INTERNATIONAL LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURAL COMPETITION FOR THE DESIGN OF ZARYADYE PARK
The Moscow City Government invites Russian and international teams of landscape architects, architects and urban planners to develop new designs for a park in Zaryadye district, at the very heart of Moscow and in close vicinity to the Kremlin.

This document contains the terms of the competition, and a summary of its main objectives and programme.

In the first phase of the competition, six teams will be selected to develop final design proposals to be submitted for the second phase of the competition.

Production:

Project team
Oliver Carroll
Natalya Ivlikova
Maria Kosareva
Olga Khokhlova
Sergey Kulikov
Ivan Kuryachiy
Denis Leontiev
Varvara Melnikova
Alexandr Ostrogorsky
Maria Ponomareva
Olga Romanova
Alena Sibiryakova
Valeriya Shvets
Alena Shlyakhovaya
Kira Tarbazheeva
Natalya Volkova
Alena Zhmurova

Experts
Mikhail Blinkin
Pavel Kupriyanov
Mikhail Lurye
Grigory Revzin
Taisija Volftrub

Legal support
Burchills Advocates Bureau

This document has been produced by the Strelka Institute for Media, Architecture and Design at the request of the Scientific Research and Design Institute of the Moscow Master Planners Office (NIIPI Genplan). It has been produced as part of a consultancy services contract for preparatory work and realisation of a landscape-architecture competition and related development concepts for the 20-25 Zaryadye site.

The Rossiya joint stock company owns exclusive license rights to this document.
CONTENTS

Introduction
  Foreword of Sergey Sobyanin, Mayor of Moscow 2
  Foreword of Sergey Kuznetsov, Moscow Chief Architect 3
  About the competition  6
  Competition timeline 11
  Jury members  13

History
  Historical timeline 13
  Zaryadye: history
  Surviving constructions 17

Context
  Contemporary context  19
  Surrounding areas  21
  Expert comments  27

Competition requirements  29
  Introduction
  Themes
  Park programm

Competition regulations  37
INTRODUCTION

COMPETITION FOR THE CONCEPT OF MOSCOW’S MAIN PARK
The City of Moscow’s new development policy is directed towards making Russia’s capital a city made for life and for people. In practice, this will demand a whole range of programmes and measures, but the task of developing public space is of particular significance.

We started our work in the city by improving courtyards, parks and green spaces, by creating pedestrian zones, and by bringing squares and building facades into good order. The work is not over yet, but we are already facing up to new and greater tasks, searching for solutions to make our urban environment even more attractive.

We are paying particular attention to Moscow’s historical centre, and it is here, in Zaryadye district, that we plan to embark on a unique project to create a new park.

The site is located on the banks of the Moskva river — right in the centre of the city, next to Red Square, the Kremlin, and the many other historical and cultural attractions loved by Muscovites and visitors alike. On the other hand, any architectural concept must consider real transport and construction constrains.

Understanding how to tap the potential of this public space, and how to find solutions to these problems is not only of relevance to this particular project. It will offer new perspectives for development of the entire city.

I’m certain that an international competition to develop concepts for the new park will interest professionals working both in our country and abroad. The very best ideas and suggestions presented in the competition will be used in the final plan, and will serve to further the development and upgrading of the city.

Sergei Sobyanin
Mayor of Moscow
Contemporary Moscow, is a vivid, energetic and expanding megalopolis; a large financial and industrial centre with a fast growing economy. What the city lacks however, are recreational spaces, places where people can feel at ease.

The construction boom has deprived Moscow of it’s human scale. Our task is to revive it, by developing pedestrian infrastructure and green areas throughout the city centre. In order to achieve this very important aim however, we must learn how best to roll-out precise, targeted projects onto the urban landscape.

The Zaryadye ‘Russia’ Park will form the central piece among a number of projects targeted at repairing, recreating, and giving new life to the city’s urban environment. The project will also establish a precedent – modern Moscow’s first successful international architecture competition.The competition winner will be tasked with convincing the general public that contemporary landscape architecture can prosper in contemporary Moscow.

Zaryadye will not only become symbolic of modern Moscow — it will also act to positively inform all aspects of future development in the city.

We are looking for the strongest and most interesting teams to take on this exciting project. The scale of the task is huge; the opportunity to impact everyday life of modern Moscow is once in a lifetime.

Sergey Kuznetsov
Moscow Chief Architect
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$1.5 BILLION
SITE’S VALUE, ACCORDING TO FORBES (№ 02 (107) 2013)

$11,538
VALUE PER M²

16 MONUMENTS ON THE UN LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE SITES ARE LOCATED WITHIN A 1 KM RADIUS

5 MIN
WALK TO LENIN’S MAUSOLEUM

300 M
DISTANCE TO RED SQUARE
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- **13 HA** Surface area of the territory
- **16 m** Height of the slope from Varvarka street to Moskva River.
- **5 Churches** located within the competition area
- **2 Museums** in Zaryadye
ABOUT THE COMPETITION

Preconditions

In terms of its significance, the Zaryadye park project is without precedent. It is impossible to find a similar undeveloped site in the heart of any other global capital. This is why the Moscow City Government has commissioned an international competition to develop the site. The park that will be built here will project an entirely new image of Moscow and Russia upon the world. The competition will rank among the most important architectural happenings of recent decades. It stands alongside the development of Ground Zero in New York, the reconstruction of the Reichstag in Berlin and the competition for a new cultural district in West Kowloon, Hong Kong.

Background history

The Zaryadye city district is located just a minute’s walk from the Kremlin and the Red Square. Sitting on the most expensive land in Russia’s capital, the site today forms the largest wasteland in the heart of Moscow, holding huge development potential.

The Zaryadye territory currently combines an unparalleled location with concrete dereliction. It is a place of rich history, and as such provides the perfect site to develop new trajectories in landscape architecture in the city. It boasts one of the best panoramic views of Moscow, but it’s 13 acres of land are currently enclosed. It is simultaneously an area of attraction, and a forgotten zone of exclusion.

Ever since the first settlement in the 11th century, this site has always bustled with life. At first, it was a lively river port. In the 16th century, when Moscow became the Imperial capital, the area became the settlement for aristocrats and diplomats. During the 18th century, these settlers moved to St Petersburg, the new Russian capital, and Zaryadye turned into a colourful slum. By the early 20th century, the area had become a densely built and cheerful quarter of the old city. Yet the entire area was subsequently demolished as part of Stalin’s reconstruction of Moscow.

The tallest skyscraper in Moscow was due to emerge from the site, but instead, after the project failed to come to fruition, the largest hotel in the world – the Rossiya hotel – was built. In 2006, the hotel was demolished, and the area fenced off; the concrete fence surrounding the site became the largest advertising space in Europe.

The fence stood for six years, until January 2012, when during a visit to the area, Vladimir Putin suggested to the new Mayor of Moscow, Sergey Sobyanin that a park be created out of the wastelands. Within this single decision, a piece of ‘golden land’ next to the Kremlin was given back to the city and its inhabitants.

Aim

The aim of the competition is to develop a landscape architecture concept and, on the basis of that, to create a contemporary park with high quality infrastructure, open for the public all year round.

Competition Objectives

The objectives of the competition are: to arrive at a strategy for development and planning of the park; to make spatial decisions for the landscape architecture of the park; to propose an overarching urban, spatial and architectural solution for other elements of the park, such as buildings and structures, a mul-
tifunctional complex, parking and the Moskva River embankment; and to determine the location, size and volume requirements of the Philharmonic building complex and the hotel (architectural solutions of these buildings are not included in the objectives of this competition).

Who we are looking for

We are inviting architects, landscape architects and urban planners, who can bring together multidisciplinary teams of specialists in the fields of engineering, management of public spaces, entertainment industry, cultural programming, economy, sociology, anthropology, dendrology, ecology and wildlife management.

Competition format

The competition format will be in two-stages with an open prequalification to select teams for the second stage.
Stage 1: Pre-qualification of competitors. Six teams will be selected to participate in the second stage.
Stage 2: Concept competition. Winner and finalists (second and third) will be selected.

Main dates

Deadline for registration of applications
22 May 2013
First stage jury meeting, selecting 6 participants for the second stage of the competition
17 June 2013
Deadline for submission of the competition projects
27 September 2013
Second stage jury meeting, selecting winner
1-12 November 2013

Rewards

Each of the six teams selected after the first stage jury meeting of the competition will receive compensation to the amount of $80,000 USD exclusive of VAT covering the concept development expenses.

Implementation

The client will intend to implement the project with direct participation of the author of the chosen landscape and architectural concept. Following the result of the competition, a contract will be drawn up between the competition initiator and author to develop the preliminary design, which will ensure that all parties agree on the key visual, technical and technological decisions to be made, as well as the time period and cost of their implementation, up and until the final project documentation.
## COMPETITION SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>22 APRIL</td>
<td>COMPETITION ANNOUNCED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 APRIL - 22 MAY</td>
<td>ONLINE FORUM BEGINS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>22 MAY</td>
<td>DEADLINE FOR APPLICATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 MAY - 14 JUNE</td>
<td>ANALYSIS OF APPLICATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>17 - 18 JUNE</td>
<td>JURY MEETING</td>
<td>SELECTION OF 6 COMPETITION TEAMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 JUNE - 2 JULY</td>
<td>ARRIVAL OF COMPETITORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28 JUNE - 20 SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>COMPETITION PERIOD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 JULY - 2 SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>ONLINE FORUM OPENS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27 SEPTEMBER - 1 NOVEMBER</td>
<td>JUDGMENT OF ENTRIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>DEADLINE FOR COMPETITION ENTRIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>21 OCTOBER</td>
<td>DEADLINE FOR COMPETITION MODELS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 12 NOVEMBER</td>
<td>JURY MEETING</td>
<td>SELECTION OF WINNER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### JURY MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position / Affiliation</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Heather Deal</td>
<td>Councillor, City of Vancouver</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yuri Grigoryan</td>
<td>Head of &quot;Project Meganom&quot; Architectural Bureau, Director of Educational Programs at Strelna Institute for Media, Architecture and Design</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sergei Kapkov</td>
<td>Minister of the Moscow Government, Head of the Department of Culture of Moscow</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Keith Kerr</td>
<td>Chairman of The Development Studio</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Alexander Kibovsky</td>
<td>Minister of the Moscow Government, Head of the Department of Cultural Heritage of Moscow</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Anton Kulbachevsky</td>
<td>Minister of the Moscow Government, Head of the Department for Environmental Management and Protection of Moscow</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sergei Kuznetsov</td>
<td>Chief Architect of Moscow, Chairman of the Architectural Board of Moscow</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mikhail Posokhin</td>
<td>General Director of State Unitary Enterprise &quot;Mosproject-2&quot;, Member of the Russia Academy of Arts</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Gaëtan Royer</td>
<td>Manager of Metropolitan Planning, Environment &amp; Parks for Metro Vancouver in 2011-2013, Author of “Time for Cities”</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Saskia Sassen</td>
<td>Professor of Sociology, Department of Sociology, Co-Chair of Committee on Global Thought, Columbia University</td>
<td>The Netherlends / USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Martha Schwartz</td>
<td>Head of Martha Schwartz Partners</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Natalya Sergunina</td>
<td>Deputy Mayor for Property and Land Relations</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ken Smith</td>
<td>Principal of WORKSHOP: Ken Smith Landscape Architect</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Martha Thorne</td>
<td>Executive Director, Pritzker Architecture Prize</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Antoni Vives i Tomàs</td>
<td>Vice Mayor of Barcelona</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Peter Walker</td>
<td>Head of PWP Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HISTORY

NEW HISTORY OF THE OLD CITY
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TIMELINE

First mention of Zaryadye in the chronicles.

Under Ivan the Terrible, wooden trade stalls are built in the eastern part of Red Square. In 1595, by order of Boris Godunov, they are replaced by stone constructs. The site is named Zaryadye - meaning the area behind the row of trade stalls. Around the same time, a system of street lanes are formed, which existed up until the 1950’s.

Construction of the stone fortifications of the Kremlin.

Construction of the Kitay-gorod walls.

Ivan the Terrible confers the English court, now the mansion of the Old English court.

Znamensky Monastery is built on the former estate of the Romanov boyars.

Gostiny Dvor is founded. The prohibition of wooden constructions inside Kitay-Gorod.

Under Ivan the Terrible, wooden trade stalls are built in the eastern part of Red Square. In 1595, by order of Boris Godunov, they are replaced by stone constructs. The site is named Zaryadye - meaning the area behind the row of trade stalls. Around the same time, a system of street lanes are formed, which existed up until the 1950’s.

The mounds are built along the walls of the Kremlin and Kitay-gorod, which change the sanitary situation in Zaryadye.

The capital is moved to St Petersburg. Zaryadye is turned into an area of artisans and small merchants.

The fire changes the social composition of the population: houses are bought by enterprisers, new rooming houses are built.

First mention of Zaryadye in the chronicles.

1340
1460-1495
1534-1538
1547
1556
1629-1631
1707-1708
1710
1775
1812
1730
1770
1790
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1890-e</td>
<td>Construction of Dmitry Chechulin’s Narkomtiazhprom ‘Stalin’ skyscraper begins. Many historic buildings were demolished in preparation for the building work, but in 1955, Kruschchev halts construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>The first night club and casino open in the Hotel Rossiya area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>With the opening of Glebovskoye Podvorye inn Zaryadye had become a hub of Moscow Jewish community. In the late XIX century the most part of city’s Jewish population, including the residents of Zaryadye, was deported by the order of General Governor Apostol Kostanda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934-1936</td>
<td>Competition for the design of the Narkomtiazhprom building at the Red Square are held. Ivan Leonidov’s design emerges victorious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-1969</td>
<td>Hotel Rossiya, also by Chechulin, is built on the existing skyscraper foundations. The building, with a concert hall and a cinema, is included in the Guinness Book of Records as the largest hotel in Europe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Hotel Russia is demolished, the area fenced off, and the surrounding boards become Europe’s largest advertisement space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Advertisements are removed from the site. Prime Minister Vladimir Putin announces a decision to turn Zaryadye into a park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Archival competition to create a new park for Moscow is announced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Photographs: ITAR-TASS, Yuriy Artamonov / RIA, Oleg Lastochkin / PhotoSoyuz, Aleksey Druzhinin / RIA*
HISTORY OF ZARYADYE DISTRICT

Port and merchant settlement 11th-16th centuries

The area immediately to the east of the Kremlin was incorporated into the city-proper during the very earliest period in Moscow’s history. It was here wherein the very first settlements of an emerging city appeared, between the river and the fortress at Borovitsky Hill.

