary to pay attention to the terrain modeling of the territory, its slope.
- The jury also recommends addressing the interconnection with other important sites connected with the existence of the camp, i.e. the pond and the quarry.

D. Additional questions of the jury:

How was the "crater" size calibrated?

Design No. 6

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

<p>Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:</p> <p>The jury appreciated the very sensitive approach to both the landscape and the theme of the monument. The jury considers the proposal to be a strong, basic concept with which it is possible to work in detail in the future, including in intensive cooperation with the bereaved, without compromising its integrity.</p> <p>The jury evaluates as positive the emphasis on the landscape design, which corresponds to the desire for freedom and for nature inherent to the Czech Roma and Sinti. At the same time, however, the jury expresses doubts about how the whole concept will work immediately after the opening of the memorial, when the basic compositional component of the design, which we assume are forest stands, will not yet fulfill their compositional role as indicated in the design visualizations. The jury appreciates the element of creating a wall that borders on "the other world" and the sensitive work with the remains of the industrial pig farm.</p> <p>It is not entirely clear from the design how the proposal would propose to treat the place of the burial ground and the requirement of the bereaved that it would be appropriate to delimit the burial ground area so as to prevent the movement of visitors directly along the victims' graves.</p>
<p>The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti</p> <p>The proposal works sensitively with the theme of remembrance and time, as well as the theme of respect for Romani culture and history - translated into respect for nature and our free or non-free "being and movement" in it. The jury also considers the very gentle treatment of the circle/wheel symbol to be very successful.</p> <p>During the jury's discussions, an objection was raised, especially by the survivors, against the placement of the victims' names on the sidewalk around the center of the camp, because it means that visitors will tread on the names.</p>

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
9	9	9	9	36

C. Recommendations of the Jury

- The submissions must be supported in the second round by the designer presenting ideas for how the space will develop in the period from its establishment until the full functionality of the forest stands that form the compositional basis of the solution.
- It is necessary to document the designer's idea of the nature of the new forest stands and how to work with the adjacent forest stands so as to create a harmonious, functional whole.
- It is necessary to submit a framework proposal for the care and maintenance of the area, especially the forest stands.
- The jury recommends reconsidering the placement of the names of the victims in the sidewalk around the circular area, given that the survivors consider this to be very inappropriate.
It is necessary to further define the individual parts of the design, especially the cemetery of the victims of the camp, and the remaining parts of the former pig farm.
- The jury also recommends further elaborating the design of the connection with the other important places connected to the existence of the camp, which are the pond and the quarry.

D. Additional questions of the jury:

Is the jury's assumption correct that the overall concept can be worked on in detail in the future without compromising its integrity?

Design No. 8

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
<p>The jury appreciated the innovative approach taken to the concept of the monument, whereby a cluster of buildings concisely designed to resemble a Roma settlement forms the center of gravity of the entire area and is situated in the existing landscape, free of all the remains of the industrial pig farm. The jury also appreciates the effort to create a space open to all, a space for cultures to encounter each other.</p> <p>However, the jury considers the insertion of a building complex into part of the land in such a way as to also affect the area of the former concentration camp to be inappropriate, both from the point of view of the commemoration of and reverence for the victims of the former so-called <i>Zigeunerlager</i>, and from the point of view of preserving any future archaeological finds.</p> <p>The jury also appreciates the preservation, or rather, the restoration of the original agricultural cultural landscape. The jury considers the design of the parking spaces along the new road connecting both entrances to the area to be beneficial, as it facilitates the entry of visitors to the memorial premises. Visitors would have the opportunity to choose the paths along which they would move freely about the area. The maintenance of the reclaimed lands of the former pig farm by means of controlled grazing is also stimulating, although debatable from the point of view of their operation.</p>

The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti

The unusual concept of the monument in the form of a Roma settlement basically contradicts the fact that the victims of the concentration camp at Lety u Písku were mostly Czech Roma and Sinti for whom, with few exceptions, nomadic life was typical at that time, not life in Roma settlements. The proposed format, therefore, raises the legitimate fear that it will exacerbate the stereotypical image of the Roma population currently held in the Czech lands.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
9	9	8	3	29

C. Recommendations of the Jury

The jury is aware that by selecting this proposal for the second round and at the same time making such fundamental comments and recommendations for completion of the design, it puts the contestant in a very difficult situation. Nevertheless, the design of the proposal is so exceptional that the jury has taken this step.

- The jury recommends that the contestant, while maintaining an innovative approach to the concept of the monument, reconsider the use of the motif of a Roma settlement in the place of the former so-called *Zigeunerlager*.
- Should a new location and a new grouping of buildings be proposed, it is then necessary to address the reminder of the location of the former concentration camp.
- The jury also recommends addressing the design of the connection with other important places connected with the existence of the former camp, which are the pond and the quarry.

D. Additional questions of the jury:

The fundamental question that the proposal submitted in the second round must answer is: Are you willing to fundamentally reconsider your proposal, based on the comments and recommendations of the jury?

Design No. 21

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

<p>Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:</p> <p>The jury appreciates the distinctly minimalist, rational spatial composition of the design, which effectively highlights and interconnects all the important parts of the territory and the individual content spaces, thereby creating preconditions for the creation of a strongly contemplative space.</p> <p>The main conceptual line of the design is the delimitation and framing of the most important parts of the memorial - the area of the former camp and the cemetery. The minimalist solution is nice, but it risks a formalistic, mechanistic monotony. During the jury's discussion, the opinion was expressed as to whether the indicated spatial framing would not act too much as a barrier, or whether it might result in unjustified fragmentation of the landscape, which is meant to be treated with reverence.</p> <p>The proposed landscaping shows an attempt to subordinate the entire design to geometry. The proposal thus has weaknesses in connection with the existing landscape structures. The jury believes the overall concept would be helped by a certain "softening" of its strict geometry, a closer connection of the geometric concept with the natural aspect of the landscape.</p> <p>For the time being, the visitor center building is designed too schematically and requires further architectural completion.</p>
<p>The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti</p> <p>The overall elaboration is adequate and retains the authenticity of a personal experience without unnecessary formal symbolism. The presentation of the theme of memory is applied through a continuous spatial experience supported by composed scenes of open and closed landscapes.</p> <p>The concept creates good preconditions for a deeper understanding of the cultural significance of the place.</p>

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
8	8	8	8	32

C. Recommendations of the Jury

- The jury recommends considering a certain "softening" of the strict geometry of the overall concept, using natural, organic elements and linking the concept with the natural aspect of the surrounding landscape.
- The jury recommends further thinking through and presenting in adequate detail the design of the framing elements of important areas of the memorial so that the created scenery/spaces do not seem monotonous and do not create unjustified barriers in the area. The jury recommends considering the development of variants of walls and interfaces with a greater range of permeability and transparency while maintaining geometric purity.
- The jury recommends considering the proposed scenario of a visit to the site including the possibility of an even more spontaneous exploration of the area, freer movement around the grounds. The jury recommends reviewing the consideration that learning about the place and the history it represents should be made flexible in time and space for the visitor.
- In general, the conceptual quality of the design must be supported in the second round by more information specifying individual aspects and elements of the solution - especially the visitor center, the road network, the work with the existing and new landscape elements, and the vegetation.

D. Additional questions of the jury:

One of the axes of the overall concept ends at the quarry - do you have an idea for the design of this space?

Design No. 27

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
<p>The design deals with the location of the former camp and the burial ground with great care. It situates the entrance building logically with respect to these two places and leaves intact the artifact of the walls of the two halls as a memento of the removed pig farm. However, the design ignores the pond, as a place of disgraceful cleansing, and the quarry as a place of forced labor.</p> <p>The visitor center is located in a two-story building sunk into the ground and situated in the middle of the monument. To ensure accessibility, this building is likely to require an elevator. The jury believes that the direct track of the paths leading to the entrance of the building is too abrupt.</p> <p>The archaeological outlines of the former buildings of the camp are inscribed in the space by planting trees. The depiction of the main gate through which the prisoners entered the camp, using railway ties referencing the transports of the prisoners, is convincing. However, the wheel-shaped artefact rendered with stones is much more formalistic. The other buildings, the pillory, and the well are very formalistic in terms of their design.</p>

The design for the camp victims' cemetery makes a convincing, moving impression. However, the jury expressed concern that this locale, which functions today, might become too overwhelmed by the new elements.

The overall landscape context is defined quite preliminarily, it is not possible to get an idea of the target state of the landscape from the submission.

The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti

In this proposal, the jury sees an attempt to install symbols referring to Romani culture too explicitly, without these artefacts serving any real function within the concept of the monument.

