

Mixed Holding “Elektroprivreda Republike Srpske“

Parent Joint-stock Company Trebinje

Competition Jury for evaluation of the Proposals received under the Public Invitation for procurement of services for development of the Conceptual Architectural and Urban Design for construction of the Congress Center in Trebinje

Ref.no.:

Date: 11 March 2024

Minutes of the First Working Meeting

By the Decision of the Management Board of MH “ERS” MP a.d. Trebinje number: 03/3-3333-1/23 as of 6 October 2023, the Competition Jury was appointed for evaluation of the Proposals received under the Public Invitation for procurement of services for development of the Conceptual Architectural and Urban Design for construction of the Congress Center in Trebinje, consisting of:

- 1) Luka Petrović, M.Sc.M.E. – Chairman
- 2) Prof. Vladan Đokić, Ph.D. in Arch.Eng. – Deputy Chairman
- 3) Prof. Vladimir Lojanica, Ph.D. in Arch.Eng. – Member
- 4) Prof. Saša Čvoro, Ph.D. in Arch.Eng. – Member
- 5) Prof. Svetlana Perović, Ph.D. in Arch.Eng. – Member
- 6) Dragan Šiniković, Ph.D. in Arch.Eng. – Member
- 7) Prof. Miomir Mijić, Ph.D. in El.Eng. – Member
- 8) Radojka Nožica, Arch.Eng. – Member

Substitute Members:

- 1) Prof. Ivan Rašković, Ph.D. in Arch.Eng.
- 2) Danilo Ilić, Civ.Eng.

Expert Rapporteurs:

- 1) Tijana Kozić, Arch.Eng.
- 2) Slađana Prcović, Arch.Eng.

Secretary:

- 1) Đorđe Jelić, B.LL.

The Competition Jury held the first informal meeting on 8 March 2024 in the amended composition, because Prof. Vladan Đokić, Ph.D. was absent for justified reasons and his place was taken by Prof. Ivan Rašković, Ph.D. as a substitute member. The conditions and program of the Public Competition were verified and a quantitative review of the number of received Proposals was carried out. For

Proposals submitted properly and within the deadline, the designation of Competition Proposals was initiated by assigning a reference number. The Expert Rapporteurs reviewed the received Proposals in the period from 8 March 2024 to 11 March 2024. At the very beginning of the first working meeting, the Expert Rapporteurs informed all members of the Competition Jury about the number of received Proposals in electronic form in accordance with the conditions of the Public Competition and the specified deadline and submitted the Report in writing regarding the compliance of the received Proposals with the conditions of the Public Competition and orally explained each received Proposal. In accordance with the Rules of Procedure of the Competition Jury, all present members of the Competition Jury agreed that in the first round, after the review of all Proposals prepared by the Expert Rapporteurs, the voting should be on the principle of absolute majority, i.e. that only those Proposals for which each member of the Competition Jury agreed that they had not met the set conditions and criteria from the Public Invitation should be eliminated.

After reviewing all Proposals, the members of the Competition Jury agreed not to pass in the second round the Proposals that had the following reference codes assigned to them, because they did not meet the specified conditions or the Public Competition program:

03 (01994TA), 04 (2401SC), 05 (8235ER), 07 (16761TS), 08 (19103DM), 10 (28031PJ), 11 (29105VS), 12 (35870HA), 13 (45680DH), 15 (62339EK), 16 (77778GS), 17 (87429YM), 18 (60923KP), 19 (1625AM), 20 (S32323B), 21 (22024LB), 22 (01040OO), 24 (00030MA), 26 (17998BH), 27 (31148ЛК), 28 (78624HM), 29 (24525GI), 30 (07014BO), 31 (12468WJ), 32 (90909QQ), 33 (88888AA), 37 (22238ДC), 38 (13623AR).

In the process of further consideration and analysis of the remaining Proposals, all members of the Competition Jury agreed to apply voting or decision-making in the next round on the principle of a simple majority of the Competition Jury members.