The district contains the site of one of Moscow’s earliest churches, the Church of St Nikola Markov. It was no by coincidence that the church was dedicated to St Nikolay: the original urban settlement grew from the river’s port; St Nikolay was the patron saint of shipwreck victims.

As Moscow later grew and transformed into a powerful Russian principality, the area took on another role, developing into a centre for economic activity, for artisans and tradesmen.

The settlement developed along two transport arteries: Velikaya street, which ran from the docks to the Kremlin, and Varvarka street, which was formed from part of the Vladimir road. The latter was a favoured spot for merchants trading with Byzantine and Mediterranean countries, traders who would in turn make the area their home.

A quarter for courtiers and diplomats 16th to 18th centuries

Over the 14th and 15th centuries, Moscow emerged from a series of local military conflicts and political intrigues into a leading position among rival settlements. New people appeared on the streets of the township: small traders were replaced by feudal lords, and wealthy merchants by artisans and craftsmen. Representative offices of foreign governments were established. Ivan the Terrible’s reign saw the opening of the Old English Court, which would become an important trade and diplomatic centre, located on Varvarka street right next the Moscow Mint (Monetny Dvor).

The castle walls of the Kremlin (1485-1495), Kitay-gorod (1534-1538 gg.) and the Bely Gorod “White City” (1585-1593) were built at the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth century. These formed three defence zones that consolidated the radial city layout, and formed the boundaries and functional divisions of the city regions.

The construction of the Kitay-gorod walls disconnected Zaryadye from the river embankment, and the port ceased to be the core function of the region. Close to the Kremlin, Varvarka became the district’s central street, and Velikaya street, leading from the Kremlin to the river piers, was renamed Mokrinsky lane. An area of trade stalls became established on Red Square around this time, and the neighbourhood was renamed from the simple Porechnaya (“by the river”) into Zaryadye (“behind the rows of stores”).

Riverside slums 18th–20th centuries

During the reign of Peter the Great, new ground fortifications around the Kitay-gorod walls clogged natural and artificial drains to the river, meaning that dirt and sewage from higher areas started to flow into low-set Zaryadye. The area became dominated by slums: the closer to the river, the poorer the inhabitants, the harder the life. The district’s backyard trading stalls and substandard living quarters contrasted with the district on the other side of Varvarka Street, where the trading centre of the bourgeois city, complete with the Gostiny Dvor (indoor merchant and warehouse halls), stock exchange and shops stood.

Restoration of the House of Romanov Boyars and the construction of pompous developments such as the Marozov Mansion and the offices of the insurance company Yakor at the end of the nineteenth century only served to reinforce this urban divide.
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History of Zaryadye district

1597

Khotevskiy plan, 1852
City block on Vasilyevskaya square. Right: Church of St Nicholas Moskvoretsky (demolished in the 1930s). 1890s

View from Ivan the Great Bell Tower. 1884

View of the Kremlin. 1860

View of Zaryadye. 1880

History of zaryadye district photos - oldmos.ru
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History of Zaryadye district

Photo taken between 1898 and 1901
Nor would significant change be brought about after the revolution: the cheap residential buildings were simply transformed into communal apartments, while Soviet institutions, warehouses and shops emerged in place of the former trade, warehouse and office buildings.

**USSR facade 1934-1991**

From the early 1930s, an effort was made to turn Zaryadye into a showcase for the new regime. Between 1934 and 1936, two design competitions were held to identify a design for the new People’s Commissariat of Construction of Heavy Industry in the area. The new building was intended to serve as a symbol for national rebirth, of the country’s transformation from agrarian backwater to industrial superpower. Moscow’s 1935 General Plan similarly projected a park area in the Zaryadye district — between the river and planned new buildings. The competition attracted leading architects of the time, each representing many different generations and directions of the Soviet avant-garde: Konstantin Melnikov, the Vesnin brothers, Alexey Shchusev, Boris Iofan, Ivan Leonidov and Arkady Mordvinov. The building was never realised, but the Zaryadye district nonetheless began to prosper. In 1936-1937 the Moskva river embankment was re-constructed: clad in granite, new reinforcements were made of the quay sides. Around the same time, authorities began to demolish the less attractive buildings in the area, as well as some other monuments, such as the Kitay-gorod walls.

In 1940, the area was once again selected as the location for a major development project, this time the building of the Council of People’s Commissars was targeted for renewal. The ongoing war across Europe however, put a hold on construction, while the newer church of St. Nicholas Mokry, built at the end of the 17th century to replace the former church, was demolished.

At the end the 1940s, Zaryadye was chosen as the site for a new a skyscraper, the eighth of Stalin’s “sisters”. This building was to be made by Moscow’s Chief Architect Dmitry Chechulin. In preparation for construction, all of Zaryadye’s remaining old buildings were demolished, and residents removed to new purpose-built blocks outside the district; while Moscow’s first extensive archaeological excavation began at the same time.

After Stalin’s death in 1953, works were brought to a halt, with only the foundation and basement floors of the new building having been built. It was not until the 1960s that the intended showcase building emerged from the site. This was to become the Rossiya, or ‘Russia’ hotel, the largest hotel in the world, with large concert hall and movie theatre. The project was led by the same Dmitry Chechulin who had been in charge of plans for the skyscraper. A few of the remaining Zaryadye buildings were restored around this time — these small buildings on the backdrop of the expansive modern hotel were to become a popular image of “Moscow now and then” on calendars and postcards thereafter.

**Benchmark 1991-2013**

By the 1990s, with a city on a radically new development trajectory, there was demand for hotels and cinemas of a new level of quality. The Rossiya hotel was never able to meet these modern standards, and in 2004 the building was condemned to demolition.

The hotel was bulldozed, but disputes over development and the global financial crisis have led to a situation of stasis in development. The area was fenced off, with the border screens temporarily utilised as the largest advertisement space in Europe. The fencing off of Zaryadye from the area practically removed the district from the fabric of the city altogether.

The modern chapter of Zaryadye’s history began in 2012. During a meeting between the City Mayor Sergei Sobyanin and Vladimir Putin — at the foot of the construction site — it was decided that a park would be built.
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Proposal for Narkomtyazhprom building by Ivan Leonidov

Proposal for the eighth "sister" by Dmitry Chechulin

Frozen construction of the high-rise

Cover of the Illustrated Supplement to Stroitel'nyaya Gazeta, October 1940
**KREMLIN HERITAGE PROTECTION ZONES**

1. **Restoration** - complex measures aimed for long-term conservancy of heritage objects, neutralization of distortions, exposure of object's major urban design qualities.

2. **Regeneration** - restoration and conservation of heritage objects, preservation and reconstruction of traditional qualities of valuable urban environment with allowable usage of compensative construction methods.

3. **Renovation** - renewal of existing urban environment aimed to support and reconstruction of traditional qualities of urban landscape and optimization of Moscow Kremlin perception conditions.
SCHEME OF PRECONDITIONS FOR PROJECT SITE HEIGHT RESTRICTIONS

- areas with various parameters of height restrictions
- control directions of visual perception
- allowed height restrictions in visual perception sectors
- objects with active design and silhouette qualities

Routes of comprehensive perception of territory of research:
- from Raushskaya embankment
- from Bolshoy Moskovetsky and Bolshoy Ustinsky bridges

- green areas
- Kitay-gorod wall

Areas with various parameters of height restrictions
Control directions of visual perception
Allowed height restrictions in visual perception sectors
Objects with active design and silhouette qualities

Routes of comprehensive perception of territory of research:
- from Raushskaya embankment
- from Bolshoy Moskovetsky and Bolshoy Ustinsky bridges
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SURVIVING CONSTRUCTIONS

1 Church of St Varvara
The first stone church of Varvara was built in 1514 by the Italian architect Aleviz Fryazin, who also took part in the building of the Kremlin. Part of the church’s original foundations and walls have been preserved in the existing building, which was built in 1796-1804 by P. P. Kazakov in a classical Moscow style. The church remains in operation.

2 Church of St Maxim the Blessed
The church was built some time before 1434, which is when Maxim the Blessed is said to have been buried here. The existing chapel was built in 1698 and the bell tower in 1829. The church remains in operation.

3 The Church of St. George at Pskov Hill
The first stone church on Pskov Hill was built some time before 1462, according to historical records. The church is associated with the settlement of people originating from Pskov, who resided next to the church in the 16th century. The present building was constructed in 1657 using fragments from ancient structures. The bell tower was built in 1818. The church remains in operation.

4 Mansion of the Old English Court
This is one of the oldest preserved stone buildings in Moscow. The mansion faces south towards the now extinct yard, with the north face of the building dug into the hillside. The lower limestone floor was probably built in the early 16th century, when the ownership was held by the innkeeper, I. D Bobrischevu. In 1556, the property was given to English merchants, present in the city since 1649, as their residence in Moscow. Today the building houses a museum and hosts chamber music concerts.

5 Old Sovereign's Court — Zmanensky Monastery
The Znamensky monastery was founded between 1629-1631 at the Old Sovereign's Court, the estate of Tsar Michail Fedorovich’s ancestors. The monastery occupied the entire quarter. The stone manor house on Varvarka street and the domestic church of Zhnamenya were constructed later in the 16th century. Today, the house of the Romanov boyars is located on the territory and working as a museum.
Church of the Conception of Saint Anne at the Corner

The Church of the Conception of Saint Anne is first mentioned in 1493. It was built at the corner of Moscow, where the Kitay-gorod wall was built in the 1530s. The present church building was probably built in the second quarter of the 16th century. The South Aisle of St. Mina was attached in the first quarter of the 17th century, and the north aisle of St Catherine in the years 1658-1668. Today the church is closed for congregations, since it is located behind the security fence surrounding Zaryadye.

Kitay-gorod walls

The walls of Kitay-gorod, Moscow's first stone building, were built in 1534-1538 by the architect Petroc Minor, one of a group of Italians who helped build the Kremlin. In 18th -19th centuries, the walls' original function as strategic defence point became redundant, and as such were transformed for other purposes. The main historical uses of its inner side were for warehouses and barns, and rigging directly adjacent buildings.

After renovations in the 1920’s, the walls took on a new function — as an architectural monument along with the surrounding squares.

Moskva River Embankment

One of the first stone embankments of the Moscow River were constructed between 1795-1810. The retaining wall of the original quay was almost vertical in its profile and made of rubble masonry with hewn limestone revetments. The original waterfront was a metal grate with stone pedestals. On the waterfront area adjacent to Zaryadye territory there was a pier with stone steps down to the water near the Moskvoretsky bridge, and a stairwell pier opposite the Kitay-gorod passage. In 1936, the old stone embankment of the Moscow River underwent reconstruction. The stone walls were overlaid with concrete and the top surface was partly demolished.
A GREEN ALTERNATIVE TO THE RED SQUARE
Zaryadye is unique not only in terms of its location but also in terms of the degree and mix of people who pass through it each day. Geographically, it is the boundary between the officialdom and tourism of the Kremlin district, the business and trade of Kitay-gorod and the tranquil centres of Zamoskvorechye and Khitrovo.

Zaryadye is a key component of the city, linking the Kremlin, the river and the surrounding areas of central Moscow. Today, the main flow of people around Zaryadye are tourists, shop visitors from GUM and the Okhotny Ryad shopping centres, local office workers, students and parishioners of nearby churches. Residents of adjacent districts rarely visit Zaryadye.

GUM has more than 50,000 daily visitors (according to the official site), and almost 20 million visitors a year. National festivities and concerts at the Red Square can amass anywhere between 10,000 and 100,000 people at a time. Each year the area attracts a some 20 million visitors in total.

Zaryadye is located at the sharp corner of a green wedge, stretching along the Moskva River from the Sparrow Hills, through the Gorky Park and the fallen monument park to Bolotnaya Square. It is on opposing sides flanked by the Yauza Square, the Ilyinsky Boulevard and the Alexandrovsky Gardens. On its southern side, Zaryadye reaches down and stretches along the Moskva River embankment. An underground pedestrian passage connects Zaryadye with the waterfront. Nearby, there is a pier for a waterbus route which runs on the Moskva River from May to October. The Government of Moscow’s current infrastructure development plans include an increased use of the river as a transport route.

The plans envisage a common water bus link for all Moscow’s city parks. This would link Zaryadye with the central green areas such as Sparrow Hills, Gorky Park and Luzhniki.

Zaryadye is adjacent to the host of many an official state event, including the Victory Day military parade, and public festivities, such as the New Year celebrations on Red Square. It looks on to Vasilevsky Spusk, the venue for many large-scale music concerts. In wintertime, the Red Square operates as a popular skating-rink for up to 500 people at a time, and around one million visitors each season.

Zaryadye has a number of pedestrian zones in close proximity, including the Istorichnaya pedestrian zone on Nikolskaya Street, Teatralnaya on the Bolshaya Dmitrovka and Stoleshnikov lane and Muzeynaya, which leads from the Tretyakov Gallery to Bolotnaya Square. Zaryadye is located between Nikolskaya and Bolotnaya squares.

Zaryadye’s nearest metro stations are Okhotny Ryad, Ploschchad Revolyutsii, Teatralnaya, Kitai-gorod.
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1. View from Zaryadye to the Red Square

2. Fireworks on the Red Square

3. View on the GUM Department Store

4. Concert on the Red Square
SURROUNDING AREAS

Red Square and the Kremlin

This is the workplace for the president of the Russian Federation, the setting for important public holidays and ceremonies as well as the most visited tourist destination in the country. Small in size compared to the scale of the city, this area nonetheless is concentrated with a high number of important and protected buildings.

Surface area: Kremlin — 27.7 ha, Red Square — 9.3 ha
Transport: Pedestrian zone, vehicle access allowed with permit; next to 7 metro stations; bus, trolleybus and tram lines.

Kitay-gorod (Tverskoy District)

Formally speaking, Zaryadye overflows into Kitay-gorod, but historically it has always been seen as separate from it. Most parts of Kitai-gorod are federal institutions and private offices. The liveliest street is Nikolskaya St, which connects four squares — Red, Teatralnaya, Manezhnaya and Lubyanskaya. Large flows of tourists pass through the street on their way to Red Square and the Kremlin. There are a number of cafés, shops, clubs and bars located along it.

Size — 40 ha
Transport: 5 metro stations; bus, trolleybus and tram lines.