Representatives of the bereaved on the jury significantly appreciated the building of the main gate, which they also perceived as a possible chapel.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
7	8	8	8	31

C. Recommendations of the Jury

- The jury recommends considering whether the number of elements used is not too many, whether their use is not a simplistic one, whether there is a risk of losing the strong meaning of the whole by installing these partial fragments no matter the cost.
- The jury recommends considering whether a two-story visitor center design is appropriate with regard to ensuring accessibility.
- The jury recommends reconsidering the design of the access routes, especially the access to the visitor center.
- The jury recommends reconsidering delimiting the outline of the former camp's ground plan with trees given the need to preserve archaeological finds.
- The jury recommends further exploring and reconsidering the design and location of the broken wheel artifact and other elements in the area – e.g., the well, the pillory.
- In the cemetery area, the jury recommends reconsidering the relationship between the newly- designed memorial, the cemetery wall, and the existing memorial by Z. Hůla with regard to the jury's concern that this functioning location not be too overwhelmed by new elements.
- In the second round, the design needs to describe and design the natural and landscape dimensions more specifically. This is mainly about the involvement of

existing landscape elements, terrain modeling, designation of the types of new landscape elements, etc.

- The jury also recommends further addressing the design of the connection to the other important places connected with the existence of the former camp, which are the fishpond and the quarry.

D. Additional questions of the jury:

Could you imagine the building at the main gate being used as a chapel?

Design No. 32

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
<p>The jury appreciates the distinctly minimalist and rational spatial composition of the design, which is based on the triangle principle. The minimalist solution is pleasant, but carries the risk of excessive schematisation, monotony, and the question arises as to whether the technicalist solution does not bind and control the territory too.</p> <p>The architecture of the visitor centre is inspired by the wheel symbol. The building is designed to allow gradual implementation, offering flexible spatial solutions. The camp's buildings and the victim's cemetery are spatially delimited by extensive flower beds. However, the overall solution of the camp is not entirely clear to the jury. The proposal reminds of the post-war period by leaving the frontage of 3 halls, but it is not yet clear how they will be involved in the overall concept. The opportunity to sit in the entire area on the walls lining the paths intersecting the meadow, which replaces the former pig farms, is attractive.</p> <p>The proposal has reserves in conjunction with existing landscape structures. The jury believes that the overall concept would be aided by a certain "softening" of strict geometry, a closer link between the geometric concept and the natural aspect of the landscape.</p>
The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti
<p>The triangle symbol is used, among other things, as a symbol of the imprisonment of Roma and Sinti in concentration camps. At this point, however, the prisoners were not marked as such and the survivors do not have Lety associated with this symbol. This raises the question of whether the triangle is a reasonable principle of the whole composition.</p> <p>The proposal works with the theme of the memory line, reminds and connects all important places in the territory, all its historical stages.</p>

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
8	7	8	8	31

C. Recommendations of the Jury

- The jury recommends confronting the proposal with the question whether the triangle is a justified basic principle of the whole composition, when it is not perceived by the survivors as a symbol of imprisonment of Czech Roma and Sinti in Lety.
- The jury recommends considering the possibility of some softening of the strictly geometrical composition of the design, for example through a more intensive connection with natural landscape structures.
- The jury recommends to more specifically describe and propose the natural and landscape dimensions of the proposal, to deal more closely with the interconnection of existing and newly proposed landscape features.
- The jury recommends to more specifically describe in the proposal the idea of the solution of the area of the so-called Gypsy camp and the area of the cemetery of the victims of the camp.
- The jury recommends also addressing the interconnection with other important sites connected with the existence of the camp, meaning the fishpond and quarry.

Design No. 35

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:

The jury appreciates the conceptual original and sensitive interpretation of the whole territory. For the time being, however, the present proposal is merely an indication of the approach of the authors to the solution of the territory;

The main, strong motive of the design is a "scar", a kind of artificial terrain rift intersecting the whole area from the camp to the Lipeš pond. The parameters of this rift are not clear from the proposal, its depth, width and the jury therefore cannot assess the influence of this element on the patency of the territory, on the safety of visitors. In the south-eastern corner of the area, the scar significantly affects and divides the agricultural lands that are not owned by the museum.

The design places the visitor centre itself in one of the halls, leaving the other halls at a different stage of disintegration, leaving them to the tooth of time. It is not entirely clear whether the retained structures will be used in some way, or whether they form

a "mere" backdrop, how the retained structures will be conserved, or how the safety of visitors will be ensured.

For the time being, the proposal of the solution of the so-called Gypsy camp, the cemetery of the victims, has not been finished. Work with new vegetation elements is not specified.

The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti

The jury appreciates the sensitive approach to the place and its history, the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti. A deep scar stretches across the territory, which guides the visitor through the story of the Roma and Sinti, the story of the site.

We appreciate that no formalities and clichés connected with general ideas about the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti are used in the proposal.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
7	8	8	8	31

C. Recommendations of the Jury

- In general, the conceptual quality of the design in the second round needs to be demonstrated by a much more concrete solution to all aspects of the design that will allow the jury and Contracting Authority to get a more accurate picture of the memorial and its future functioning:
 - the scar solution, its depth, width, should be specified,
 - it is necessary to define a reminder of the so-called Gypsy camp, the cemetery of the victims of the camp
 - the authors' ideas about the visitor centre and its curatorial potential should be specified,
 - it is necessary to think about and specify work with existing and new landscape elements, vegetation, their interconnection, character
 - the material design of the road network and other paved areas should be clarified
 - it is necessary to pay attention to the terrain modelling of the territory, its slope.
- The jury recommends taking into account the question of the safety of movement of visitors in the proposal.

- The jury recommends considering whether the continuation of the "scar" on land that is not owned by the contracting authority and which is currently used agriculturally is justified.
- In the second round it is necessary to deal with the stages of realization of the memorial, but also its further development. It is necessary to prove the feasibility of leaving the halls at different stages of decay, the feasibility of the principle of their gradual disintegration.

7. Assessment of proposals excluded from competition

Design No. 1

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
The architectural design is oversized and ill-suited for the site. The complexity of the proposed landscape design does not sufficiently respect the topography and character of the surrounding landscape.
The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti
The plan does not show a deeper understanding of the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti. As a result, the proposal does not sufficiently correspond with the survivors' idea regarding the memorial design.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
0	0	0	2	2

Design No. 3

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
The design proposes an architectural solution that is so schematic as to be unsophisticated. The design respects the surrounding landscape, restoring it to an agricultural character.

The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti

The theme of grazing horses does not correspond to the ideas of the bereaved or to the requirement that the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti be respected. It is inadequate to use elements from the disassembled industrial pig farm in the area of the former camp.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
3	5	4	4	16

Design No. 4

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:

The architectural design emphasizes the extensive campus of the entire former pig farm too much. The relics of the farm become the dominant feature of the territory, overshadowing the area of the former camp and burial ground. The composition of the axes of the grounds is interesting, although not entirely justified.

The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti

The proposal is not sufficiently connected with the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti, it does not correspond to the survivors' idea of the form of the memorial. One stage of the site's history is too preferred in the proposal.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
3	6	4	4	17

Design No. 5

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
The theme implements a landscape intervention that is conceptually bold and daring. However, the proposal stretches the limits of the location. The distinctive terrain modelling "cuts" and covers the pig farm, but in the end, the design perhaps unintentionally overemphasizes the pig farm's significance.
The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti
The submitted design proposal does not adequately work with the history and culture of Czech Roma and Sinti. As such, the entry does not sufficiently correspond with the survivors' idea regarding the memorial design.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
5	5	4	4	18

Design No. 7

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
The proposal presents a sophisticated landscape solution of the topic. It proposes a clear operating scheme and phasing. However, it is difficult to imagine the final form from the presentation, the symbolism is rather generic in nature. The visitor center building is not architecturally developed.
The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti
The design makes it difficult to read the subject of the memorial and to express respect for culture of the Czech Roma and Sinti specifically.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
5	6	5	7	23

Design No. 9

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
This architecture is formed generically, copying contemporary tendencies. Making such a deep dent in the meadow damages the landscape and creates a disproportionate barrier.
The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti
The definition of the memorial's themes is vague. The connection to the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti is not obvious. The proposal does not correspond to the survivors' idea of the form of the monument.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
4	4	4	3	15

Design No. 10

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
The jury appreciates the effort of the proposal to use a wider compositional area to link places connected with the fate of Czech Roma and Sinti. The proposal works with the intersection of broader relations and places in it the site of strongest emotions. The composition of these relations, however, is hidden in almost unreadable patterns. The jury appreciates the use of non-traditional architectural forms.
The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti
The impressive architectural design is in slight contradiction with the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti and their humble live style. As such, the entry does not sufficiently correspond with the survivors' idea regarding the memorial design.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
6	6	6	4	22

Design No. 12

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
This path is too dramatic, too "fraught", it does not respect either the specific environment or the topic. The walls have a disproportionate impact on the landscape. The architectural design of the entrance gate and gazebo is too expressive for the location. It is not clear why the architecturally dramatic expression of the entrance gate contrasts so sharply with the organic morphology of the walls delimiting the route to the former camp. The design does not sufficiently connect the locale with the cemetery.
The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti
The attractive use of wheels in connection with the actual history of the camp is positively evaluated by the jury. However, the jury believes the excessive.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
4	5	6	5	20

Design No. 13

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
The jury appreciates that the wider context of the place, including the quarry, is involved in the design. The attempt to restore the landscape to its original state of agricultural use is successful. However, the conceptual landscape solution contrasts with the low architectural level of the proposed buildings.
The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti

The proposal reflects, if only in segments, the historical context, subject and themes of the memorial, it is not in conflict with the culture of the Czech Roma and Sinti.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
3	5	3	3	14

Design No. 14

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:

The "scar" used in the proposal - the corridor – connects significant parts of the area addressed and emphasizes them. The design works appropriately with the emotions of visitors, which end with the wall into the former camp and the way from the camp to the cemetery. The jury appreciates the use of mobile phone applications in the former camp area. However, the design creates an undesirable barrier at the site. Inspiration from contemporary trends and implemented solutions is obvious.