The Proposal under reference number 01 (00211DG) was noted as constructively unrealistic; it was a facility of spectacle; individual facilities stood well; it had a problem of urbanism of different structure. The Proposal under reference number 02 (01037NB) was noted to be futuristic; it lacked rationality and functionality; it was best elaborated; the focus was on modernity; to be a "landmark", there was a lot of ambience and sub-ambience; it would be difficult to implement due to seismology. The Proposal under reference number 06 (12784AD) was noted to be too conventional and did not respond to the set request for "landmark" architectural expression. The Proposal under reference number 09 (19022NE) was noted as interesting, up-to-date, modern; denivelation with amphitheatres was good, the entrances and the technological part should be additionally worked on. The Proposal under reference number 14 (50632DE) was noted to be out of context. The Proposal under reference number 23 (28028AR) was noted that there were the necessary spectacularities in the architectural sense; the theater was well designed. The Proposal under reference number 25 (01998LY) was noted to have similarities to the Proposal under reference number 35 but it was not of sufficient quality as the Proposal under reference number 35. The Proposal under reference number 34 (59920MM) was noted to be a good solution; the halls were well designed, but the appearance was difficult to maintain due to the climate conditions – storms and sunshine. The Proposal under reference number 35 (51300YШ) was noted to be a good urban solution; there was no spatial and design spectacularity required; the concert hall was questionable and the constructive system was inadequate. The Proposal under reference number 36 (30211LP) was noted to have

taken into account conditions of the terrain; it was interesting; the entrance for audience was problematic, there was a communication gap.

After reviewing the submitted Proposals (animation, cross-sections, 3D views), in the second round of voting the Competition Jury members agreed to eliminate the Proposals under the following reference numbers:

01 (00211DG), 06 (12784AD), 14 (50632DE) and 34 (59920MM).

All Competition Jury members agreed that the selection of the remaining six Proposals was made in such a way that three Proposals would be awarded prizes while three Proposal would be awarded non-monetary acknowledgement.

The Proposal under reference number 02 (01037NB) was noted to be well done, having a radical approach; it was at the same time unrealistic in terms of seismics; it had functional deficiencies and a mannerist approach. The Proposal under reference number 09 (19022NE) was noted that it worked great in the aspect of architectural expression; it met the Competition program; it resorted to an atypical and bold solution; a spectacular facility was designed. The Proposal under reference number 23 (28028AR) was noted to have problem with design of halls above the halls and the winding terrace leading to the roof could hardly be sustainable in the local climate. As for the Proposal under reference number 25 (01998LY), the lack of a theater hall, stage and side stages was noted, but it provided a basis for the future spatial, planned development of a new part of the city. The Proposal under reference number 35 (51300UŠ) was noted to have an interesting urban direction but also a weak architectural expression; it did not represent the facility of spectacle, but an interesting urban idea in connection with the further, planned development of the area. The Proposal under reference number 36 (30211LP) was noted to be of a high quality, to have prospect, to have a walkway elevating above the ground; while the problem was large glass transparent surfaces of the halls, because they would eliminate the possibility of light design during performances.

The Competition Jury unanimously decided that excellent work had been done, that the Competition was successful and thus concluded the first part of its work. Continuation of work was scheduled for 12 March 2024 at 8 a.m.

The meeting started at 10 a.m. and ended at 4:30 p.m.

Prof. Ivan Rašković, Ph.D. in Arch.Eng. – Deputy Chairman

Prof. Vladimir Lojanica, Ph.D. in Arch.Eng. – Member

Prof. Saša Čvoro, Ph.D. in Arch.Eng. – Member

Prof. Svetlana Perović, Ph.D. in Arch.Eng. – Member

Dragan Šiniković, Ph.D. in Arch.Eng. – Member

Prof. Miomir Mijić, Ph.D. in El.Eng. – Member

Radojka Nožica, Arch.Eng. – Member

Secretary:

Đorđe Jelić, B.LL.

Chairman of the Competition Jury:

Luka Petrović, M.Sc.M.E.