Bolotny Island (Zamoskvorechye)

Separated from Zaryadye by the Moskva River, Zamoskvorechye is considered as a relatively quiet district. In the 19th century it was primarily inhabited by representatives of the merchant class. The area boasts a mixed architecture — colourful office and residential buildings, cultural facilities and recreation areas. One of the most luxurious and well-known hotels in the city, the Balchug Hotel, is situated on Raushskaya Embankment, across the river from Zaryadye.

Size — 117 ha
Transport: 6 metro stations; bus, trolleybus and tram lines.

Khitrovka (Basmanny District)

Khitrovka is located east of Zaryadye, behind Staraya Ploschchad ('Old Square') and Ilyinsky Boulevard. The area is named after the legendary Khitrovskaya market, around which the old Moscow city slums were concentrated. It is considered to be one of the best preserved parts of Old Moscow.

In character and typology, the buildings are most similar to old districts of Zaryadye, which were demolished in 1947. Though now mainly a residential area, Khitrovka also hosts the State Historical Library and a few buildings of the Higher School of Economics.

Size — 50 ha
Transport: 3 metro lines (at Kitay-gorod station) 3 tram lines; 2 bus lines; 2 trolleybus lines.

Kulichki (Tagansky District)

Kulichki is located close to Zaryadye on the eastern side, starting from Kitaigorodskii passage, which runs alongside the preserved section of the wall in the area of the planned park. Kulichki divides Solyanka street into two parts. Opposite Zaryadye, in the western part of the district, are several of the presidential administration buildings and the Peter the Great Military Academy of Strategic Missile Forces. This academy is located along the river embankment in a former orphanage, and is protected as a monument of 18th century architectural heritage. The eastern part of Kulichki is dominated by residential areas.

Surface area — 32 ha
Transport: 3 metro lines (at Kitay-gorod station), 5 bus and minibus lines, 5 trolleybus lines and 2 tram lines.
URBAN CONTEXT

- project site area
- Kremlin and Red Square
- Hitrovka
- Bolotny ostrov
- Kitay-gorod
- Kulishki

Surrounding areas
Zaryadye Park: Request for expression of interest

FUNCTIONAL ZONES

- Project site area
- Commercial buildings
- Mixed-use buildings
- Office buildings
- Administrative buildings
- Residential buildings
- Medical facilities
- Moscow Kremlin
- Educational facilities
- Cultural facilities
- Hotels
- Religious buildings
- Green areas
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TRANSPORT

- project site area
- technical transport passage
- car traffic area
- direction of traffic movement
- intensity of traffic movements

- public transport stops
- pedestrian crossings
- pedestrian zones
- traffic lights

Red Square

TRANSPORT project site area

technical transport passage

car traffic area

direction of traffic movement

intensity of traffic movements

Red Square

Red Square

Red Square

Red Square
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PARKING

- Business-center parking
- Pavement parking
- Guest parkings
- Social facilities parking
- Project site area
- Number of parking lots
- Green areas

Map showing the distribution of parking areas and project site area within the Zaryadye Park area.
Operating passenger river routes

- route: Northern riverside station — "Bay of Joy" recreational area
- route: Troitse-Lykovo — Strogino
- route: Kievsky railway station - Novospassky bridge
- route: Luzhkov bridge - Novospassky bridge
- route: Kolomenskoye - Brateevo - Mar'ino
- route: Northern riverside station - Brateevo
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Moscow parks

1. Park Brattsevo
2. Park Severnoye Tushino
3. Khimki woodland park
4. Dmitrovsky Park
5. Park “VISHOM”
6. Park near Korovinskoie highway
7. Park (Northern) Dubky
8. Lianozovsky Park
9. Altufyevo Estate
10. Sanctuary Altufyevskiy
11. Medvedkovsky Forest Park
12. Park in Olonetsky passage
13. Babuskinsky Park
14. Park Djamarovsky pond
15. North River Terminal Park
16. Park Druzby
17. Moskvoreckiy history-theme natural park
18. Pokrovskoe-Streshnevo Forest Park
19. Park of Timiryazev Agricultural Academy (T.S.Kh.A.)
20. Park Dubky
21. Park Ostankino
22. Main Botanical Garden Named after N. V. Tsitsin RAS
23. Park of the 850th Anniversary of Moscow
24. Park Sokolniki
25. Yauzsky Lesopark
26. Losiny Island Forest Park
27. Rublevsky Park
28. Serebryany Bor
29. Birch Grove Park
30. Petrovsky Park
31. Moscow Hermitage Garden
32. Ekaterininskii park
33. Festivaln Park
34. Bauman Garden of Culture and Recreation
35. Lefortovsky Park of Culture and Recreation
36. Park Semenovsky
37. Izmailovsky Park
38. Filevsky Park
39. Victory (Pobedy) Park
40. Presnenskii Park
41. Park near Chinese Embassy
42. Botanical Garden of Moscow State University named after M. V. Lomonosov
43. Vorobyovy Gory (Sparrow Hills) park
44. Novodevichy Park
45. Neskuchny Garden
46. Gorky Park
47. Park of Arts Museon
48. Tagansky Park
49. Perovskiy Park
50. Kuskovo Forest Park
51. Park Raduga
52. Troparevsky Forest Park
53. Nikulino Park
54. Park in place of Nikolske manor estate
55. Park 50 Years of October
56. Southwest forest park
57. Park of Vorontsovo Manor
58. Teplostansky forest park
59. Park of Nagatino Water-Meadow
60. Park of the Kolomenskoe Manor
61. Park Pechatniki
62. Park Kuzminki
63. Park “850 anniversary of Moscow”
64. Golubinsky forest park
65. Bitsevski Forest
66. Butovo forest park
67. Yasenevo Park
68. Arshinovsky Park
69. Tsaritsyno, Birulovo forest park
70. Vidnovsky Forest Park
GREEN ZONES IN BOULEVARD RING
List of green zones in Boulevard Ring:

1. Nikitsky boulevard
2. Park near Nikitsky Gate
3. Tverskoy boulevard
4. Novopushkinsky garden
5. Gardens on the Pushkinskaya square
6. Strastnoy boulevard
7. Petrovsky boulevard
8. Gardens on the Neglinnaya street
9. Tsvetnoy boulevard
10. Rozhdestvensky boulevard
11. Sretensky boulevard
12. Chistye Prudy boulevard
13. Gardens near N. G. Chernyshevsky monument
14. Pokrovsky boulevard
15. Gogolevsky boulevard
16. Gardens on the Znamenka street
17. Gardens near the Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts
18. Gardens near Cathedral of Christ the Saviour
19. Nizhny Aleksandrovsky Garden
20. Aleksandrovsky Garden
21. Lawns on Manege Square
22. Taynitsky garden
23. The Grand Kremlin Public Garden
24. Senate Square
25. Lawn near Kremlin wall
26. Lawn near TsUM shopping center
27. Gardens on the Theatre Square
28. Gardens on the Revolution Square
29. Flower garden in place of the F. E. Dzerzhinsky monument
30. Gardens near the Solovetsky Stone
31. Il'insky gardens
32. Hill in place of the Kitai-gorod wall
33. Morozovsky garden
34. Milyutinsky garden
35. Ust'insky garden
36. Park of Arts "Museon"
37. Bolotnaya Square park
38. Yakimansky garden
39. Ordynski blind alley garden
40. Bolshaya Ordynka garden
41. Gardens near metro station Novokuznetskaya
42. Sadovnicheskaya embankment gardens
PHOTO FIXATION: VIEW OF ZARYADYE
Zaryadye Park: Request for expression of interest
Zaryadye Park: Request for expression of interest
PHOTO FIXATION: VIEW FROM ZARYADYE

Cathedral of St. Basil the Blessed

Church of the Holy Great Martyr Varvara
Gostiny Dvor multifunctional centre

Old English Court

Church of St. Maxim
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Former guest house of Z.M. Persits

Military Academy of the Strategic Missile Troops
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High-rise building at Kotelnicheskaya Embankment
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basement of Rossiya Hotel

Photo fixation: view from zaryadye
EXPERT COMMENTS

Michail Blinkin, Director, Institute for Transport Economics and Transport Policy, Higher School of Economics; professor and expert in the field of transport and road infrastructure

The site is not naturally suitable for projects attracting a large number of people at once, since the surrounding transport arteries are not designed to withhold large crowds. Exit from the site is more of a problem than access to it: exit is only possible along the waterfront, and the transport capacity around the waterfront is limited.

The territory is not naturally able to cope with sudden spikes in usage, like concerts and big events. Restrictions on the number of vehicle parking bays, the overall parking volume, tariff decisions and planning restrictions would of course help to mitigate the situation, but it would not change it profoundly. As such, it would be preferable to distribute visitor volume more evenly — both in terms of function and opening hours. For example, there might be several shops and museums, and a cinema varying screening times.

The immediate surroundings contain a comfortable pedestrian environment with attractive public spaces of low capacity and intensity. It would be difficult to make the surrounding streets completely pedestrian, but areas of restricted car traffic could be arranged. Current traffic levels on Varvarka street and neighbouring streets are not particularly high.

It should be understood that any parking facility in the area will attract not only visitors to the park, but also people working in neighbouring offices and shops. It would therefore be a good idea to build a car park of high capacity, yet it is not immediately clear where such a car park could be placed. Occupancy could be regulated by fees and regulations. It is a possibility that parking could be paid for alongside concert tickets, or the metro system could be used to bring people to the venue. An automated parking system might help solve some of the problems: it would require less space since there are no entry and exit ramps, and no turning circles are required. The problem remains, however, of queueing to and from the elevator.

Access to the river is most likely impossible. It is not obvious how one could narrow down the embankment road, currently in six lanes: it is an important transport artery of Moscow, indeed very often so busy it is not moving. Perhaps it would be possible to run the road underground through a tunnel, but the aesthetics of such a venture are questionable. Constructing such a tunnel would also incur almost insurmountable burdens, both administrative (a location just by the Kremlin) and technical (incurring conflicts with the river embankment foundations). Yet it is possible, at least in the warm season, to establish a river transport system with underground or overground pedestrian connections between the embankment and Zaryadye.

One final question is how to facilitate access for people coming from the Kitay-gorod metro station. The current structure — a narrow pavement leading down toward an underground passage — is unsuitable. A new, and more attractive solution, must be found.

Mikhail Lurie, PhD, History of Arts, Lecturer and Dean of the Faculty of Anthropology at the European University, St. Petersburg

The centrality of Zaryadye was one of the most important features of the area for former residents. Yet by the beginning of the 20th century, the district was dominated by slums. Zaryadye was a paradox, a fragment of the periphery located in the very heart of Moscow. This paradox has returned today, as the vacant space and constant building work common to the city’s outskirts characterise Zaryadye’s central location.

Before the area became Zaryadye - between the 12th and 16th centuries - it functioned as important trading port servicing the Kremlin. Later, from the 16th century onwards, the area was fenced off from its surroundings: the Kitay-gorod wall on two sides, the trade stalls and Varvarka street. Today, people still pass Zaryadye on their way to the Kremlin, GUM, Red Square and the Tretyakov Gallery. In other words, the district’s original transit function has been preserved; and as before, the district continues to be flanked by government buildings and commercial centres.
This is yet another paradox: despite its close proximity to the Kremlin and other facilities of national significance, Zaryadye has itself never managed to host any functions of federal power. Throughout its existence, the only building of state or institutional status to occupy the space was the Hotel Rossiya, which stood for just three decades.

The transitory nature of the area however, should be neither taken lightly nor relied on entirely. The park must become a place with its own set of values. It should transmit an openness and flexibility and conserve the district’s transitory character, while saturating it with new meanings.

Socially, this site is of national importance: it links areas that are of significance for both the capital and the country at large. It is important for the area to retain a Muscovite flavour, depicting the symbols of the existing and contemporary capital city.

In this sense, the history of the area is perhaps not quite as important as the setting. Zaryadye is on one side bordered by the Kremlin and Red Square, representing the city’s imperial and federal history; on the other side - by the Moscow River, and on the third – by Varvarka street, complete with its churches and museums. Fitting a park into this location is an exciting but comprehensive task.

While new buildings and developments must not ignore their historical surroundings, a reproduction of history is not appropriate. With the diversity of meaning which Zaryadye has held throughout its history, the choice of one single interpretation would certainly strike a false note. Rather than focus on direct reproductions, the area should be filled with small, communicative practices, including small-scale commercial functions. Large-scale trade has always been concentrated to Varvarka street; while in Zaryadye, commercial activity has traditionally been small-scale, and on occasions, even underground.

Taisija Volftrub, President of the Association of Landscape Architects of Russia, Professor of the International Academy of Architecture

Moscow is today undergoing a landscape renaissance, with a great deal of attention being paid to the improvement of green areas. Unfortunately, redevelopment is mostly dominated by commercial developments. Regardless of any service being provided, however, we should not forget that a park is something created by the elements of nature; a place where landscape is the dominant feature.

In the case of Zaryadye, it is important to try to understand the function of a city park situated in the very centre of a huge metropolis. What will be the aim of this type of park, which at just 13 hectares will not be particularly large? Whilst, there should be a defined activity program, there should not be rigid segregation: there is no need to divide the park into sections for children, culture, tourism or sports. Different functions should be mixed. There might need to be designated areas for some sports, but large-scale sporting activity would be inappropriate. The same is true for culture. Small-scale cultural recreation should be promoted — there could be an outdoor theatre for classical music concerts or theatre festivals. There should be small cafés, but no mass catering facilities. One comes to a park in search of a place of retreat. All functions there should be somewhat dimmed and de-concentrated in order to achieve an intimate, human scale. This is a green cultural space in the city centre.

It is important to consider the immediate surroundings of the park. Red Square is at one side, the river at the second and Kitay-gorod at the third. It is hard to imagine a more diverse immediate environment. Yet they must all be taken into account, and interlinked with an obligatory access to the river. The park should be penetrable and have interesting walking routes. It should have main and secondary entrances and exits.

It is important to retain the spirit of a Moscow park. Moscow parks differ from those of St Petersburg. In a sense, they imitate country estates. The layout of a park follows classical laws: entrance, central square, walking circle, active local dominant (lake, embankment, pond, concert pavilion). No park exists without a link to another place — otherwise it is an abstraction.
INITIAL PROJECT REQUIREMENTS

OLD CITY’S NEW HISTORY
INTRODUCTION

Significance of the Park

This will be the first public park built in Moscow for over 50 years. The last park was the Soviet Friendship Park, created for the 1958 Festival of Youth and Students. Since then, the practice of landscape and garden design has developed through several stages. Contemporary landscape design remains under-explored in Moscow, a city that otherwise reflects very European and modern developments in architecture, urban planning and consumption habits. Creating a landmark piece of landscape art — adapting best practice to the characteristics of the Moscow climate — is thus a matter of crucial importance.