The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti

The proposal works appropriately with the contrast of freedom / non-freedom. However, the proposal does not correspond much with the survivors' ideas about the form of the monument.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
6	4	6	6	22

Design No. 16

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
The jury appreciates the overall concept of the design and the sensitive treatment of all the landscape elements. The design also incorporates the quarry. However, the jury believes the petrification of the buildings of the former camp is not very suitable due to their material having originally been wood. The focus of the design on the former camp may draw too much attention to one stage in the story's history.
The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti
The proposal works well with all topics of the assignment, but the Roma theme is not very legible.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
6	5	6	5	22

Design No. 18

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
The jury appreciates the connection of the individual parts of the area addressed and the location of the visitor facility in the middle of the area. However, the proposal introduces an intervention into the landscape that significantly limits its permeability and freedom of movement there. An empty eclecticism of elements used elsewhere prevails in the architecture.
The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti
Romani subject matter is not sufficiently legible. The proposal does not correspond to the survivors' idea of the form of the monument.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
4	4	6	6	20

Design No. 19

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
This regular, even historicist, landscape solution denies the <i>genius loci</i> . The chosen architectural form is soulless. The architectural solution overshadows the place of the former camp and burial ground; the form of the former pig farm, which the landscape design immortalizes, is unnecessarily emphasized.
The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti
Representatives of the survivors appreciated the detail of the depiction of the victims of the camp in the relief of the panels. The design lags behind the essential themes of the memorial.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
6	6	5	4	21

Design No. 20

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

<p>Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:</p>
<p>The proposal presents a sophisticated solution that connects all parts of the area. However, the location of the monument - the center of gravity of the design - seems to be unfounded, and the related geometry of the road network thus has no obvious logic and unnecessarily binds together a number of otherwise innovative elements. The location of the viewpoint on the Krahulík hill, the creation of a chapel near the cemetery, and the symbol of free nomadism, an important element of the culture of prewar Czech Roma, are all valuable. The jury appreciates the expressive coherence of the proposal.</p>
<p>The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti</p>
<p>Elements based on the survivors' ideas about the form of the memorial are appropriately used in the design.</p>

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
6	6	6	6	24

Design No. 22

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

<p>Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:</p>
<p>The topic of the assignment is elaborated by a combination of landscape design with architectural elements. The design enhances the site of the former camp in an innovative way by using a footbridge lining the perimeter of the camp. The dotted line indicating the planting of the new vegetation elements used would probably be illegible in reality and is therefore unjustified. Some parts of the concept are not clearly legible.</p>

The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti

The proposal cannot be reconciled with the survivors' idea of the form the memorial should take.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
4	5	5	5	19

Design No. 23

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:

The monumentality of the building, as well as of the whole design, is completely inadequate to the site, its wider context, the theme of the monument and the piety of the area.

The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti

The proposal does not read the inspiration of the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti, the inspiration for the theme of the monument. As such, the entry does not correspond with the survivors' idea regarding the memorial design.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
2	0	2	1	5

Design No. 24

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
The design reflects a misunderstanding of the locality and theme. The solution is schematic, monumental, and inadequate. The proposal presents excessive urbanization of the landscape, inadequately high intensity of development.
The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti
Roma culture is inadequately incorporated and reflected in the proposal, and the design does not express the survivors' ideas of the form of the monument.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
3	3	4	3	13

Design No. 25

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
The overall design concept is difficult to read. The solution is out of context, does not integrate the surrounding landscape, is too fragmented, full of conflicts. It is unclear why and how large water areas are designed in sloping terrain without a water source.
The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti
The chosen architectural concept utilizing fragmented forms is not in line with the purpose of the Holocaust memorial, which is to create a quiet place of piety. The proposal does not correspond with the survivors' idea of the nature of the memorial.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
4	2	3	3	12

Design No. 26

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
The jury considers the proposal to be very formal and non-contextual. The spatially complicated landscape solution does not respect the topography of the place. The proposal does not work with other parts of the area, especially the cemetery. The proposal shows signs of a gross misunderstanding of the place and the subject.
The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti
The proposal shows a low degree of a deeper respect for or relationship to Roma culture. The proposal does not correspond to the survivors' idea of the form the memorial should take.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
2	0	2	0	4

Design No. 28

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
The design shows too much formality and geometry. Even the landscape solution is too technical and is not set in the broader context of the landscape. The depiction of the former camp is very emotional, but there is no personal scale that allows for self-reflection, the design does not offer a place suitable for undisturbed meditation.
The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti
The proposal shows sufficient respect for the culture of the Czech Roma and Sinti, but it looks too formal.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
5	6	4	5	20

Design No. 29

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
The design is far too monumental and schematic, based on a misunderstanding of the place and its context in the landscape. The design proposes excessive urbanization of the landscape.
The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti
The proposal differs from the idea held by both the bereaved and the rest of the jury about the depiction of the themes of the memorial and the interpretation of the culture of the Czech Roma and Sinti.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
3	3	3	3	12

Design No. 30

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
The jury considers the submitted concept to be inadequate both in relation to the assignment and to the landscape, the locale. The design is completely unrelated to the context and scope of the place. It is unclear why an architectural form in the shape of a divided hill was chosen. The jury appreciates the use of mobile phone applications outdoors.
The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti
The reference to the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti is not legible, nor is the relationship to the subject and themes of the memorial. The proposal does not correspond to the survivors' idea of the form the memorial should take.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
2	3	3	4	12

Design No. 31

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
The symbolism and the number of attributes used make an inconsistent impression. The landscape solution is overwhelmed by disparate elements and symbols. According to the jury, the attempt to poetize the landscape is not successful. The architectural design with the attributes of the wheel and the nomadic wagons would border on disrespectful.
The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti
The jury considers the use of references to the attributes of the culture of the Czech Roma and Sinti to be so superficial as to be theatrical.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
2	5	6	5	18

Design No. 34

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
The design does not respect the landscape or its scale and topography; it is inappropriately aggressive and monumental. There is no clear relationship to the former camp or the cemetery. The monumentality of the central building and the access to it downplays the location of both the former camp and the cemetery of the camp victims.

The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti

The proposal is a legible attempt to work with symbols of Romani culture (the broken wheel), but this symbol is used too brutally, forcedly. The proposal does not correspond to the survivors' idea of the form of the memorial.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
2	3	3	2	10

Design No. 36

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:

The proposal represents an attempt at an expressively clean, minimalist design that seeks to reintegrate and soothe a landscape marked by dramatic historical developments. The location of the former camp is highlighted by a COR-TEN wall with a cross-shaped floor plan. However, the design erects too much of a barrier to movement around the territory. The architectural solution of the visitor center in the form of a tent is debatable. It refers to nomadic life and its temporary nature, while allowing for flexible use.

The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti

The design of the visitor center refers too much to the stereotype of the circus tent and can thus lead to a deepening of stereotypical ideas about the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
8	7	6	7	28

Design No. 37

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
The proposal is overly complex, almost theatrical, and does not respect the scale of the territory and the surrounding landscape. The reason for using the central motif of the proposal - the spiral - is not clear to the jury. The proposal brings inadequately complex operational relations to the territory.
The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti
The reference to the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti is unreadable. The presented solution does not correspond with the survivors' idea of the form of the memorial.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
2	1	2	2	7

Design No. 38

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
The solution is too material, expensive. The architectural design underscores the existence of the pig farm, creating several unusable spaces. The proposed landscape design and placement of elements in the countryside is of average quality.
The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti
The reference to the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti is unreadable. The presented solution does not correspond with the survivors' idea regarding the memorial design.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
3	4	2	3	12

Design No. 39

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
The design submitted is too schematic, both the architectural and the landscape approach are too formal. A reminder of the buildings of the pig farm could contribute an interesting rhythm to the landscape. An interesting element is the vertical of the Tower of Suffering in the former camp area, but the jury is not sure about the adequacy of its scale. The jury considers the arrival area and the visitor center to be the weakest part of the proposal.
The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti
The proposal lacks reference to Romani culture and does not correspond to the survivors' idea of the form of the memorial.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
4	4	3	4	15

Design No. 40

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal

Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
The design is too monumental, and the scale is too brutal. It brings stereotypical, rigid, symbolism without emotion. The design overly overemphasizes the pig farm, and allows the remains of the farm to dominate the site. The jury has doubts about the sustainability of glass insoles in such a remote area.
The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti
The Roma culture is side-lined. The proposal does not correspond with the survivors' idea of the form of the monument. The rendering of the theme is rigid and unemotional.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
3	3	2	2	10

Design No. 41

A. Verbal assessment of the proposal


Architectural and artistic quality of the design, quality of the memorial's setting in the landscape:
The design presents a rigid, stereotypical symbolism devoid of emotion. The deployment into the landscape lacks a deeper logic - the links to the surrounding landscape are not addressed. The main memorial is located within the area of the former <i>Zigeunerlager</i> , which could risk damaging archaeological finds.
The degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, the representation of the themes of the memorial, the level of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti
The proposal lacks a connection to Romani culture and does not correspond to the survivors' idea of the form of the memorial.

B. Score of the level of fulfilment of the evaluation criteria

Note: The evaluation of each sub-criterion is expressed on a scale of 0-10 points.

architectural and artistic quality of the solution	quality of placement in the landscape	degree of expression of the theme of the memorial, rendering of the themes of the monument	degree of respect for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	evaluation criteria in total
2	3	2	3	10

8. Attendance list from the first assessment session of the jury

Prezenční listina

Krajinářsko-architektonická soutěž o návrh
„Lety u Písku. Památník holokaustu Romů a Sintů v Čechách“

Hodnotící zasedání poroty v 1. kole
6. 2. 2020, Auditorium Národní galerie ve Veletržním paláci

řádní členové poroty závislí	
Jana Horváthová	
Čeněk Růžička	
Martin Martínek	
řádní členové poroty nezávislí	
Josef Pleskot	
Vladimír Sitta	
Emílie Rigová	
Rostislav Koryčánek	
náhradníci poroty závislí	
Anna Míšková	
Rudolf Murka	
náhradníci poroty nezávislí	
Regina Loukotová	
Igor Marko	
organizátor soutěže – ONplan lab s.r.o.	
Petr Návrat přezkušovatel soutěžních návrhů	
Karolína Koupalová sekretář soutěže	

Prezenční listina

Krajinářsko-architektonická soutěž o návrh
„Lety u Písku. Památník holokaustu Romů a Sintů v Čechách“

Hodnotící zasedání poroty v 1. kole
7. 2. 2020, Auditorium Národní galerie ve Veletržním paláci

řádní členové poroty závislí	
Jana Horváthová	
Čeněk Růžička	
Martin Martínek	
řádní členové poroty nezávislí	
Josef Pleskot	
Vladimír Sitta	
Emílie Rigová	
Rostislav Koryčánek	
náhradníci poroty závislí	
Anna Míšková	
Rudolf Murka	
náhradníci poroty nezávislí	
Regina Loukotová	
Igor Marko	
organizátor soutěže – ONplan lab s.r.o.	
Petr Návrat přezkušovatel soutěžních návrhů	
Karolína Koupalová sekretář soutěže	

9. Report on explanations of the Competition Terms in the second round

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms No. 26:

Could you please provide us with the information, if there is any specific deadline for the questions regarding second phase? Or it is possible to send questions when they occur during the design process?

Answer No. 26:

According to the Competition Terms, Chapter 6.11: "Subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 5.3, participants may request an explanation of the Competition Terms in the field of organizational aspects of the competition by April 1, 2020 and in the competition subject by March 15, 2020."

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms No. 27:

Also, we would like to know if it is possible to edit the team members list stated in the form attached with the first phase submission?

Answer No. 27:

The participant of the competition must remain the same, but changes in the composition of the competition team are possible in principle. However, it is necessary to comply with the conditions for participation in the competition as set out in paragraph 4.1 of the Competition Terms. In case of changes in the competition team, it is also necessary to show evidence of the fulfillment of the conditions for participation in the competition according to paragraph 4.2 of the Competition Terms and to submit an affidavit according to the model PF2, which is an Assignment Detail of the competition.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms No. 28:

I cannot find further specification or the form for the envelope "Contact Information". Will you be sending any documents in that regard or have I missed something?

Answer No. 28:

According to the Competition Terms, Chapter 8.5: "The envelope "Contact Information" will contain a filled-in and signed form (which will be part of the call for participation in the 2nd round of the competition).

THAT SHALL BE SUBMITTED IN A SEALED, INTACT ENVELOPE IDENTIFIED AS "KONTAKTNÍ ÚDAJE" – 2nd ROUND. The envelopes will not be presented to the Jury."

The above-mentioned form will be uploaded to NEN and sent via email to the participants to the address given in the PF1 form.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms No. 29:

Does the car park have to be located within the built up area?

Answer No. 29:

According to point 2.4 of the Competition Terms, the binding requirement is the placement of the visitor center on the land owned by the Museum of Romani Culture (i.e. the pig farm and related land), which is built-up land. Placing a car park on these grounds is not obligatory according to the Competition Terms.

However, it is necessary to point out the investment limit for the implementation of the first stage of the monument. Placing the buildings necessary for the functioning of the memorial on plots that are not the property of the Museum of Romani Culture may require the purchase of such land and thus increase the investment costs for implementation. Furthermore, there is a risk that in the future there may be no agreement on the proprietary settlement of these lands, and, in addition, the construction of a car park located outside the built-up area may not be given planning and building permits.

Placing the car park outside the built-up area is not in conflict with the Competition Terms, but could be problematic in the next phase of project preparation.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms No. 30:

Are there any geotechnical studies of the area available (ex. wells)?

Answer No. 30:

The Contracting Authority does not have any geological, hydrogeological and similar studies available. The contracting Authority will, if necessary, deal with the processing of the necessary surveys after completion of the competition in connection with the next stage of project preparation.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms No. 31:

Do you consider an electronic only submission due to the circumstances (Covid-19 induced measures)? Or maybe even changing the date of the deadline?

Answer No. 31:

For the time being, we are not considering changing the deadline for submission of competition proposals or changing the way of submission of competition proposals in the 2nd round of the competition.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms No. 32:

Instead of a general site plan at a scale of 1:1000 is it possible to select an axonometric representation in the same scale?

Answer No. 32:

Instead of a site plan at a scale of 1: 1000, it is possible to choose an axonometric representation at the same scale demonstrating the layout of the planned spatial and functional relationships between each component of the site, including their operational relationships, final landscaping, vehicle access and parking and the principles according to which the site will be connected to the infrastructure network, including depictions of the contour lines, the foot print of the existing grounds of the former pig farm and the foot print of the former so-called Gypsy Camp.

Request for explanation of the Competition Terms No. 33:

We have one more question regarding the general questions all participants have to answer in the second phase. We do not fully understand the third question:

"In which parts of the submitted area solution should the individual themes of the memorial contained in the tender documentation be presented?" (toto je překlad z výzvy a ne ze zápisu bohužel)

By themes of the memorial do you mean the three themes indicated in the brief? Or themes like theme of memory...? and how they should be presented in tender documentation?

Or by tender documentation you mean the competition brief and the question simply refers to where and how in our proposal we presented the indicated themes?

Answer No. 33:

The themes of the memorial refer to the themes stated in the Competition Assignment:

- The story of the Roma and Sinti from the First Republic to the end of World War II
- The so-called Gypsy Camp in Lety u Písku
- Situation after the return of the surviving Roma

When answering the question contestants should explain in which parts of the memorial design these themes will be presented, where visitors will be educated on these basic themes.

Additional information No. 3**A. Extending options of submission of the parts of the proposal to be submitted as hard copies**

The submission of the part of the proposal submitted in paper form personally to the address of the Competition Organizer, as well as the option to send proposals by post or other public delivery of consignments according to chapter 6.6.1 of the Competition Terms remains the preferred method of submission.

However, given the current situation caused by the COVID-19 epidemic, which could bring complications with the delivery of letter-post items, especially from abroad, all contestants in the second round of the competition can use the following method of submitting the competition panels and of the "Contact Details" envelope (part of the proposal submitted physically).

Competition panels and contents of the "Contact Details" envelope can be sent in digital form, along with information on how to print the panels and envelope content, to a copy centre in Prague. The Contestants have to make these arrangements with the copy centre on their own. The copy centre staff will then hand over the consignment containing the competition panels and the sealed envelope "Contact Details" to the authorized person.

The authorized person will only collect the consignment. All costs for copy centre services shall be borne by the contestant. The Competition Organizer is not responsible for any failure on the part of the copy centre.

If you choose this method of submission, please send the information about where and when the copies are to be collected by April 19, 2020 to the authorized person at: awinkelman@seznam.cz. The copies must be ready for collection within the deadline for submission of proposals: 21 April 2020 at 3 pm Central European Time. On receipt of the copies by the authorized person, the parts of the competition proposal submitted as hard copies will officially count as submitted. The authorized person will inform you once the copies have been received.

B. Change of delivery address for the parts of the competition proposal submitted as hard copies

The competition organizer has changed its registered office. In case of personal hand-over of part of the proposal submitted in paper form, or in case of sending by post or other public delivery of consignments (according to chapter 6.6.1 of the Competition Terms), the delivery address is:

ONplan lab, s.r.o.
Karmelitská 18/379,
118 00 Praha 1 - Malá Strana

10. Report from the examination of the designs in the second round

1. Reception of proposals in the second round

A total of seven proposals in paper form were delivered to the seat of the jury secretary by the deadline for submission of proposals in the second round (21 April 2020, by 3 PM Central European Time). Proposals were marked with a serial number and the date and time of receipt.