Regardless of its eventual design, the Park will attract visitors from the nearby Red Square (about 20 million people per year) — Muscovites, tourists, domestic and foreign. As such the Park needs to be able to cope with large crowds, and that even the smaller, more intimate spaces of the area will incur high pressure usage. The city centre of Moscow is also a very dense urban environment. The current amount of green space in the city is only 1.5 m² per capita, and the need for recreational areas is keenly felt. Herein lies the main contradiction of this design project: the project must reproduce a fragment of the natural world within an overtly man-made environment. The basic idea behind the Park will be to create a green visitor attraction within a highly urbanised environment.

The exceptional location of the Park means that architects must pay attention to Park's visual interaction with key Moscow landmarks: the Kremlin, Red Square, the Moskva river, Kitay-gorod and the Zamoskvorechye districts. More than simply creating an attractive green space, the Park should become a convenient viewing point for the surrounding cityscape. Viewing points are a feature of any urban park: that is how the Alexander Gardens were planned, and that is how parks in London, Paris and Rome function. Within any city centre, a park offers a new perspective on the surrounding city. The low altitude of the competition site and the poor urban connections of Zaryadye create a special risk that such functions might be lost. Design work therefore should aim try to mitigate that risk.

The climatic conditions of Moscow require inventive solutions as to how the Park can function in the winter season. The proposal should take into account the traditional use of public recreational space during Moscow’s winter season (ice skating, snow slides, fireworks, ice architecture and sculpture festivals as well as other seasonal festivities).

The planned Philharmonic building will create additional cultural activities in the Zaryadye area. An architectural competition for the design of this building will be announced separately. The Philharmonic building should be placed in the immediate vicinity of the Park.
THEMES

Integration

The Park is located in close proximity to the Kremlin and Red Square, as well as the surrounding heritage buildings protected by UNESCO. The Park must be integrated sensitively within this urban context. A viewing point for the surrounding cityscape should become one of the main park attractions.

The competition proposals should consider and emphasise the panoramic view that opens from the Park towards the high-rise building at the Kotelnicevskaya Embankment, the Raushshkaya Embankment opposite, the Kremlin and Saint Basil’s Cathedral. The Park should not overshadow Kitay-gorod, but provide a green border to it. This necessarily imposes certain height restrictions on construction (the height of the Kitay-gorod slope is 16 meters). The Park will become an open-air museum of sorts, where the permanent exhibition on show is the city itself. The buildings immediately surrounding the park area reflect the full spectrum of Russian architecture from the 16th to 20th centuries: a life-size exhibition against a green backdrop. The Park will operate as an introduction to Moscow: the place where one discovers what this city is really about.

The Park should become a central feature of the city, both in terms of its location and significance among the chain of parks and green areas dotted along the Moskva River embankment, from Tushino to the former ZIL factory areas in the Natatinskaya floodplain. A new plan has been developed to link all these areas with a new waterbus route on the river. The park project should provide for a pier serving this new transport route.

The location of the Park by the river embankment necessitates its function as a part of the city’s waterfront. The competition projects must also properly consider the Park’s appearance from the opposite bank of the river. Currently, Zaryadye is separated from the river by heavy car traffic along the Kremlin side of the embankment. The territory of the Park is therefore disconnected from the river. Integrating the waterfront area into the park landscape is one of the main objectives and requirements of this competition.

The Park should unite and connect nearby pedestrian and green areas, become a natural centre-point and enclose the Boulevard ring road. Part of the Park is in close proximity to a number of planned and existing pedestrian and green areas. The closest of them are the Istorecheskaya area, at Nikolskaya street and the Museynaya district, which includes the Tretyakov Gallery and Lavrushinsky lane.

The future Park is located at the corner of a green wedge, spanning from Sparrow hills in the South-East, through Gorky Park, the Fallen Monument Park to Bolotnaya Square. Alexander Gardens, Ilyinsky Boulevard and the Yauza Park, which all form part of the Boulevard ring road, are also nearby.
Implementation stages

The competition proposals must look to develop the Park in distinct stages, with staggered openings, with the construction process itself becoming a tourist attraction. The first phase of construction should be completed before 2015.

Accessibility

In projecting the Park as an open space, participants should consider its function as an everyday thoroughfare for pedestrians. These pedestrians may be tourists from Red Square, office workers and shop visitors from Kitay-gorod district, parishioners of nearby churches, river bus passengers or simply those walking through Zaryadye towards the waterfront or from Staraya Ploschchad ("Old square"). The project should look to distribute these flows across the entire territory.

The Park should be able to cope with a visitor load of approximately 15 000 people. Both Red Square and Vasilievsky Spusk to the West from time to time become venues for large public events. Participants should understand that an event on Vasilievsky Spusk might attract 50 000 people, while the maximum capacity of Red Square is 130 000 people.

The design proposal should include underground parking spaces for 500 cars. The issue of entering and exiting the parking area is a complicated one, due to the lack of space and unforgiving city traffic. Participants are expected to provide an optimal solution to this problem, both in terms of design and engineering.

Historical heritage

The Zaryadye area contains five operating Orthodox churches, two museums (the House of the Romanov boyars and the Old English Court), as well as part of the Kitay-gorod walls. All these buildings and constructions have high architectural and historical heritage values. They are located on, or in close vicinity to, the future park area. It is an absolute requirement that these historical objects are sensitively integrated in the park structure.

Participants should take into account that about 30 percent of the area is a protected archaeological zone and several historical remains are hidden in the ground (for example fragments of the Kitay-gorod walls along the river). Solutions for how this archaeological heritage can be displayed as a seamless part of the park landscape are encouraged.

Landscape

Landscape is the Park's main feature. Since the 12th century, Varvarka street has been a kind of urban balcony, opening out onto the river. The competition projects should preserve this informal viewing platform. Consideration should also be made of the existing topographic pattern. This includes the steep slope from Varvarka, that gently descends down to the river. The height of the slope is 16 meters. This is the southern slope of the Kitay-gorod hill, and should provide an ideal setting for a park area.
Natural historical topographical features, such as gradual height differences and the terraced slope, should be kept as a matter of high priority. However, it is not necessary to preserve the current landscape in its entirety. Participants are free to suggest more complex and intriguing interpretations.

The competition projects must also consider the visual aspects of the area. The demolishing of Zaryadye’s historical buildings has opened a clear sightline towards the Kremlin and the Vasilyevsky Spusk, which has become one of the most famous images of Moscow. As such, the heights of the Park terraces should not exceed 10m, except from the small area of ‘visual silence’ in the eastern part of the Park. This is where the Philharmonic building is to be located (the maximum height in this zone is 20 m). This does not imply an even height of the whole territory. On the contrary, and as already mentioned, diversity in landscape heights is to be encouraged.

The landscape design should also include a system of viewing points, offering the best views of Moscow. They should be connected by a single continuous route, which could be a maze. The project should propose a certain variety of park and landscape features. Greenery should be the main attraction.

Even usage distribution

It is important that the Park is able to combine transit and touristic functions, as well as being the setting for informal meetings between different social, ethnic and age groups. The Park should facilitate a number of leisure activities, and be able to facilitate them at the same time. Pressure on usage should be evenly distributed, which means that public events are to be kept to a relatively small scale, and their location should be spread evenly.

In organising activity and attractions within the Park, participants should remember that people will mostly arrive from Red Square and the Vasilyevsky Spusk. Features of note should be placed away from the main pedestrian thoroughfares to avoid undue pressure on central parts.

Participants should note the nature of events taking place on the nearby Red Square and Vasilyevsky Spusk. The Park might begin to be used as an informal amphitheatre to watch parades and New Year fireworks.

Zoning

The competition projects should include a system of zoning, both in relation to the topography, and the existing and planned surroundings of the Park. The Park area should consist of three main components — historical, cultural and social areas — with service functions and places to hold events. These components might be combined as separate elements or blurred into each other.
Multi-seasonal usage

Moscow is located in the humid continental climate zone, with winters lasting around 7 months of the year and periodic heat waves during summer. Maintaining year-round activity in the Park is an important element of the design task.

Summertime, the Park should function as a venue for music festivals, flower festivals and exhibitions of landscape objects, land-art and contemporary art. Temporary pavilions might be used. In wintertime, the Park should be able to host winter attractions and festivities.

The topography of the Park implies the inclusion of a sledging slope, which has been a traditional ingredient in many Russian parks. This is to be one of the Park’s obligatory functions. Participants should consider how this slope can be used during summertime.

Economic sustainability

Direct return on investment is not one of the main aims of the Park. Nonetheless, participants should identify strategies to create sustainable economic models for the Park, and to optimise maintenance costs for the city.

Ecological sustainability

Competition projects should design the Park as a sustainable ecosystem, which implies biodiversity and ecological balance. Any proposal should include the usage of energy-efficient, innovative, environmentally friendly technologies and materials. The Park should act as a benchmark for Moscow City Government environmental policy.

Innovation

The competition project should suggest inventive solutions and advanced technology in order to maximise the efficiency and viability of the Park. These solutions should respond to contemporary demands on urban lifestyle, enliven the public riverside area, be suitable for all climate conditions, use a minimum of energy, and ensure easy maintenance.

Identity

Competition proposals should contribute to a strengthened identity of the territory, taking into account its importance both on an urban and national level. This will be Moscow, and Russia’s, most important park. It should therefore be a world class riverside public space with significant individual character. A unique landscape concept must be created for this site. The design for the Park should briefly suggest branding and identity elements that infer recognition of Russia, while avoiding any direct and obvious implications.
Principles for the spatial organisation of the Park

All buildings of the Park should be of limited height and volume, and follow the scale of the surrounding urban environment. This will be a multifunctional area, which might include small pavilions, performance and exhibition space, cafés and restaurants and technical and sanitary facilities.

It is important that these functions do not become unconnected, disparately placed buildings, but integrated as part of a varied landscape environment. The greenery should be the superior element both in literal and figurative sense.

Philharmonic Hall

A new 1500 seat and 20 000 sq m. Philharmonic Hall is being planned for the Zaryadye redevelopment, built in parallel with the construction of the Park. A separate architecture competition will be announced for the design of this building. The area reserved for the Philharmonic Hall is located in the eastern part of Zaryadye and stretches along the Kitaygorod passage.

It is important that competition participants suggest the best location for this building in relation to the overall landscape and architectural concept. The Philharmonic Hall must be both able to operate independently of the Park, as well as function as a continuation of it if necessary. Attention should be paid to the height limit of 20m.

Embarkment

The river embarkment is a key element of the Park, and should become a seamless part of it. Visitors should be provided an easy access to the waterfront from the park side. The visitor’s route to the water should be the main functional and notional highlight, an attraction point and one of the key points in the tourist route from the Red Square.

Activity spots, including cafés and restaurants, should be placed along the waterfront to ensure access to and usage of it all year round. Competitors should evaluate possible alternatives for creating a pedestrian link to the water (above or below the highway) and present an option that best supports the architectural concept that is both economically and technically justified. Proposals for how the embarkment can be broadened by changing the location of the highway, without reducing its transport capacity, should be presented.

Central Pier

Projects should provide for a comfortable passenger pier on the Moskvoretskaya waterfront immediately opposite the Park, where the current pier at the Peter the Great RVSN Academy is to be moved. This should be the central pier in Moscow, connecting river transports of key public and recreational spaces along the Moskva River.
Hotel

A hotel for 100-150 guests is to be established in the immediate vicinity to the Park. The hotel should be an extension to the complex of the existing late 19th century buildings located in the northeastern part of Zaryadye. The competition proposal should provide a seamless integration of the hotel within the park area, while keeping the ability for the hotel to operate independently.

Open-air Museum of Moscow

The Park should function as an open-air museum. Using the surrounding world famous architecture and modern media technologies, it should look to display Moscow’s history and architecture to Muscovites and visitors to the city.

Exhibition and performance spaces should also be integrated in the Park. In the warm season, they should open towards the Park.

Pskovsky Slope

The slope should be placed in the incline from the Kitay-gorod towards the river. This winter attraction could in the warmer months function as a walking path, viewing platform or ramp.
System of viewpoints should integrate the various parts of the Park and offer a variety of leisure activities

Underground parking

Designs should develop plans for 500 parking spaces, intended primarily for park visitors.
Zaryadye Park: Request for expression of interest
WE DON’T REMAKE, WE CREATE
1. General Information on the Competition

1.1. Purpose of the Competition

The Competition is intended to:

(a) prepare Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design and select the best amongst them which is most conformant with the Competition Brief and the Competition Criteria; and

(b) select the Author (from among the Finalists) of the best Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design who will, at a later stage of the Project, be engaged in the preparation of design documentation with respect to the Property.

1.2. Grounds for the Competition

The Competition is held on the initiative of the Moscow City Government.

1.3. Competition objective

The Competition objective is a Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design, which should encompass:

(a) the general urban planning, layout, spatial and landscape solutions for the Project Site, including a park as part of the Project Site;

(b) the general urban planning, layout, spatial and architectural solutions for other components of the Property: the structures and facilities in the park, the multipurpose complex included in the park (sociocultural, retail and entertainment functions), parking places, and Moskvoretskaya [Moskva river] Embankment; and

(c) the borders and dimensions of a philharmonic complex and a hotel (the architectural solutions for those buildings are not part of the Property for the purposes of the Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design and further designing on the basis thereof).

2. Signing Contract with the Author

2.1. Client’s Intention

(a) The Client confirms their intention to develop the Project on the basis of the Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design chosen to be the best one as a result of the Competition and taking into account the Commercial Proposals to be made by the Finalists during the Competition and the negotiations to be conducted by the Client with the Finalists. Participation in the Competition or eventual victory does not guarantee the Author any right to secure a contract with the Client.

(b) The Author will retain exclusive rights to the Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design and will be engaged in the preparation of the design documentation for the Property as the author of the Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design chosen for implementation. It is envisaged that the Author will, at the very least, be engaged in architectural work as well as preparing designs for greenery planting, landscape design,
architectural lighting, park navigation system and in selecting materials for finishing surfaces and pavement.

(c) It is hereby provided that the Client or any respective person in charge of the implementation of the Project shall be free to do the following:

(i) refrain from implementing certain parts of the Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design; and

(ii) demand that the Author amends the solutions developed in the Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design;

Nothing shall limit the right of the future owner of the Property for a future reconstruction thereof. Such reconstruction shall not presume any consent or involvement of the Author.