2. Examination of proposals in the second round

On 21 April 2020, after 3:00 PM, all seven proposals submitted in paper form were unpacked by the secretary of the jury, and the panels submitted with the proposals and the envelopes with the "contact details" were renumbered with randomly generated numbers. Envelopes with the contact details of the participants were handed over to an authorized trusted person of the Contracting Authority.

On 24 April 2020, all seven submitted proposals were examined in terms of the binding requirements for the manner and form of submission and the requirements for addressing the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms and specified, based on the jury recommendations, in the call for proposals in the second round. At the same time, a report on the examination of proposals was prepared.

The design was examined by design examiner Petr Návrát and the competition secretary Karolína Koupalová.

3. Examination findings for the second round

Details of the examination of each proposal are given in the individual records of the examination that are part of the tender documentation and are available for inspection at the contracting authority.

4. Conclusion of the examination of proposals in the second round

All submitted proposals meet the binding requirements for submission and for addressing the competition subject that are set out in the Competition Terms and specified in the call for proposals in the second round of the competition.

5. Checking parts of the designs submitted electronically through the National Electronic Instrument (NEN)

By the deadline for submission of proposals in the second round (21 April 2020, by 3 PM Central European Time), all electronically submitted parts of the proposals of all seven competing teams were delivered to the NEN. The electronically submitted parts of the proposals were delivered as encrypted attachments to the messages addressed to the contracting authority.

The person authorized by the contracting authority paired the delivered hard copy parts of the proposals with the parts submitted electronically on 21 April 2020 after the

deadline for submission of proposals (3 PM Central European Time) had expired as follows:

- the authorized person opened the "contact details" envelopes from the seven competing teams;
- the authorized person decrypted the attachments to the messages uploaded by the competing teams to the NEN and printed out those documents;
- the authorized person paired those printed text parts with the delivered panels;
- the authorized person numbered the printed text parts according to the number on the panels and on the "contact details" envelopes;
- the authorized person resealed the open envelopes with the "contact details" and provided their signature and the date of sealing.

In Prague on 24 April 2020, the examiner of competition proposals

Ing. Petr Návrat MSc.

11. Minutes of the jury meeting assessing the designs in the second round

20th May 2020

The evaluation meeting of the jury took place in the Auditorium of the National Gallery at the Trade Fair Palace in Prague

1/ Preparation for the jury session

Due to the COVID-19 epidemic, it was discussed in advance with all jurors and the contracting authority that the jury would be empaneled for one day only and jurors not in the Czech Republic would participate online.

With regard to this measure, all participants in the second round of the competition were asked by the authorized person to send a digital version of their proposals ahead of the evaluation meeting of the jury. Competitors sent their proposals in digital form to the authorized person.

On 29 April 2020, all jurors received all the proposals in digital form for study, in an anonymized form that did not allow for the identification of the authors of the individual proposals. At the same time, all jurors signed and sent to the secretary a solemn declaration that they had not participated directly or indirectly in the work on the submitted proposals, that they do not know the names of the authors of the proposals, and that they had no conflict of interest pursuant to Section 148 (1) of the Public Procurement Act. The statement also included a commitment that the proposals provided in digital form would be used by the jurors just for the purpose of preparing for the jury meeting would not be given to anybody else.

2/ Examination of the proposals by experts of the jury

On Tuesday, 19 May 2020, the second-round proposals were made available for study by the experts of the jury in the auditorium of the National Gallery at the Trade Fair Palace. On that day, the present experts of the jury signed a solemn declaration that they did not participate directly or indirectly in the work on the submitted proposals, that they did not know the names of the authors of the proposals, and that they had no conflict of interest pursuant to Section 148 (1) of the Public Procurement Act.

Among the experts who reviewed the proposals on 19 May 2020 were Mr Jan Hauer, a representative of the former prisoners' families; Romani Studies scholar Helena Sadílková; and the head of the archeological research at Lety, Pavel Vařeka. On that same day the proposals were also reviewed by dependent jury member Mr Čeněk Růžička.

The Museum of Romani Culture's public procurement administrator, Petr Oulehla (Department of Memorials); the Museum of Romani Culture's investment technician Pavel Odstrčil (Department of Memorials); Marek Ehrlich, head of the České Budějovice Field Office of the Institute of National Heritage (Department of Specialists); and Janis Vlachopoulos, appraiser of the cost calculations for the individual proposals, studied the proposals in digital form. These experts signed an affidavit stating that they did not directly or indirectly participate in the work on the submitted proposals, that they did not know the names of the authors of the proposals, and that they were not in conflict

of interest pursuant to Section 148 (1) of the Public Procurement Act. At the same time, the experts to whom the proposals had been provided in digital form signed a commitment to use the provided proposals only for the purpose of preparing for the jury meeting and not to provide them to anyone else. Pavel Vařeka, Marek Ehrlich and Janis Vlachopoulos provided their comments and recommendations on the proposals to the jury in writing. Jan Hauer and Helena Sadílková were present at the jury meeting and communicated their recommendations to the jury as part of the discussion on the individual proposals.

3/ Beginning of the jury meeting

The jury meeting began at 9:15 AM

Those physically present for the jury meeting were:

Regular members of the jury dependent	Jana Horváthová, Čeněk Růžička, Martin Martínek
Regular members of the jury independent	Josef Pleskot, Vladimír Sitta, Rostislav Koryčánek
Alternate of the jury dependent	Anna Míšková
Alternate of the jury independent	Regina Loukotová
Invited experts	Jan Hauer, Helena Sadílková
Organizers of the competition	Petr Návrat, Karolína Koupalová

Those who attended the jury meeting online were:

Regular member of the jury independent	Emília Rigová
--	---------------

The aim and program of the jury meeting:

Josef Pleskot, chair of the jury, welcomed those attending and explained the goal and the program of the second round of assessments by the jury.

Emilie Rigová, independent juror, joined the jury meeting online. It was agreed that due to her physical absence, her vote would be cast by Regina Loukotová, alternate independent juror, throughout the meeting.

4/ Discussion of the report from the examination of the proposals

At 9:30 AM, Karolína Koupalová presented the basic examination findings.

All seven proposals were submitted within the deadline and without violating the condition of anonymity, and the authors were invited by the authorized person to participate in the second round. All submitted proposals meet the binding requirements for submission and address the competition subject set out in the Competition Terms and specified in the call for proposals in the second round of the competition.

The examiner recommends that the jury assess all proposals submitted in the second round of the competition.

The jury voted that on the basis of the results of the examination of proposals, it will assess all seven proposals submitted in the second round.

Votes: for: 7 against: 0 abstentions: 0

The jury agrees to assess all seven proposals submitted to the second round.

Josef Pleskot, Vladimír Sitta, Rostislav Koryčánek, Regina Loukotová, Jana Horváthová, Čeněk Růžička and Martin Martínek voted.

5/ Information about recommendations of the jury experts

Emília Rigová did not participate online during the following parts of the jury session.

From 9:45 AM to 10:15 AM, Karolína Koupalová presented to the jurors the recommendations of the jury's experts: an opinion on the calculation of the investment costs of the individual proposals prepared by Ing. Janis Vlachopoulos; the recommendation of Pavel Vařeka, head of the archaeological survey at Lety; and the recommendation of Marek Ehrlich, head of the České Budějovice Field Office of the Institute of National Heritage (Department of Specialists). The jury incorporated the assessment of the investment costs of the individual proposals and the recommendations of the other experts of the jury into their work during the evaluation of the individual proposals.

6/ Discussion of the jury about the individual proposals

From 10:15 AM to 13:15 PM the jurors and the present experts of the jury discussed the individual proposals. The subject of the discussion was their fulfillment of all requirements of the assignment and the aspects of the proposals.

7/ Lunch break

For the period from 13:15 PM to 14:00 PM the chair of the jury adjourned the meeting for lunch, which took place directly in the meeting room.

8/ Assessment of proposals

From 14:00 PM to 17:00 PM, the jurors proceeded to score and verbally assess all the proposals in the second round. Emília Rigová rejoined the jury meeting online at 14:00 PM. She informed the jury of her evaluation of the proposals.

During the discussion, the jurors verbally scored the individual proposals according to the evaluation criteria for the second round of the competition:

- architectural and artistic quality of the design
- extent of expression of the mission of the Memorial, visual design of the topics of the Memorial and quality of the design of exposition areas
- extent of respect of the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti
- quality of integration of the memorial site in the landscape
- economically reasonable investment and operating costs of the proposal and its ability to be realised in stages s considering the financial means of the investor and the requirements for the stages of construction as mentioned in the competition assignment.

The points of the individual criteria were evaluated on a scale of 0 - 10, where 10 points meant optimal fulfillment of the given criterion and 0 points meant non-fulfillment of the given criterion. The best-rated proposal received the highest score for all criteria. The individual criteria were evaluated by the jury based on the knowledge and experience of its members. This evaluation is, therefore, the professional yet subjective opinion of the jury. The jury ranked the proposals, chose the winning proposal, and appraised the proposals.

Minutes from the jury meeting assessing the proposals in the second round.

Proposal no. 1		
assessment criterion	Score and verbal assessment of the proposal according to criteria	
architectural and artistic quality of the design	<p>This is a coherent, compact design based on a simple, straightforward strategy. However, the monumentality of the design and the symbolism do not correspond to the mission of the monument.</p> <p>The "incision" or scarring of the landscape, which has turned into a strictly geometric element since the first round, can be considered to border on a cliché that exists in many forms in the world. This scar in the terrain violates the historical terrain, especially in the area of the former camp.</p> <p>It does not seem entirely logical that the visitor center is completely new when the buildings of the former industrial pig farm are used for the exhibitions.</p>	7
quality of integration of the memorial site in the landscape	<p>The façade of greenery and the vegetation growing throughout the area of the former industrial pig farm is charming. However, the memorial seems too harsh and uncompromising in the landscape. The "scar" and the concrete wall around the former camp dislocate the viewer from the horizon of the surrounding landscape. There is excessive denial of the landscape and intervention into it even though it formed the backdrop to the prisoners' experiences, including their hope of escape.</p>	7
extent of expression of the mission of the Memorial, visual design of the topics of the Memorial and quality of the design of exposition areas	<p>The proposal can be seen as a metaphor that works impressively with the historical experience that has permanently shaped the Roma identity embodied in the landscape. However, the intensity of the intellectual idea of the design of the monument hinders the release and use of the simplest emotions.</p> <p>The design preserves and even monumentalizes the industrial pig farm halls and thus places a disproportionate emphasis on this part of the history of the area.</p>	8
extent of respect of the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	<p>The material rawness and strict geometry, together with the emptiness and the loss of natural horizons in the landscape, the impossibility of free movement through the landscape and the options for perceiving the surrounding landscape do not correspond to the culture of the Roma and Sinti.</p> <p>In the interior design, original references to symbols of Roma and Sinti culture do appear.</p> <p>The approach described in the text for communication with the bereaved, with the community of Czech Roma and Sinti, and the fact that the authors attach fundamental importance to it, can be assessed positively.</p>	7
economic proportionality of the proposal	<p>The calculation of the cost to implement the first phase of the memorial is partially underestimated for the items of the "scar" foundation, the walls around the former camp and the car park; the connection to utilities is not addressed. An increase in</p>	7

	the costs of the reconstruction of the two halls also cannot be ruled out.	
--	--	--

Proposal no. 2		
assessment criterion	score and verbal assessment of the proposal according to criteria	
architectural and artistic quality of the design	<p>This is a homogeneous, readable design that effectively highlights and interconnects all important parts of the memorial. However, the rationality and strict geometry of the three axes and the circle, which are the essence of the architectural solution, bring too much order to the territory. The architectural and landscape solutions lack a deeper, mutual dialogue.</p> <p>The jury appreciates the attempt at not just a spatial but also a visual interconnection of the parts of the memorial, such as the window from the visitor center onto the landscape. However, the material design and shape of the memorial in the area of the former so-called <i>Gypsy Camp</i> is not convincing as a place of reconciliation.</p>	8
quality of integration of the memorial site in the landscape	<p>While the design continues to work with and preserve the cultural history of the landscape, the placement of the memorial in the landscape is bluntly construed and is therefore quite unnatural.</p> <p>The geometric layout of the paths does not follow the topography of the locale and does not offer either an intuitive or a logical opportunity for moving around this location. There is excessive effort expended to influence the movement of the visitor - free movement in the landscape is not allowed, but the chorography of movement in the territory is not completely clear either.</p>	7
extent of expression of the mission of the Memorial, visual design of the topics of the Memorial and quality of the design of exposition areas	<p>The design addresses all of the basic segments of the memorial and its themes. The buildings of the industrial pig farm are not glorified in any way; just a part of the farm's fencing is preserved. The quarry is suitably incorporated into the design.</p> <p>However, the design's bet on the strength of the architectural concept of the landscape does not appear to be adequate to the theme of the memorial. It is a kind of "colonization" of the landscape by the memorial's theme.</p>	8
extent of respect of the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	<p>The proposal is verbally very committed to respecting the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti, but its formal side does not much correspond to the stated intention. It is exactly the excessive geometry, monumentalism and rationality of all the elements that the bereaved find unconvincing.</p> <p>The very helpful, open attitude to communicating with the survivors described in the text can be appreciated, as well as the stated realization that the acceptance of the proposal by the survivors is essential.</p>	8
economic proportionality of the proposal	<p>The calculation of the costs of the implementation of the first phase of the memorial is partially underestimated, especially with respect to establishing the infrastructure; the connection to utilities is not addressed.</p>	7

Proposal no. 3		
assessment criterion	score and verbal assessment of the proposal according to criteria	
architectural and artistic quality of the design	<p>The design presents a functional, sober concept with effective elements of architectural design and a thoughtful form of landscaping. Everything comes together and gives the visitor an opportunity to consider the subject of the memorial in peace without resorting to labeling.</p> <p>The innovative approach to the concept of the memorial, the effort to create a place of living culture, is a congenial one. The buildings of the visitor center create a space with the character of a community where a very interactive way of interpreting the contemporary culture of the Roma could take place.</p>	9
quality of integration of the memorial site in the landscape	<p>The fragmented deployment of the individual parts of the monument in the landscape is sensitive. No one part sticks out too much. The landscape and its memory are therefore able to bear witness to the subject of the memorial.</p> <p>Entry into the territory is not formed by a monumental building or parking lot but is civil and sensitive. The advantage of the design is the landscape as the main backdrop to the entire memorial and the possibility of free movement around it.</p>	9
extent of expression of the mission of the Memorial, visual design of the topics of the Memorial and quality of the design of exposition areas	<p>The close proximity of the former camp to the "visitor center" yields an opportunity for many interactions that would be very desirable and interesting. No other proposal has offered such a close relationship between these places of the past and present.</p> <p>There was a discussion, though, about the suitability of a living center - a center for the presentation of living culture - which in and of itself could be evaluated positively as an overlap to the present. However, this intention is difficult for the survivors to accept in the area of the memorial near the cemetery of the former camp victims. At the same time, it is possible to doubt whether such a center could function due to the remoteness of the locale.</p> <p>The preservation of the ramps for transporting pigs to the slaughterhouse and the rest of the former industrial pig farm's fencing can be considered a very appropriate reminder of the pig farm and especially of the struggle to remove it, without glorifying this period of the area's history.</p>	8
extent of respect of the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	<p>In contrast to the first-round design, the authors abandoned the architectural solution evoking a Romani village, a significant shift that can be assessed positively. However, the survivors perceive the building of the center as too monumental, the inspiration from the quarry is not convincing. They assess positively the space for meetings between the buildings and the location of the chapel with a clear view of the greenery and the landscape.</p>	8
economic proportionality of the proposal	<p>The calculation of the cost has been processed professionally with actual prices. The proposal is very flexible in terms of the phasing of the construction of the visitor center. The first, minimalist phase is very effectively costed. The next phase is reasonably priced and should follow immediately.</p>	9

Proposal no. 4		
assessment criterion	score and verbal assessment of the proposal according to criteria	
architectural and artistic quality of the design	<p>The jury appreciates the conceptual contribution and expressive face of the design. The dramaturgy of the intention is represented by architectural and artistic means that are bold and very emotional. However, the scenography of the design could be perceived as contradictory.</p> <p>The original concept from the first round has been scaled back by developing the other parts of the memorial, such as the design of several entrance buildings, the landscaping of the original former camp and highlighting the former pig farm ruins. The jury appreciates the effort to recycle and the work with materials at the site.</p>	9
quality of integration of the memorial site in the landscape	<p>The quality of the placement of the memorial in the landscape corresponds to the required degree of contrast that the design follows. The brutality of the intervention into the landscape refers to the tragic story of the place. The jury appreciates the spatial choreography of the design, the thoughtfulness of the individual sequences.</p> <p>The garden on the site of the former <i>Gypsy Camp</i> would provide visitors a place for meditation and for remembrance. Here the vegetation is in contrast to the arid crater.</p>	9
extent of expression of the mission of the Memorial, visual design of the topics of the Memorial and quality of the design of exposition areas	<p>The conceptual solution and the expressive face of the design very strongly represent the assignment's topic. The crater reflects part of the memorial's theme - the unresolved nature of the Roma issue. However, there is still a concern that the system may not function without excessive explanations for visitors with different life experiences.</p> <p>Compared to the design in the first round, the area of the former camp is more emphasized. The center of the entire design and of the physical space, however, remains the "crater", which pushes reminders of the former so-called <i>Gypsy Camp</i> and the cemetery of the former camp's victims into the background.</p>	8
extent of respect of the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	<p>The degree of empathy for the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti is vast, but at some points the memorial may be too intellectually constructed and not understandable to all.</p> <p>The survivors fear that the appearance of the crater with the "cast-aside" relics of the former camp will support a stereotypical identification of Romani people with socially excluded communities.</p>	9
economic proportionality of the proposal	<p>The calculations of investment costs appear to be significantly underestimated, especially in the prices of the new buildings and paved areas; the connection to utilities is not addressed.</p> <p>The implementation of the proposal could lead to financial problems on the part of the investor.</p>	5