(d) In case when the Author is acting as a Consortium, the Client has the right to demand the replacement of the Consortium members during the implementation of the Project, excluding the Leader of the Consortium, as per Clause 10.2

(e) The tasks of the Author will include the following:

(i) at the design stage:

(A) to prepare a schematic design based on the Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design chosen for the implementation by developing key design solutions shown in the Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design and by elaborating those design options, which meet the applicable terms/requirements to the greatest extent and are most feasible, with due regard for the Client's wishes; and

(B) to take part in the preparation of the Design documentation and conduct author’s supervision over the preparation of the Working documentation for the Property; and

(ii) during construction: to conduct author’s supervision over the construction of the Property.

(f) Next steps of the Project would require the approval of the necessary urban planning documentation by the official authorities of the City of Moscow. The Author may be engaged as a consultant of such urban planning documentation by the relevant official Moscow authorities in order to reflect in a true manner the impact of their Concepts for Architecture and Landscaping Design. The terms of such engagement are outside the Competition Documentation.

2.2. Exclusive Rights to the Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design

(a) As part of the Competition, none of the Participants shall assign to the Client (or to anyone acting on behalf of the Client) any exclusive rights to the Works contained in its Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design.
(b) As part of the Competition, any Participant shall only assign to the Client certain rights to use its Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design, mainly those related to its publication, as per Clause 14.2 below.

(c) The reservation by the Author of its exclusive rights to the Works contained in its Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design will ensure the Author's engagement in any further work on the Project that suggests the use of its Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design.

(d) Any matters related to the assignment in favour of the Client of any exclusive rights to the Works, both contained in the Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design and created by or with the participation of the Author in connection with any further development of the Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design will be resolved in the contract(s) to be entered into with the Author.

2.3. Specific Provisions Related to the Signing of the Contract with the Author

(a) The work for which the Author will be engaged can be divided into certain stages each of which will be stipulated in an individual contract, e.g.: a contract for the preparation of a schematic design and, separately, a contract for participation in the development of the Design Documentation and author's supervision over the preparation of the Working documentation for the Property, and at a later stage – a contract for the Author's supervision over the construction.

(b) The placement of an order for the preparation of the design documentation may require compliance with the laws of the Russian Federation and the City of Moscow regarding the placement of orders for goods delivery, work performance or service provision for government or municipal needs.

(c) Depending on the circumstances and the terms and conditions of order placement with respect to the preparation of the design documents, a contract regarding the Author's engagement in this work will be concluded directly with the relevant client, with the designer selected in connection with such an order, on a subcontract basis or as a multilateral contract.

2.4. Refusal to Implement the Project

According to Clause 20.5, the Client has the right to refuse the implementation of the Project.

3. Procedure and Schedule of the Competition

3.1. Competition Procedure

The procedure for the Competition is briefly described below in order to give a general idea of the sequence of its stages and procedures.

Qualification

(a) Applicants will submit their Applications (see Article 11 below).
(b) Such Applications will be checked for compliance with the Regulations and the Qualification Criteria; the Organizer will prepare a Qualification Rating and submit it to the Jury for review (see Article 12 below).

(c) The Jury will select six (6) Participants from among the Applicants (see Article 13 below).

The approval and delivery to the Participants of the final version of the Competition Documentation (see Article 7 below)

(d) The Jury will review the Competition Brief and give recommendations regarding its approval.

(e) The Client will approve the Competition Brief.

(f) The final version of the Competition Documentation including the Competition Brief and a draft Agreement with a Participant will be delivered to the Participants.

The preparation and submission of the Design proposals

(g) The Organizer (acting as agent for the Client) will conclude the Agreement with each Participant (see Article 14 below).

(h) The Organizer will make arrangements for the Participants to make a site visit (see Article 15 below).

(i) The Organizer will conduct an introductory workshop for the Participants (see Article 15 below).

(j) The Participants will prepare and submit their Design proposals (see Article 16 below).

Preliminary examination

(k) The Experts will review the Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design for their conformity with the Competition Criteria and prepare their replies (see Clause 17.2 below).

(l) On the basis of the Experts’ evaluation, the Organizer will prepare the Technical Report and submit it to the Jury for review (see Clause 17.3 below).

The selection of the Winner and other Finalists

(m) The Jury will select one Winner from among the Participants, whose Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design will be ranked as Number 1, and select two more Finalists from among the Participants, whose respective Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design will be ranked as Numbers 2 and 3 as a result of their evaluation and comparison (see Article 19 below).

The selection of the Author

(n) Following the review of the Commercial Proposals by the Client and subsequent negotiations with the Winner and other Finalists, whose
Concepts were ranked as Second and Third, the Client will determine the
Author, i.e. the Finalist whose Concept for Architecture and Landscaping
Design will be chosen for implementation.

3.2. Competition Schedule

The schedule of main events within the Competition is given in Appendix
1.

4. Organizer

4.1. Organizer

NIiPI (Research and Design Institute) for the General Plan of the City of
Moscow State Unitary Enterprise acts as the Competition Organizer on
behalf of the Client.

4.2. Responsibilities of the Organizer

The Organizer is a specialised organisation authorised by the Client to
perform certain functions related to the Competition, including:

(a) to publish and place a notification of the Competition;

(b) to receive any correspondence, information or documents from the Ap-
plicants and the Participants, including the Applications and the Concept
for Architecture and Landscaping Design;

(c) to provide relevant notifications;

(d) to maintain the Competition Website;

(e) to arrange for and conduct any preparatory or introductory activities;

(f) to interact with the Experts;

(g) to prepare materials for Jury meetings, including the Qualification Rat-
ing and the Technical Report;

(h) to plan Jury meetings;

(i) to explain the provisions of the Competition Documentation to the Ap-
plicants and Participants.

5. The Jury

5.1. The Jury

(a) The Jury shall be the official authority of the Competition. The Jury will
include representatives of the federal authorities and the Moscow city
administration as well as well-recognised Russian and international public
figures and experts in urban planning, architecture, landscape architecture
and the development and operation of projects similar to the proposed
Project.

(b) Jury members will be appointed and act in their personal capacity
rather than representatives of those entities of which they are members/
participants, managers or employees they are. They shall neither accept nor request from any persons any instructions regarding any decisions falling under the authority of the Jury.

(c) In its proceedings, the Jury shall follow the principles of professionalism, independence of opinions and unbiased decision-making, on the basis of the Competition Documentation.

(d) Jury members shall act without fees. If necessary, any foreign members of the Jury will be provided with visa support, business class air travel, four- or five-star hotel accommodation, reimbursement of accommodation expenses and airport-hotel transfer.

5.2. Jury Composition

The composition of the Jury is provided in Appendix 3.

5.3. Authority of the Jury

The Jury shall be authorised to:

(a) select the 6 Participants from among the Applicants;

(b) review the draft the Competition Brief and give recommendations to the Client regarding its approval or the making of any amendments or additions to it;

(c) evaluate and compare Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design and to choose the Winner and the Finalists; and

(d) disqualify any Applicant or Participant.

5.4. Jury Meetings

(a) The Jury will meet twice:

(i) for the period of 17-18 June 2013 for selecting Participants of the second stage of the Competition, review Competition; and

(ii) for the period of 1-12 November 2013 for selecting the Winner and determine other Finalists.

(b) If, at a certain date when a Jury meeting is scheduled, a quorum is not achieved or the meeting has failed to make the necessary resolution, the Jury meeting may, as decided by the present members of the Jury or by correspondence vote, be adjourned to another day and another time within the next thirty (30) working days.

(c) Any Jury meeting shall be conducted by the Jury Chairman in the presence of the representatives of the Organizer. The Organizer’s representative have the right to inform the Jury concerning the powers of the Jury, the agenda of that specific meeting, and the rules of the Jury’s proceedings, including the procedure for voting and decision-making.

5.5. Jury Chairman

(a) The Chairman of the Jury shall be elected from among the Jury mem-
bers at the first meeting upon the proposal of any Jury member and shall retain his or her powers at any further meetings of the Jury. Simultaneously with the election of the Chairman or at any subsequent meeting, where the Chairman is absent, the Jury may, upon the proposal of the Chairman or any member of the Jury, elect a deputy chairman, who shall act in the absence of the Chairman.

(b) The Chairman of the Jury shall:

(i) conduct any meeting;

(ii) receive from Jury members their proposals with respect to the agenda of the meeting;

(iii) add any proposed matters to the agenda of the meeting, formulate the agenda matters and draft resolutions thereon; and

(iv) moderate the discussion during the meeting.

5.6. Voting and Decision-Making

(a) Unless otherwise determined herein, a Jury meeting shall be competent (quorate), if eight Jury members are present thereat. In order to pass a resolution regarding the selection of Finalists (Clause 5.3(c) above), two thirds of all Jury members shall be present at a meeting.

(b) Any resolutions regarding:

(i) the selection of Participants (Clause 5.3(a) above) shall be passed; and

(ii) the selection of the Winner and other Finalists (Clause 5.3(c) above) may be passed, unless otherwise determined by the Jury,

by rating vote, where each Jury member present at the meeting shall, in each round of voting, have the number of votes equal to the number of the Applicants or Participants (their Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design), respectively. Such member shall be entitled to cast no more than one (1) vote for any of the Applicants or Participants (their Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design), respectively. Once the votes of the Jury members are counted, the Applicants or Participants (their Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design), respectively, will be assigned numbers in the decreasing order according to the number of votes cast for them by the Jury members.

As a variety of such rating vote, the Jury may elect to use for the selection of the Winner and other Finalists (Clause 5.3(c) above) a voting procedure where each Jury member assigns a position to each Participant, the total number of such positions being equal to the number of Participants (their Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design).

Such rating vote shall be secret and conducted by ballot.

(c) Any resolutions regarding any other matters, including:

(i) procedural matters, such as: the adjournment of a meeting, voting by rounds and determining the number of such rounds (Clause 5.6(d) below,
the selection of the Winner and other Finalists by individual qualitative vote;

(ii) the disqualification of an Applicant (Clause 13.1 below);

(iii) any matters related to the evaluation of the draft Competition Brief (Clause 5.3(b) above); and

(iv) the selection of a certain Applicant to replace an outgoing Participant (Clause 13.2(c) below),

shall be passed by qualitative vote on a "one Jury member – one vote" basis, by a simple majority of the Jury members present at the meeting.

Such qualitative votes shall be cast openly, by a show of hands.

(d) For the purpose of selecting the Participants (Clause 5.3(a) above) and the Finalists (Clause 5.3(c) above), the Jury may decide to vote by rounds, where the Jury will first, in one or more rounds, determine the preliminary list of selected persons and then, using such list, select the Participants or the Winner and other Finalists, respectively.

(e) The Jury may make a decision regarding the selection of the Winner and the distribution of positions among the other Finalists by a quantitative vote to be conducted separately for each such position.

5.7. Meeting Minutes

(a) Any Jury meeting shall be recorded in the minutes. Such minutes shall be taken by a representative of the Organizer.

(b) The minutes of each Jury meeting shall be prepared in three (3) copies, one (1) copy for the Client and two copies for the Organizer.

(c) The minutes of each Jury meeting shall be signed by all Jury members present at the meeting.

(d) The minutes (or an extract from the minutes) of a Jury meeting containing the Jury’s decision regarding the selection of Participants from among the Applicants or the selection of the Winner and other Finalists shall be published on the Competition Website within ten (10) working days after the preceding Jury meeting.

6. Experts and the Expert Panel

6.1. Experts

(a) Professional experts in the following fields shall be engaged as Experts:

(i) urban planning and spatial characteristics of a Site;

(ii) museum technology;

(iii) fire safety;

(iv) structural solutions;
(v) utilities;
(vi) parking technology;
(vii) preservation, use, public promotion and state protection of cultural heritage;
(viii) landscape architecture, and
(ix) any other fields required to evaluate Design proposal.

(b) The task of the Expert is to conduct a Technical Expertise, i.e. a preliminary examination of the Concepts for Architecture and Landscaping Design submitted by the Participants to determine their conformity with the requirements of the Competition Documentation, the Competition Criteria, any rules and regulations applicable to designing and construction and, generally, their feasibility.

(c) The list of such Experts shall be contained in the final Competition Brief.

(d) The Experts shall be engaged by the Organizer as part of performance of its obligations under the contract with the Client.

6.2. Expert Panel

(a) The Expert Panel shall consist of the Experts' representatives who will be appointed by the Experts to such panel at the Organizer’s request.

(b) The Expert Panel shall be held once, at the Jury meeting, where the Concepts for Architecture and Landscaping Design will be reviewed, evaluated and compared.

(c) The task of the Expert Panel is to provide advisory assistance for the Jury in evaluating and comparing Concepts for Architecture and Landscaping Design, including any clarification to Jury members as may be requested by them, of certain remarks and comments made by the Experts during the Technical Examination.

7. Competition Documentation

7.1. Contents of the Competition Documentation

The Competition Documentation shall include the following parts, each being its integral part:

(a) Part I: Request for Expression of Interest (a notification of the Competition);
(b) Part II: Regulations; and
(c) Part III: Competition Brief.

7.2. Competition Brief Review

(a) At its meeting the Jury is intended to select Participants from among the Applicants or, if adjourned, at adjourned subsequent meeting, the
Jury shall review a draft Competition Brief and give its comments on it. Such review may result in Jury recommending certain amendments or additions to the Competition Brief.

(b) The Client shall, not later than 21 June 2013, review the Jury’s recommendations with respect to the Competition Brief, and if deems them necessary, give further specification.

7.3. Procedure for Publication of the Competition Documentation

(a) Initially, Part I (Request for Expression of Interest (a notification of the Competition)) and Part II (Regulations) shall be published. However, the Regulations shall not include the draft Participant Agreement. Such parts of the Competition Documentation shall be made publicly available on the Competition Website on 22 April 2013.

(b) The final version of the Competition Documentation shall include:

(i) Part II (Regulations) with all Appendixes thereto; and

(ii) Part III (Competition Brief).

The final version of the Competition Documentation shall be sent by the Organizer to the addresses of the Participants within five (5) working days after the approval of the Competition Brief by the Client. The final version of the Competition Documentation shall also be available to the Participants on the Competition Website.

8. Qualification Eligibility

8.1. Qualification Eligibility

(a) Any entities, acting individually or as a Consortium (see Article 10 below), except for those indicated in Clause 8.2 below, shall be eligible for participation in the Qualification, provided that such Applicants have submitted their Applications complying with the provisions of these Regulations in terms of their contents, format, manner and date of submission.