Proposal no. 5		
assessment criterion	score and verbal assessment of the proposal according to criteria	
architectural and artistic quality of the design	<p>The jury assesses positively this basic, comprehensible, operationally economical, simple concept with which it is possible to work in detail in the future without compromising its integrity.</p> <p>The encompassing, forest-lined circle around a meadow of reverence is an effective gesture, defining the place of memory. The concept uses minimalist means of expression and the architecture of the buildings corresponds to this.</p>	9
quality of integration of the memorial site in the landscape	<p>The placement of the monument in the landscape is congenial, in harmony with the surrounding landscape, and sensitive. The gradual development of the main compositional element of the monument - the new forest - will symbolize growth and the strengthening of the relationship between the majority and the minority. The proposed circulation of visitors is convincing and easy to read. It connects the artefacts and buildings that seem to be forgotten and which visitors gradually discover on their way through the forest.</p>	9
extent of expression of the mission of the Memorial, visual design of the topics of the Memorial and quality of the design of exposition areas	<p>The design fulfills the preconditions for a reverential site - a memorial - and works sensitively with the themes of remembrance and time. The exhibition opportunities are sufficiently variable and provide room for creativity.</p> <p>The comprehension of the memorial's theme and its abstraction into the design can clearly be assessed positively. History is incorporated into the landscape - creating a place that has to be discovered by the visitor, just as the history of the Roma has to be discovered. The empty space of the place hidden in the forest symbolizes an empty space in history and in memory. The former camp is not glorified, but offers a place to discover its history right on its actual former site.</p>	9
extent of respect of the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	<p>The proposal suitably shows respect for Romani culture and history - translated into respect for nature and the possibility of free "being and movement" in it. Forests, meadows and the road are strong attributes of nomadic Roma, but also effective attributes that can be used to sensitively present the suffering history of this place to others. The survivors like the modesty and simplicity of the design, they did not want to build a large monument at Lety.</p> <p>For the bereaved, the use of artefacts and replicas from the former camp, i.e., descriptive attributes of that history, is positive, and they would also like to work with them during other phases of the project, to investigate using them in outdoor exhibitions.</p> <p>Helpfulness and willingness to communicate with the bereaved and the creators of the exhibitions, willingness to continue working with the design concept, was significantly reflected in the text.</p>	9
economic proportionality of the proposal	<p>The proposal appears to be economically reasonable. Its phasing is meaningful and does not weaken the concept.</p>	9

Proposal no. 6		
assessment criterion	score and verbal assessment of the proposal according to criteria	
architectural and artistic quality of the design	<p>The jury assessed the symbolism of the chapel made of railroad ties, the gate and the tower at the site of the original entrance to the former camp. However, the monumentalism of the visitor center into the form of an antique building with a peristyle weakens the dominant feature of the chapel, the entire design, and the gate.</p> <p>The alignment of the main axis of the car park with the visitor center is not justified by the context of the place and loses its connection to the rest of the area. The authors of this design have flooded the entire area with small-scale architecture.</p>	6
quality of integration of the memorial site in the landscape	<p>In this design, the landscape is more of a framework into which the architectural elements are embedded.</p> <p>The natural erosion of the areas of the demolished pig farm is unconvincing, as is the overall landscape concept.</p>	7
extent of expression of the mission of the Memorial, visual design of the topics of the Memorial and quality of the design of exposition areas	<p>The design addresses the area of the cemetery and the former camp. It can be assessed as positive that the authors do not glorify the former pig farm, but do their best to allow the memory of the suffering of the former camp victims to be distinctly heard.</p>	8
extent of respect of the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	<p>The author has a great deal of respect for the cultural heritage of the Roma and Sinti, but it is probably not well communicated by this design.</p> <p>Survivors consider the symbolic gate at the entrance to the camp to be very successful - a solitary architectural object built out of material that refers to the transports of prisoners.</p> <p>However, the architectural design of the visitor center has no relation to Roma culture.</p>	8
economic proportionality of the proposal	<p>The calculations of investment costs appear to be significantly underestimated, especially the price of the paved areas and the visitor center; the connection to utilities is not addressed.</p> <p>The implementation of the proposal could lead to financial problems on the part of the investor.</p>	5

Proposal no. 7		
assessment criterion	score and verbal assessment of the proposal according to criteria	
architectural and artistic quality of the design	The quality of the architectural solution does not correspond to the elaborated landscape design. The architectural solution of the visitor center is especially debatable. The circular form inappropriately determines the exhibition possibilities, the gradual construction (phasing) of a single building lacks logic from an economic and technical point of view. The proposal is weakened by an excess of small-scale architecture and its design, which, given the expected intensity of traffic, would probably not even be used.	7
quality of integration of the memorial site in the landscape	The design treats the landscape's potential moderately, leaving its openness. A landscape is created featuring a meadow that is "stamped" by triangular paths symbolizing the past, present and future. The concept of a "landscape" monument is appropriate and impressive enough, but forms a certain contrast to the architecture of the cultural and educational center. Perhaps the solution intentionally does not offer catharsis. It is a complex with several centers. The experience of a visitor in this design is debatable given the anticipated low intensity of visitors. The jury appreciates that the proposal also includes an example of seasonal activities in which the visiting public could participate that rises to the level of ritual.	8
extent of expression of the mission of the Memorial, visual design of the topics of the Memorial and quality of the design of exposition areas	The design works with the theme of the line of memory, connecting all the important places in the territory and reminding the visitor of all its historical stages. The survivors dislike the geometric nature of the design and the use of the triangle, although compared to the proposal in the first round, this aspect has been suppressed and refined by the landscape design, which can be assessed as a positive shift. The exhibition spaces of the visitor center are unconvincing.	8
extent of respect of the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	The proposal relates quite empathetically and freely, in its own way, to the elementary conception of the culture of the Czech Roma and Sinti. It is a comprehensible, unforced concept. However, the symbol of a circle applied to the architecture of a building - a circle with radial axes - seems premature and unconvincing. The idea of community management of the meadow can be assessed as naive, as is the idea of grazing horses without the necessary background facilities.	8
economic proportionality of the proposal	The calculation of the costs of the implementation of the first phase of the monument is partially underestimated, especially the issue of establishing the infrastructure; the connection to utilities is not addressed.	7

Summary of the assessment and scoring of the proposals according to the evaluation criteria for the second round of the competition and ranking of the proposals according to the number of points.

design number	architectural and artistic quality of the design	quality of integration of the memorial site in the landscape	extent of expression of the mission of the Memorial, visual design of the topics of the Memorial and quality of the design of exposition areas	extent of respect of the culture of Czech Roma and Sinti	economic proportionality of the proposal	point totals
5	9	9	9	9	9	45
3	9	9	8	8	9	43
4	9	9	8	9	5	40
2	8	7	8	8	7	38
7	7	8	8	8	7	38
1	7	7	8	7	7	36
6	6	7	8	8	5	34

The jury proceeded to vote on the above-mentioned evaluation and scoring of the individual proposals based on the criteria for the second round of the competition.

Vote: For: 7 Against: 0 Abstentions: 0

The jury unanimously approved the above-mentioned scores of the proposals.

Josef Pleskot, Vladimír Sitta, Rostislav Koryčánek, Regina Loukotová, Jana Horváthová, Čeněk Růžička and Martin Martínek voted.

The jury also discussed whether, according to the above-mentioned evaluation and scoring of the proposals, the 1st, 2nd and 3rd prizes will be awarded and whether the other proposals will be divided equally in terms of reimbursement of expenses in the amount specified in Chapter 10 of the Competition Terms.

The jury votes on the awarding of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd prizes according to the above-mentioned evaluation and scoring of proposals according to the criteria for evaluation of second-round proposals and distribution of reimbursements in equal parts for the non-awarded proposals as set out in Chapter 10 of the Competition Terms.

Voting: For: 4 Against: 1 Abstained: 2

The jury agreed by a majority of votes that, according to the above-mentioned evaluation and scoring of the proposals, the 1st, 2nd and 3rd prizes will be awarded and reimbursements will be divided equally as set out in Chapter 10 of the Competition Terms.

Josef Pleskot, Vladimír Sitta, Rostislav Koryčánek, Regina Loukotová, Jana Horváthová, Čeněk Růžička and Martin Martínek voted.

Based on the above-mentioned evaluation and scoring of the proposals according to the criteria for the second round of the competition and the subsequent voting, the jury has reached the following result for the competition:

- **proposal No. 5 is awarded the 1st prize in the amount of CZK 150,000,**
- **proposal No. 3 is awarded the 2nd prize in the amount of CZK 120,000,**
- **proposal No. 4 is awarded the 3rd prize in the amount of CZK 90,000,**
- **Proposals No. 2, 7, 1, 6 will be equally awarded reimbursement of their expenses in the amount of CZK 40,000.**

9/ Final recommendation of the jury to the contracting authority

The jury recommends the contracting authority implement proposal no. 5.