(b) To avoid any doubts any Applicant, acting individually or as a consortium, should have as a part of its team specialists in the field of city planning, architecture and landscape design.

8.2. Parties Not Eligible for the Qualification

The following parties shall not be eligible for the Qualification:

(a) the Organizer and his subcontractors;

(b) any Applicants who, as decided by the Jury in accordance with Clause 13.1 below, have an actual capability of influencing the outcome of the Competition.

9. Disclosure

9.1. Grounds for a Possible Conflict of Interests

If an Applicant (or, in the case of a Consortium, any member of such
Consortium) is an affiliate of any of the following parties which, for the purpose of this Clause, are deemed to be able to influence the outcome of the Competition:

(a) a Jury member or any individual subordinated to such person by virtue of his or her position; or

(b) a person acting as individual executive body or members of a collective executive body of the Organizer, the Organizer or any Expert (being a non-profit entity), any individual subordinated to such person by virtue of his or her position (provided that for the purpose of this Clause an individual shall not be deemed subordinated to a certain person by virtue of his or her position to the extent that the job function of such individual is solely limited to research, educational or other creative activities),

then such Applicant may be deemed capable of influencing the outcome of the Competition.

9.2. Disclosure Letter

(a) If any of the grounds indicated in Clause 9.1 above exist, then the Applicant shall submit to the Organizer a Disclosure Letter, depending upon the time when such grounds arise:

(i) either as part of its Application, if such grounds exist when the Application is submitted;

(ii) or, if such grounds arise at a later date, immediately after their occurrence.

(b) Such Disclosure Letter shall be prepared in an arbitrary form and shall contain:

(i) an indication to the grounds on which the Applicant may be deemed capable of influencing the outcome of the Competition in accordance with Clause 9.1(a) above or capable of restricting competition with respect to the selection of a contractor for the construction of the Property by the Client in accordance with Clause 9.1(b) above, respectively, including an indication to the person with whom the Applicant is connected;

(ii) the nature of such connection, i.e. the basis on which the Applicant is or may be deemed an affiliate of the relevant person; and

(iii) any specific features of such connection, i.e. any further information on the relevant connection which may, as believed by the Applicant, be useful in order to evaluate the actual ability of the Applicant to influence the outcome of the Competition or the selection of a contractor for the construction of the Property by the Client.

(c) The fact of submission and the contents of any Disclosure Letter shall be in any event included in the Qualification Rating, and copies of such letters shall be presented to the Jury meeting, which is to decide on the selection of Participants from among the Applicants.

(d) An Applicant/Participant’s failure to submit a Disclosure Letter where
it is required in accordance with Clause 9.1 above shall constitute unconditional grounds for the disqualification of such Applicant or Participant.

10. Participation of Consortiums in the Competition

10.1. Consortium

(a) Any entities intending to participate in the Competition may form a Consortium in order to ensure compliance with the Qualification Criteria on a joint basis. Consortiums including Russian and international professionals in the fields of architecture, landscape design, urban planning, engineering, public site management at a minimum, and specialists in the fields of entertainment, cultural programming, economics, sociology, anthropology, dendrology, ecology and nature use as a suggestion. However, the functional competence of each member in such Consortium may include more than one discipline.

(b) The persons forming a Consortium shall submit a single Application on behalf of the Consortium and shall, for the purposes of the Competition, be deemed a single Applicant and further, if such Applicant has passed the Qualification, a single Participant. Accordingly, wherever used herein, the terms "Applicant" and "Participant" and, respectively, "Winner" and "Finalist", will be construed to include all members in a certain Consortium.

(c) Any Applicant wishing to participate in the Competition through a Consortium shall submit, as part of its Application, a Declaration regarding the formation of such Consortium and engagement of subcontractors and consultants.

(d) A member in a certain Consortium, whose functional competence within the Consortium includes the preparation of the architectural and/or landscape planning part for a Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design, shall not apply for participation in the Competition, whether individually or as part of any other Consortium.

(e) It is recommended to include in any Consortium a Russian member, whose functional competence within the Consortium would include ensuring the compliance of the Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design with the Russian urban planning regulations or to employ an appropriate Russian specialist as a subcontractor or consultant for such Consortium.

10.2. Consortium Leader

(a) The members in any Consortium shall determine the Leader of the Consortium;

(b) A Consortium member whose functional competence includes the preparation of the urban planning and architectural and/or landscape planning part of the Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design may serve as the Leader of the Consortium.

(c) The Consortium Leader shall be intended to represent all members in the Consortium vis-à-vis the Organizer and the Client for the purposes of
the Competition.

(d) The Consortium Leader, its representative for communications with respect to any Competition-related matters and its contact details shall be indicated in the Declaration regarding the formation of the Consortium and engagement of subcontractors and consultants (Clause 10.1(c) above).

11. Application Procedure

11.1. Application

The composition, contents and requirements to the Application are set forth in Appendix 2.

11.2. Reception of the Applications

(a) The reception of the Applications will commence once the Request for the Expression of Interest is published and will end at 6:00 p.m. Moscow time on 22 May 2013.

(b) Each Application shall be sent to the Organizer:

(i) in the electronic version – as a set of electronic documents submitted through the Competition Website;

(ii) in the original version – as three (3) hard copies of the original documents and materials, delivered by post, courier or by hand

In the case of discrepancy between electronic and hard copies of the Application, the hard copy shall prevail.

(c) Where an Application is delivered by mail or courier, the Application shall be deemed submitted on time, if:

(i) the relevant item of mail was handed over for dispatch to a post office (as evidenced by the time stamp of the post office) or to a courier service before the deadline indicated in Clause 11.2(a) above; and

(ii) such mail was actually received by the Organizer at or before 6:00 p.m. on 29 May 2013.

(d) The Applicant may, at any time before the deadline indicated in Clause 11.2(a) above, make amendments to its Application by giving notice to this effect to the Organizer (accompanied, if necessary, by any amended and/or updated information or documents).

12. Review of Applications

12.1. Review of Applications

(a) The Organizer shall check any Application for the completeness, accuracy and reliability of any information contained therein.

(b) In order to check the completeness, accuracy and reliability of any information or documents contained in an Application, the Organizer may (but is not obliged to) request from any persons mentioned therein any explanations or comment as well as any documents or information which
should have been submitted in accordance herewith but are not submitted, and to obtain any information or documents from any publicly available official sources.

12.2. Denial of Applications

(a) The Organizer may deny an Application and bar the relevant Applicant from participation in the Qualification for the following grounds:

(i) the same Applicant has submitted more than one Application, including a situation where the prohibition mentioned in Clause 10.1(d) above is breached (in such event, only one Application will be accepted, i.e. that which came first or, if simultaneously, as selected by the Organizer); or

(ii) the Application lacks any necessary information or contains any untrue information; or

(iii) the Application has been submitted after the deadline; or

(iv) the Organizer has received an official confirmation or learned from publicly available official sources that the Applicant (or, in the case of a Consortium, any member thereof) has decided to enter voluntary liquidation, or has applied to a court for its insolvency/bankruptcy, or a claim for its involuntary liquidation or insolvency/bankruptcy has been made, or its business is suspended through an administrative procedure.

(b) Following such verification, the Organizer shall, not later than 10 June 2013, give notice to the Applicants regarding their admission to the Qualification or the denial of their Applications in writing or electronically and by publishing an appropriate notification on the Competition Website.

12.3. Qualification Criteria

The Qualification Criteria and the Regulations for their consideration in preparing the Qualification Rating are set forth in Appendix 4.

12.4. Qualification Rating

(a) The Organizer shall prepare the Qualification Rating and present it to the Jury members as part of the meeting materials.

(b) The Qualification Rating shall be a summary of the Applications submitted by the Applicants and, where provided herein, any information obtained by the Organizer from publicly available official sources in order to check any information contained in an Application. The Qualification Rating shall also contain an analysis in which the Organizer, based on any information available to it, evaluates whether the Applicants meet the Qualification Criteria.

(c) The Qualification Rating shall be prepared in order to make easier for the Jury to examine the body of information contained in the Applications and will be of a solely advisory nature. In making its decision regarding the selection of Participants from among the Applicants, the Jury will not be bound by the conclusions made in the analysis section of the Qualification Rating. Therefore, no estimate given to an Applicant in the Qualification
Rating will increase or reduce its chances for becoming a Participant.

13. Selection of Participants

13.1. Disqualification of the Applicants

(a) At its meeting intended for the selection of the Participants from among the Applicants, before such Participants are picked, the Jury shall, if there are any grounds therefore, as provided in the Article 9 above, evaluate the nature of connection of any Applicant which has submitted a Disclosure Letter and whether such Applicant is actually capable of influencing the outcome of the Competition, and, following such evaluation, the Jury may bar (disqualify) the relevant Applicant from participation in the Competition.

(b) If an Applicant has failed to submit a Disclosure Letter where it should have done so in accordance with Section 9.1, the Applicant shall be disqualified by the Jury without evaluating its capability of influencing the outcome of the Competition.

(c) When making a decision regarding the disqualification of an Applicant connected with a certain member of the Jury, such Jury member shall not vote.

13.2. Selection of the Participants

(a) From among the Applicants admitted to the Qualification, not more than six (6) Applicants for whose Applications the greatest number of votes were cast shall be declared the Participants.

(b) If at any time before the first-stage Jury meeting any Applicant withdraws from the Competition for any reason, it shall be replaced by each next Applicant whose Application was assigned the highest rank, unless the Jury has made a special decision to pick a certain Applicant as replacement for such withdrawing Participant.

(c) The Jury may, by a resolution passed by simple majority vote (Section 5.6(c) above), pick a certain Applicant as replacement for a withdrawing Participant.

14. Participant Agreement

14.1. Participant Agreement

(a) Within thirty (30) days after the completion of the Qualification, the Organizer (acting as the agent of the Client) shall enter into a Participant Agreement with each Participant using Form 7.1 in Appendix 7.

(b) Under the Participant Agreement:

(i) the Participant will grant to the Client certain limited rights to use the Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design to be prepared by the Participant; and

(ii) the Client will agree to compensate the Participant a pre-determined amount for its expenses related to the creation of its Concept for Archi-
14.2. License for the Use of the Concepts for Architecture and Landscaping Design

(a) As stated in Article 2.2 above, the Participants shall reserve their exclusive rights to the Works contained in the Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design. For the purposes of the Competition, however, each Participant will grant to the Client (and also to the Organizer) the following rights to use any Works contained in its Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design:

(i) the right of reproduction;
(ii) the right of public display;
(iii) air broadcasting;
(iv) cable broadcasting;
(v) translation; and
(vi) making available to the general public.

(b) Such rights to use the Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design shall be granted by the Participant to the Client without any limitation as to the term or territory of use.

(c) The remuneration payable by the Organizer to the Participant for the granting of such rights to use its Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design shall be included in the total amount of remuneration according to Article 14.3(a) below.

14.3. Reimbursement of the Participants' Expenses for Participation in the Competition

(a) Each Participant shall be paid a remuneration of eighty thousand U.S. dollars (US$80,000) VAT exclusive or, if payment is made in a different currency, an equivalent amount at the exchange rate of the Bank of Russia effective on the day of payment. This amount includes:

(i) the license fee payable to the Participant for the granting of rights to use any Works contained in its Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design, as per Clause 14.2 above; and

(ii) compensation for any material and labour costs to be incurred by the Participant for the preparation and presentation of its Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design.

(b) According to the Participant Agreement at the request of the Participant, expenses for arrival to and accommodation in Moscow for participation in any preparatory or introductory activities (Article 15 below) for up to two (2) representatives of such Participant may additionally be reimbursed by Organizer based on economy class air travel and one (1) night accommodation in a four-star hotel.
(c) The amount mentioned in Clause 14.3(a) above shall be paid in two installments:

(i) 20% (twenty per cent) shall be paid within ten (10) days after the conclusion of the Participant Agreement; and

(ii) the remainder shall be paid within one month after the Jury’s decision regarding the selection of the Finalists.

(d) If a Participant has failed to submit its Design proposal as provided herein, it shall refund any monies paid to it under the Participant Agreement.

15. Preparatory Activities

15.1. **Within twenty (20) days after the completion of the Qualification, the Organizer will:**

(a) provide the Participants with an opportunity to visit and inspect the Project Site; and

(b) conduct an introductory workshop for the Participants in order to explain the provisions of the Competition Documentation, the goals and tasks of the Competition, and provide any additional information, as necessary.

15.2. The introductory workshop will be attended by representatives of the Client, the Organizer.

15.3. The specific dates of the Project Site visit and the introductory workshop will be communicated by the Organizer to the Participants by posting an appropriate notice on the Competition Website.

15.4. Within ten (10) working days after the date of the introductory workshop (or its last date, if the duration of the workshop is more than one day), minutes of the workshop will be sent to the Participants. Such minutes will also be available to the Participants on the Competition Website.

16. Submission of the Design proposals

16.1. **Design proposals**

The composition, contents and requirements for presentation of a Design proposal are set forth in Appendix 5.

16.2. **Reception of Design proposals**

(a) Design proposals shall be submitted in two stages. At the first stage, the Package I, including the graphic materials of Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design, is submitted. At the second stage, the Package II, including the model of the Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design, is submitted.

(b) Design proposal (Packages I and II) shall be sent to the address given in
Clause 22.2(b) below and delivered by mail, courier or hand.

(c) The reception of Package I of the Design proposals will end at 6:00 p.m. Moscow time on 27 September 2013.

(d) Where the Package I of the Design proposal is delivered by mail or courier, the Package I of the Design proposal shall be deemed submitted on time, if:

(i) the relevant item of mail was handed over for dispatch to a post office (as evidenced by the time stamp of the post office) or to a courier service before the deadline indicated in Clause 16.2(a) above; and

(ii) such item of mail was actually received by the Organizer at or before 6:00 p.m. on 4 October 2013.

(e) The reception of Package II of the Design proposal will end at 6:00 p.m. Moscow time on 21 October 2013

(f) Where the Package II of the Design proposal is delivered by mail or courier, the Package II of the Design proposal shall be deemed submitted on time, if:

(i) the relevant mail was handed over for dispatch to a post office (as evidenced by the time stamp of the post office) or to a courier service before the deadline indicated in Clause 16.2(a) above; and

(ii) such mail was actually received by the Organizer at or before 6:00 p.m. on 28 October 2013.

(g) The Organizer shall immediately give notice of receipt of each mail containing a Design proposal by showing an anonymised mark of dispatch on the Competition Website.

17. Preliminary Examination

17.1. Competition Criteria

The Competition Criteria are set forth in Appendix 6.

17.2. Technical Evaluation

(a) Within five (5) working days after the deadline for the submission of Design proposals, the Organizer shall deliver the Concepts for Architecture and Landscaping Design submitted by the Participants to the Experts for Technical Evaluation.

(b) The Experts shall carry out the Technical Evaluation of the Concepts for Architecture and Landscaping Design within thirty (30) days after their receipt from the Organizer.

(c) The results of the Technical Evaluation shall be contained in the Experts’ written replies to the Concepts for Architecture and Landscaping Design, which shall be delivered to the Organizer.

17.3. Technical Report
(a) The Organizer shall review the Concepts for Architecture and Landscaping Design for conformity with the Competition Criteria, examine the replies of the Experts and, as a result, prepare a Technical Report.

(b) The Technical Report shall include a summary of the replies submitted by the Experts and an analysis in which the Organizer shall evaluate whether the Concepts for Architecture and Landscaping Design meet the Competition Criteria.

(c) The Technical Report will be of a solely advisory nature, and the Jury will not be bound by its provisions when reviewing the Concepts for Architecture and Landscaping Design. Wherever it may be necessary to obtain any comments or remarks from the Experts, the Jury may request the same from Expert Panel members.

18. Disqualification of the Participants

18.1. Grounds for Disqualification of Participants

(a) A Participant may be barred from further participation in the Competition for the following grounds:

(i) the Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design submitted by the Participant does not conform with the provisions of the Competition Documentation in terms of its composition and contents; or

(ii) the Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design has been submitted after the deadline; or

(iii) it is established that the Participant's Design proposal contained untrue information; or

(iv) it is established that the Participant has failed to submit a Disclosure Letter where it should have done so in accordance with Clause 9.1; or

(v) the Organizer has received an official confirmation or learned from publicly available official sources that the Participant (or, in the case of a Consortium, any member thereof) has decided to enter voluntary liquidation, or has applied to the court for insolvency/bankruptcy, or a claim for its involuntary liquidation or insolvency/bankruptcy has been made, or its business is suspended through an administrative procedure.

(b) The Jury may decide to disqualify a Participant upon considering the Organizer’s report presented at a meeting for selection of the Winner and other Finalists (see Clause 5.3(c) above) in the manner prescribed by Clause 13.1 for disqualification of the Participants.

(c) Any decision disqualifying a Participant shall, within five (5) working days after it is made, be notified to the Participant and published on the Competition Website.

(d) The disqualification of a Participant shall provide the basis for the termination of the relevant Participant Agreement, in which case the Participant shall refund all payments received thereunder.
19. Selection of Winner and Other Finalists

19.1. The Jury shall review the Concepts for Architecture and Landscaping Design submitted by the Participants and the Technical Report, clarify, if necessary, the comments and remarks of the Experts with the Expert Panel members and assign ranks to the Concepts for Architecture and Landscaping Design in the decreasing order of the number of votes cast by the Jury members for each Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design.

19.2. The Jury will neither review any Commercial Proposals nor take their details into account when selecting the Winner and other Finalists.

19.3. In the case of equal number of votes for one of the Concepts for Architecture and Landscaping Design, Jury members take another vote in order to constitute a unique ranking for each Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design.

19.4. The Finalists shall be three (3) Participants whose Concepts for Architecture and Landscaping Design have received the greatest number of Jury votes. One of the Finalists, whose Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design has received the greatest number of Jury votes, shall be declared the Winner.

19.5. Announcement of the Winner and other Finalists is published on the Competition Website within five (5) working days starting from the day when the decision was made by the Jury.

20. Selection of the Author

20.1. The Author is the Finalist whose Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design will be chosen for implementation, is selected by the Client in accordance with Article 20.

20.2. In order to clarify the terms and conditions of any Commercial Proposal, the Client may conduct negotiations with the Winner.

20.3. In case if

(a) any time prior to expiration of a two-year period of time since the Jury has selected the Winner and the other Finalists, the Winner refuses from further participation in the Project implementation; or

(b) within the given time period the Winner and the Client fail to reach a mutually acceptable agreement on the participation of the Winner in implementation of the Project,

the Client gets the right to negotiate with the Finalist, whose Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design came second in the ranking of the Competition.

20.4. Furthermore in the case of refusal of the Finalist, whose Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design came second in the ranking, to participate in implementation of the Project or if it is impossible (according to the Client) to reach a mutually acceptable agreement on the participation...
in the implementation of the Project, the Client has the right to negotiate with the Finalist, whose Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design came third in the ranking.

20.5. In cases when:

(a) within two-year period since the selection of the Winner and other Finalists, the Winner and the Client fail to reach a mutually acceptable agreement on the participation of the Winner in the Project implementation; or

(b) The Client refuses to implement the Project or involve the Winner in its implementation

The Winner will have the right to demand from the Customer a fixed amount of US$ 250,000 (two hundred fifty thousand USD). The given amount shall be regarded as a compensation paid to the Winner for his non-involvement and no contract(s) to be signed with him and shall cover the full cost of preparing and presenting the Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design, and also compensation of any lost profit of the Winner. The given amount includes all taxes that are subject to be paid or may be subject to be paid by the Client or the Winner in connection with its payment.

20.6 To avoid any doubts it is said that the Client can refuse from implementation of the Project or from involving the Winner in the implementation of the Projects at any stage.

20.7 In case of any doubts Finalists, whose Concepts for Architecture and Landscaping Design came second and third, do not have the right to make restitutions according to Clause 20.5.

20.8 Commercial terms of the future cooperation with the Author might change upon the results of the negotiations with the Client, and therefore they might be fixed before the Conclusion of the Contract with the Author by a protocol of definition of the price, signed by the Client and Author.

21. Recognition of the Competition Failure

21.1 Grounds for the recognition of the Competition failure

The Competition is recognized as failed in case:

(a) less than six (6) Applicants have registered for the Competition or as a result of retirement, decline of the Application or refusal in allowance to participation in the Qualification Evaluation there are less then six (6) Applicants; or

(b) as a result of retirement or disqualification of Applicants there are less then three (3) Applicants.

21.2. Recognition of the Competition Failure

In case any of the grounds, given in the Clause 21.1, are met, the Organizer publishes a message on the Competition Website claiming the Competition Failure. The Competition is recognized failed from the moment of
the message published.

22. General provisions

22.1. Giving of Explanations

(a) Any Applicant or Participant may request the Client to explain the provisions of the Competition Documentation. Such request shall be sent in writing or electronically to the address given in Clause 22.2(b) or delivered through the Competition Website.

(b) The Organizer shall reply to any request to explain the provisions of the Competition Documentation electronically and in writing within five (5) working days after the receipt of such request. Any request from an Applicant shall be received by the Organizer not later than ten (10) days before the deadline of the Application submission. The Organizer will not be obliged to answer any request received after that deadline.

(c) Within one day after the delivery of an explanation with respect to the provisions of the Competition Documentation upon request of an Applicant or a Participant, such explanation shall be posted by the Organizer on the Competition Website with an indication to the subject-matter of the request, but without any indication to the requesting Applicant or Participant.

(d) After the Qualification is completed, a special forum shall be opened on the Competition Website in order to reply to any Participant’s requests to explain the provisions of the Competition Documentation. The forum shall operate until the last date of receipt of Design proposals. The Organizer will not be obliged to answer any requests received from a Participant after 6 September 2013.

(e) No late reply may be considered an excuse for the extension of the term for submitting an Application or a Design proposal.

22.2. Addresses

(a) The address of the Competition Website: www.parkzaryadye.com

(b) The Organizer’s address for any Applications, Design proposals and requests to explain or amend the provisions of the Competition Documentation:

Note: Competition. Zaryadye

Address: 14 Bersenevskaya Embankment, Building 5A, Moscow 119072, Russian Federation

E-mail: info@parkzaryadye.com

22.3. Applicable Law

The relations among the parties (the Participants, the Client, the Organizer and the Organizer) in connection with the Competition shall be governed by the laws of the Russian Federation.

22.4. Effect of These Regulations
These Regulations shall constitute an accession agreement between the Client and any Applicant and become binding upon each Applicant as from the time when the Organizer has accepted such Applicant’s Application.

22.5. Amendments to These Regulations

(a) The Client may, on its own initiative or upon a reasonable request of an Applicant, decide to amend the Regulations not later than five (5) working days before the deadline for receipt of the Applications. The Competition objective shall not be amended.

(b) Within five (5) working days after the date of any decision to amend the Regulations, such amendments shall be published by the Organizer on the Competition Website.

22.6. Dispute Resolution

All disputes which may arise from the parties’ relationship in connection with the Competition shall be resolved in the Moscow Arbitration Court in accordance with the procedural laws of the Russian Federation.

22.7. Language

(a) The official languages of the Competition shall be Russian and English.

(b) Any Concepts for Architecture and Landscaping Design, including all documents, legends and explanations on panels shall be submitted in Russian and (or) English.

(c) The Competition documents shall be presented in Russian and English. In the case of any discrepancy between the Russian and English texts, the Russian version shall prevail.

23. Glossary and Interpretation Regulations

23.1. Terms and Definitions

The following capitalised words and expressions used in the Competition Documentation (terms) shall have the meanings given in this article:

“Applicant” means an individual person or a Consortium wishing to take part in the Competition;

“Application” means certain information and documents to be submitted by an Applicant for participation in the Qualification. The composition, contents and presentation requirements of an Application are set forth in Appendix 2;

“Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design” means, as the context may require:

any materials containing and demonstrating (in textual and graphic form) the key layout, spatial and functional solutions for the Project Site and the Property, including the exterior and interior appearance of any buildings or structures to be built/located therein; or
the objective presentation form of such project as a certain package of media (panels, models). The composition, contents and presentation requirements of Concepts for Architecture and Landscaping Design are set forth in Appendix 5. A Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design is, together with a Commercial Proposal, an integral part of a Design proposal;

“Organizer” means state-owned unitary enterprise “NIiPI for the General Plan of the City of Moscow” as the specialised entity which conducts the Competition upon the Client’s instructions;

“Author” means the Finalist whose Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design is chosen for implementation as a result of the Competition;

“Design proposal” means a set of information and materials to be submitted by Participants in the Competition. Any Design proposal shall include a Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design and a Commercial Proposal and shall be divided into two packages: Package 1 shall include the graphic materials of the Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design and Package 2 shall include a model of the Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design and the Commercial Proposal;

“Commercial Proposal” means a Finalist’s proposal to the Client regarding the price and possible terms and conditions of its participation in the implementation of the Project during the design and construction of the Property. The composition, contents and presentation requirements of a Commercial Proposal are set forth in Appendix 5. A Commercial Proposal is, together with a Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design, an integral part of a Design proposal and will be included in Package 2 of such Design proposal;

“Consortium” means an association of two or more entities which act in the Competition as a single Applicant or Participant;

“Competition” means a Competition to be conducted on the basis of the Competition Documentation for the purpose of selecting a Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design for further implementation and an Author, i.e. a certain Finalist which will be engaged in further designing of the Property;

“Competition Brief” means a detailed description of the Client’s requirements regarding the layout of the Project Site, the contents and specific features of the Property. The Competition Brief forms Part [III] of the Competition Documentation;

“Competition Criteria” means the criteria to be used to evaluate and compare the Concepts for Architecture and Landscaping Design submitted by the Participants. The
Competition Criteria are set forth in Appendix 6;

"Competition Documentation" means documentation regarding the Com-
petition which shall include:
Part I: Request for Expression of Interest;
Part II: Regulations; and
Part III: Brief Competition;

"Competition Website"
means the following website: www.parkzaryadye.com;

"Client"
means Open Joint-Stock Company "Rossiya";

"Disclosure Letter"
means a letter in an arbitrary form which shall be submitted to the Organ-
izer by any Applicant which may, in accordance with the Regulations, be
deemed capable of influencing the outcome of the Competition or capable
of restricting competition with respect to the selection of a contractor
for the construction of the Property by the Client (or by any other party
implementing the Project);

"Expert"
means each of the persons listed in Appendix 8;

"Expert Panel"
means a special advisory body of the Competition consisting of the
Experts' representatives appointed by the Experts upon the Organizer's
request. The Expert Panel shall advise and assist the Jury in making its
decision regarding the selection of the Winner and the other Finalists.