The jury recommends the contracting authority negotiate with the authors of proposal no. 5 through a Negotiated Procedure without Publication on the conclusion of a contract for the processing of all stages of the project documentation.

The jury recommends that the contracting authority carry out as much of the proposal as possible – the landscaping, the planting of at least part of the new forest stand, and other matters possible within the implementation of the zero stage, i.e., within the demolition of the former industrial pig farm.

10/ The jury proceeded to open the envelopes entitled “Contact Details” and learned the names of the authors of the proposals in the first and second rounds of the competition

Authors of proposals in the second round of the competition

outcome	first round design No.	second round design No.	competition participant	other authors/ co-authors	collaborating persons
1	6	5	Ing. Arch. Lucie Vogelová MgA. Jan Světlík	Ing. Jan Sulzer Ing. Arch. Vojtěch Šedý Ing. Arch. Filip Šefl	MgA. Roman Černošous Mgr. Petr Karlík, Dr.rer.nat.
2	8	3	Ing. arch. Jakub Kopec, n-1 Ing. arch. Klára Zahradníčková, M.A.	MgA. Tomáš Džadoň. ArtD.	Paly Paštika Luboš Zbranek Lynda Zein
3	2	4	Andrea Govi Architetto	Karolina Chodura Joanna Rozbroj Marta Tomasiak	

	21	2	Ing. Arch Martin Duba	Ing. arch. Petr Šindelář Ing. Tereza Havránková	Ing. arch. Milada Vorzová Ing. arch. Alice Boušková Ing. akad. arch. Daniela Fenclová
	32	7	Rehwaldt Landscape Architects BY Architects	Dipl. Ing. Till Rehwaldt, Mg.A. Markéta Zdebská Ing. arch. Marek Žáček	Garth Woolison, B.Env.D., M.La Bc. Markéta Kupková Bc. Markéta Čáslavská
	35	1	Nicolas Koff, Office OU Ltd.	Joshua Kirk Marco Colturi	
	27	6	Karel Filsak	Zdeněk Rothbauer Vendula Bažová Martin Bosák	Marie Kordovská

Authors of proposals in the first round who did not advance to the second round

design No.	competition participant	other authors/ co-authors	collaborating persons
1	Archiyun Ltd.		
3	Ing. Michal Palašček	Jakub Finger/ PARTEO s.r.o.	Ing. arch. Miroslava Šešulková Ing. arch. Karolína Burešová
4	Ing. arch Marek Štěpán Atelier Štěpán s.r.o.	Prokop Matěj Ondřej Hanuš	
5	Vladislav Sudžum, PR AKVS Arhitektura	Anaela Karabašević Ana Petrović Nikola Milanović Ema Adraević	
7	Ing. arch. Radko Květ	Ing. Zdeněk Sendler Ing. arch. Pavel Pijáček Ing. Radka Táborová, Dis.	Ing. Lídie Šušlíková
9	Zoidberg Projekt s.r.o.	Mgr. art. Peter Beňo Ing. Katarína Beňová Ing. arch. Viliam Holeva	

10	AMID CERO9 SLP Cristina Diaz Moreno Efren García Grinda	Peter Zsuzsa	Lászlo Fosztó Lorenzo Perri
11	Benjamin Riley	Armelle Vidal	
12	Jakub Klaška LTD	Jakub Klaška Barbora Klaška Jan Klaška Sonia Magdziarz Tugyan Kepkep	
13	Maxim Turba, zahradní architektura	Ing. Radka Špičáková Ing. arch. Eva Velková	
14	Ing. Arch Tomáš Růžička	Ing. arch. Jiří Kolomazník Ing. arch. Barbora Predáčová Ing. arch. Adéla Varmužová MgA. Pavla Voborník Kačírková, Ph.D. Ph.D., Ing. Daniel Matějka Bc. et Bc. Michal Doležal	
15	Sitou Adolphe	Amirat Abdenour SITOU Architecture	
16	MgA. Marcela Steinbachová, Ph.D.	Ing. Vít Holý Ing. Eliška Slabochová	
17	Ing. arch. Michal Kvapil	Ing. akad. arch. Jan Konečný, CSc. Zdena Hochmanová	RNDr. Jan Hollan MVDr. Romana Doležalová Ing. Ivo Dostál
18	Ing. arch. Vladislav Králíček	Ing. arch. The Hong Nhung Ing. arch. Roman Gale	Tereza Škoulová
19	Sibre, s.r.o.	Ing. arch. Jiří Trojan Ing. arch. Jiří Brzobohatý Ing. arch. Gabriela Buzková	
20	symbio studio s.r.o. Ateliér Kopecký s.r.o.	Pavla Drbalová Marie Gelová Sandra Chlebovská Jan Kopecký Adam Kořistka	
22	OBJEKTOR ARCHITEKTI s.r.o.	Petra Karlová Tereza Scheibová	

		Pavína Malíková Aleš Steiner Jakub Červenka Václav Šuba	
23	MRZ ES		
24	Yoshiko Sato / IIA Atelier	Sayantán Chakraborty Alberto García Ortega	
25	Mark Dorrian, Architect	Mark Dorrian Adrian Hawker	
26	ARS FABRICA s.r.o.	Ing. arch. MgA. Květa Čulejová	
28	Ing. Arch. Michal Bogár	Ing. arch. Mária Bogárová Ing. Alžběta Ondrušková Ing. arch. Stanislav Ondruš	
29	Marc Subirana Jordi Miàs Jordi Artigas Marc Subirana		
30	Ing. Arch. Karel Cieslar	Ing. arch. Kamil Koláček BcA. Monika Drbalová	
31	Sokoban studio s.r.o.	MgA. Petr Souček Ing. Lucie Milovská, Ph.D. MgA. Tamara Staňová Ing. arch. Jakub Loučka Ing. Simona Rhümkorf	MgA. Filip Kotlář MgA. Stanislav Pech
33	Amos Amit Architect		
34	SIEBERT + TALAŠ, spol. s.r.o.	Matěj Siebert Roman Talaš Ivan Kulifaj Tomáš Klasek Peter Pasečný	
36	PROJEKTIL ARCHITEKTI s.r.o.	Doc. Ing. arch. Roman Brychta Ing. arch. Petr Lešek MgA. Renata Horová PhDr. Vít Havránek Ph.D.	MgA. Klára Táboříková Ing. Martina Forejtová
37	Arch. Massimo Lovera, Steget S.r.l.		

38	Ramón Fernandez - Alonso Borrajo, Architect	Ignacio Fernández-Alonso Araluce Jorge Asencio Juncal Fidel Garrido Carretero	Evangelia Chatzimpalasi Pablo Liñán Contreras Alberto Barragán Torres Alfonso Pedrosa Campoy Jesús Suárez Torres
39	Dipl. Ing. Mirko Lev	Ing. arch. Pavel Rada	Ing. arch. Monika Hlubinková Ing. arch. Lenka Bažík Ing. arch. Lukáš Darda
40	Ermal Brahimaj / BRAHIMAJ ARCHITECT	Alessio Primavera Enrico Turini Elena Varini	
41	Jakub Cigler architekti a.s.	Doc. akad. soch. Václav Cígler Doc. Ing. arch. Jakub Cígler B.arch. Peter Bednár	
42	Ethereal Designs		

The jury meeting ended at 6:30 PM

Written by Karolína Koupalová
Competition Secretary


12. Attendance list from the second assessment session of the jury

Prezenční listina

Krajinářsko-architektonická soutěž o návrh
„Lety u Písku. Památník holokaustu Romů a Sintů v Čechách“

Hodnotící jednání poroty v 2. kole

20. 5. 2020, Auditorium Národní galerie ve Veletržním paláci

řádní členové poroty závislí	
PhDr. Jana Horváthová ředitelka Muzea romské kultury	
Čeněk Růžička předseda Výboru pro odškodnění romského holokaustu	
Martin Martínek, M.A. zástupce Ministerstva kultury ČR	
řádní členové poroty nezávislí	
Ing. arch. Josef Pleskot architekt	
Ing. Vladimír Sitta krajinář	
Mgr. Emílie Rigová výtvarná umělkyně	jednání přítomna on-line
Mgr. Rostislav Koryčánek kurátor Moravskoslezské galerie v Brně	
náhradníci poroty závislí	
Mgr. Anna Mišková historička Muzea romské kultury	
Rudolf Murka zástupce pozůstalých po obětech tábora	OMLUVEN
náhradníci poroty nezávislí	
Ing. arch. Regina Loukotová architektka	
Ing. arch. Igor Marko architekt	OMLUVEN -jednání přítomen on-line-
organizátor soutěže – ONplan lab s.r.o.	
Ing. Petr Návrat, MSc. přezkušovatel soutěžních návrhů	
Ing. Karolína Koupalová sekretář soutěže	