"Jury"
means the Jury for the Competition;

"Participant"
means any Application which has passed the Qualification and declared a
Participant in the Competition by the Jury’s decision;

"Participant Agreement"
means an agreement to be entered into upon completion of the Quali-
fication between the Organizer (acting as agent for the Client) and each
Participant, whereby such Participant will grant to the Client (and also to
the Organizer) certain limited rights to use the Concept for Architecture
and Landscaping Design to be prepared by the Participant (mainly in rela-
tion to the publication of such Concept for Architecture and Landscaping
Design and the Client will compensate the Participant for the granting of
such rights and for its expenses related to the creation of its Concept for
Architecture and Landscaping Design and participation in the Competition
in a pre-determined amount;

"Project" means a certain set of operations and activities intended to plan,
prepare and construct/locate the Property;

"Project Site" means the Site including the development site of the former
Rossiya Hotel as well as the Site of Zaryadye Blocks 20-25 within
the following boundaries: the roadway of Varvarka Street, the boundary
of the protected Site of the Moscow Kremlin, excluding Z.M. Persitz’ for-
mer tenement building (14 Varvarka Street) in the North and North-West;
the roadway of Kitaigorodsky Proyezd in the East; Moskvoretskaya Em-
bankment and the water front of the Moskva river in the South; and
the roadway of Moskvoretskaya Street in the West;

“Property”
means collectively all functional Sites, buildings and structures intended
to be built under the Project on the Project Site, namely:
a park;
parking;
a multipurpose complex included in the park;
Moskvoretskaya Embankment of the Moskva river;
hotel building; and
philharmonic building;

“Qualification”
means the stage of the Competition at which Participants will be picked
from among the Applicants. The Qualification will start from the registra-
tion of any Applications submitted by the Applicants and end when the
Jury decides to declare certain Applicants as the Participants;

“Qualification Criteria”
means the criteria to be used to evaluate and compare the Applications
submitted by the Applicants. The Qualification Criteria are set forth in Ap-
pendix 4;

“Qualification Rating”
means a written document to be prepared by the Organizer, which summa-
rises the Organizer’s evaluation as to whether the Applications submitted
by the Applicants meet the Qualification Criteria;

“Regulations”
means the Regulations, terms and conditions governing the process of the
Competition, as set forth in Part [II] of the Competition Documentation;

“Finalist”
means each of the Participants, whose Concepts for Architecture and
Landscaping Design have been assigned ranks from 1 to 3 following the
evaluation and comparison of the Concepts for Architecture and Landscap-
ing Design by the Jury;

“Technical Evaluation”
means the stage of the Competition during which the Experts will evalu-
ate and compare the Concepts for Architecture and Landscaping Design
submitted by the Participants with respect to their conformity with the
requirements of the Competition Documentation, the Competition Criteria,
any applicable design and construction Regulations and regulations and
generally with respect to their feasibility and will issue their conclusions in
this regard;
“Technical Report” means a written document to be prepared by the Organizer in which the Organizer will summarise the comments and remarks made by the Experts in their replies to the Concepts for Architecture and Landscaping Design and draw its own conclusion as to whether the Concepts for Architecture and Landscaping Design submitted by the Participants meet the Competition Criteria;

“Winner” means the Finalist whose Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design is assigned the top rank as a result of the evaluation and comparison of the Participants’ Concepts for Architecture and Landscaping Design by the Jury;

“Works” means all and any copyrighted items, including, but not limited to, architectural, urban planning and gardening works, including in the form of designs, drawings, images or models, as well as any element of a complex item including several protected results of intellectual activities;

23.2. Rules of Interpretation

The following rules of interpretation shall be used in the Competition Documentation:

(a) any reference to a "Part", "Article", "Clause" or "Appendix" shall (except for such references in Appendixes which form a separate document with its own internal structure) be a reference to the relevant Part, Article, Clause of or Appendix to the Competition Documentation;

(b) Any Appendix shall be an integral part of the Competition Documentation;

(c) any reference to an agreement, contract, arrangement or undertaking shall be construed as a reference to such agreement, contract, arrangement or undertaking as varied, supplemented, novated or replaced from time to time;

(d) any reference to an affiliate of a certain person shall mean (i) a person qualified as an “affiliate” under the laws of the Russian Federation; or (ii) if at any time the laws of the Russian Federation does not define the term “affiliate”, a person qualified as a person included in a “group of persons” under the laws of the Russian Federation; and

(e) any reference to a provision of law (except for express references to the numbers of articles or parts of articles of specific legislation as at the date of the Competition Documentation) shall be a reference to such provision as may be varied or supplemented from time to time, including any relevant bylaws, as well as any rules of its practical application or interpretation from time to time, taking into account any explanations and clarifications contained in any other provisions of law, official recommendations and judicial acts (including acts with respect to any specific case).
APPENDIX 1.
COMPETITION SCHEDULE

Application deadline 22 May
Review of applications 22 May – 14 June
First stage Jury meeting (selecting 6 participants) 17-18 June
Introductory workshop for the Participants 27 June - 02 July
Participants working on Design proposals 1 July – 27 September
Operation of the online forum 1 July – 06 September
Deadline for the submission of Design Proposals 27 September
Deadline for model submission 21 October
Technical expertise of the Competition projects 27 September – 1 November
Second stage Jury meeting (selecting the Winner) 1-12 November

The Competition Organizer reserves the right to introduce changes to the Competition schedule. Such changes will be announced on the Competition Website.
APPENDIX 2.
THE COMPOSITION, CONTENTS AND REQUIREMENTS TO THE APPLICATION

1. The Composition and Contents of an Application

1.1 Information on the Applicant (the individual Applicant or, for a Consortium, the Consortium Leader)

(a) The name of the entity (indicating its postal address and website) and the address of a Russian representative office (for a foreign entity, if any);

(b) The contact details of the employee responsible for the filling the Application (full name, e-mail and contact phone number);

(c) Information on the project leader, including full name, position and experience (years of experience in such position, the list of project in which he or she was engaged and his or her role therein, the list of current projects indicating his or her role and the stage of each project);

(d) A brief description of the entity’s business (not more than 200 words);

(e) A brief description of the entity’s history (not more than 200 words);

(f) The age of the entity;

(g) The staff of the entity (the number of management staff, employees engaged in designing, support staff and temporary employees);

(h) The annual average revenue of the entity (actual annual average revenue for the last two years and forecast for the current year);

(i) Any international certificates, awards and Competitions won for the last five years – not more than 10 (name, year of award, if any).

1.2 Portfolio

Information on up to five (5) projects during the last 10 years involving the design of an urban territory with the public space elements (at least 2 hectares) or a public space (at least 0,5 hectares) located in the urban environment.

The following details shall be provided for each project:

(a) The name;

(b) The location;

(c) The year of implementation/current status of the project (if not implemented);

(d) The main purpose;

(e) The Site;

(f) The capacity (number of visitors per day/year);

(g) The list of key functions and facilities;

(h) The list of design stages in which the entity was engaged;

(i) The Client (including contact details);

(j) The project implementation budget; and
(k) Visual materials (up to five images per project).

1.3 Declaration on Establishment of Consortium

Signed by all the members of the Consortium, Declaration of Consortium on involvement of Subcontractors and Organizers shall include:

(a) A list of the Consortium’s members with a brief description of the corporate profiles and key contributions to the project.

(b) The organizational chart of the Consortium indicating the percentage of each company/employee’s contribution to the overall scope of work.

(c) Information on each employee of the companies included in the Consortium, including his or her full name, position, role in the project and brief description of his or her professional skills (years of experience in such position, the list of projects in which he or she was engaged and his or her role therein, the list of current projects indicating his or her role and the stage of each project).

1.4 Motivation Letter

A letter describing the key approaches to the concept for the Zaryadye Park.

The letter shall contain 1,500 to 2,000 characters.

1.5 Copies of Documents

(a) The certificate of incorporation/statement from the trade register in respect of each of the Consortium members.

(b) A certificate issued by a self-regulated organization to Russian companies authorising them to prepare design documentation, or a professional certificate authorising the company to perform work in the field of architecture and/or landscape design (landscape architecture) in the country of the foreign company’s incorporation.

(c) A statement confirming the awareness of the Competition Documentation, the acceptance of (accession to) the Regulations and credibility of the information contained in Application (as per Form 3.1 given in Clause 3.1 of Appendix 2).

(d) A Project Co-Operation Agreement signed by all of the Consortium members.

(e) Disclosure Letter, if needed, see Articles 9.1 and 9.2 of the Rules.

2. Requirements for Presentation of the Application

2.1 Information in all sections of the Application shall be presented according to each clause of each paragraph and strictly in accordance with Part 1 of this Appendix.

2.2 The Application shall be prepared in writing, signed by the chief ex-
ecutive officer of the Consortium leader or an authorised representative of the Applicant (Consortium Leader) and sealed by the corporate seal.

2.3 The materials shall be presented in a single A3 booklet.

2.4 The electronic form of the Application shall be submitted in the pdf format, and the size of each file containing documents and materials described in Part 1 of this Appendix 2 shall not exceed 25 Mb.

2.5 Original version of the Application is to be submitted in three (3) copies of the original documents and materials, delivered by post, courier or hand to the address given in the Clause 22.2(b).

3. Form of Statement of Awareness of the Competition Documentation and Acceptance of (Accession to) the Regulations

[On the individual Applicant or Consortium Leader’s letterhead]

We refer to the Competition Documentation with respect to the international landscape and architectural Competition for the development of a concept for Zaryadye Blocks 20-25. The terms defined in the Competition Documentation shall have the same meanings when used herein.

We [PLEASE CHOOSE: as an individual Applicant OR as the Consortium Leader acting on behalf of all of the Consortium members named in the Application] hereby state as follows:

- We are aware of the Competition Documentation and these Regulations and hereby agree with and accede to the Regulations.

- We do hereby confirm that the information contained in our Application is true and that the Organizer and the Organizer may request any further information clarifying the details contained in our Application from us, any competent authorities or any legal entities or individuals mentioned in our Application.

- We do understand that our Application may be rejected and that we may be disqualified even if we have successfully passed the Qualification in the event that any of the information contained in our Application is untrue, incomplete or inaccurate, including our failure to submit a Disclosure Letter as required by these Regulations.

We hereby give our consent to accept the decision by the Competition Jury as the final decision.

Date  _______________________
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JURY MEMBERS

Signature _______________________

The composition of the Jury shall be as follows:

Sergey Kuznetsov, Chief Architect of Moscow and Chairman of the Moscow Architecture Board (Russia)

Sergey Kapkov, Minister of the Moscow Government, Head of the Moscow Department of Culture (Russia)

Alexander Kibovsky, Minister of the Moscow Government, Head of the Moscow Department of Cultural Heritage (Russia)

Anton Koulbachevksy, Minister of the Moscow Government, Head of the Moscow Department of Nature Resources and Ecology (Russia)

Natalia Sergunina, Deputy Mayor of Moscow in the Moscow Government in charge of property and land relations (Russia)

Mikhail Posokhin, General Director of M.V. Posokhin Gosproekt-2 Institute and President of the National Designer Association (Russia)

Yury Grigorian, Co-founder and head of the architectural office “Meganom Project”, professor of the Moscow Institute of Architecture and head of educational programmes with the Strelka Institute for the media, architecture and design (Russia)

Antoni Vives i Tomas, Vice Mayor of Barcelona (Spain)

Heather Deal, Member of the Vancouver City Council and Chairman of the Vancouver Park Board in 2002-2003 (Canada)

Keith Kerr, Chairman, The Development Studio Ltd. (Hong Kong)

Gaetan Royer, Head of the Metropolitan Department of Planning, Regional Parks & Environment at Metro Vancouver in 2011-2013 and author of “Time for Cities” (Canada)

Saskia Sassen, Expert in urban sociology, professor with the Columbian University, jury chairman of the Audi Urban Future Summit (Netherlands/USA)

Ken Smith, Landscape architect, CEO of The Ken Smith Workshop (USA)

Martha Thorne, Executive Director of the Pritzker Prize (Spain)

Peter Walker, Landscape architect, Head of PWP Landscape Architecture, Berkeley (USA)

Martha Schwartz, Architect, CEO of Martha Schwartz Partners (UK)
APPENDIX 4.
QUALIFICATION CRITERIA

Any Application shall be evaluated in accordance with the following criteria:

20 POINTS
The Applicant’s profile general information: the size and age of the entity, financial details, etc.

30 POINTS
The composition of the Applicant’s team, experience and qualifications of the key team members in implementing projects with similar requirements

50 POINTS
The Applicant’s experience in preparing design documentation and implementing urban projects, multipurpose parks, landscape parks or open public spaces
APPENDIX 5.
THE COMPOSITION, CONTENTS AND REQUIREMENTS FOR DESIGN PROPOSALS

The composition, contents and requirements for the Design proposals are subject to change. The applicable requirements will be set forth in more detail when the Competition Brief is published.

1. The Composition, Contents and Requirements for Presentation of the Concepts for Architecture and Landscaping Design.

1.1 A0 presentation panels (max 14 pcs):
Panel 1: The urban planning context of park location, transport and pedestrian plans (M 1: 2000) indicating:
- the location of the Property in the context of the city's overall structures of green spaces (the scale is as selected by the Participant);
- the location of the Property in the context of public spaces in the centre of the city (M 1:10000); and
- the location of the Property in the inhabitation system of the adjacent Sites (site plan) (M 1:5000).

Panel 2: Plans supporting the concept of the park (the scale is as selected by the Participant), including a "Park in Winter" part (M 1:2000).

Panels 3-4: The architectural planning layout of the Site (master plan) (M 1:500) indicating:
- building locations with height marks of cornices/facades (along the contour);
- landscape solutions and key landscaping elements;
- key entrances;
- open public spaces, programmed spaces; and
- access roads, parking spaces, bicycle and pedestrian solutions.

Panels 5-6: Indicative sections and elevations along the site (M 1:500) consisting of:
- four elevations: along Moskvoretskaya Embankment with a view of the Kremlin, along Varvara Street, along Kitaigorodsky Proyezd, and on the side of the Bolshoi Moskvoretsky Bridge, indicating the height marks of cornices/facades, buildings (M 1:500); and
- longitudinal and lateral section and site sections showing through the key facilities (M 1:500).

Panel 7: Floor plans, facades and sections of key facilities forming the project (M 1:200) (if necessary, plans of the basement and the underground parking may be presented in scale M 1: 500) showing:
- functional zones and Sites;
- conceptual solutions for the location of technical premises and key vertical shafts; and
- fire safety conceptual solutions and evacuation routes.

Panel 8: Plan of functional land use (M 1:1000):
- the structure and content of key functional zones;
primary and secondary entrances;
boundaries of the functional zones;
balance of territory and balance of Sites in general and for each zone separately; and

requirements for the key elements of functional zones (hard landscaping, greenery, pavements, lighting and public toilets).

Panel 9: Summer and winter park operation plans (M 1:1000) indicating:
functional program of the territory;
functional program of the buildings; and
event functional program.

Panel 10: Dendro-plan (M 1:1000) and sustainable development plans
(M 1: 2000 – 1:5000) indicating:
the principles of greenery location;
the key species of trees and bushes, grass and flowers, with due regard to seasons factors;
typology of plants; and
biodiversity schemes.

Panel 11: Materials substantiating the design solution (project economics, implementation stages, etc.).

Panels 12-14: Perspective views of the park using photographs of the design site, including bird's eye views and key views at the human height, in
each case showing the park in summer, winter and autumn.
Shown below is a sample layout of the A0 presentation panels:

1.2. A3 Scaled-down copies of the presentation panels:
The complete set of scaled-down copies (50%) of the A0 presentation panels, identical in its content to the originals.

1.3 A3 album with a minimized copy of the presentation panels
Full set of minimized copies of the A0 presentation panels in a form of A3 format albums.

1.4. Explanatory note:
A3 booklet including the following chapters:

Urban planning and transport solutions;
Technical and economic indicators of the project;
Planting and landscaping and list of plants;
Principles of the year-round functions of the park
Principles of sustainable development
Pavement materials;
Balance of the territory;
Use of existing facilities;
Indicative evaluation of the cost of implementation
Engineering solutions;
Architectural solutions for key facilities;
Park exploitation parametres.

1.5. Digital materials:
A CD/DVD disk containing electronic copies of the panels in PDF or JPEG format with a 300 dpi resolution in real size, A3 album of scaled-down copies of the panels, in the PDF format, an electronic version of the explanatory note, and design drawings in DWG format (AutoCAD 2010 or an earlier version).

1.6. Model:
Model of the park territory in 1:1000 scale showing the context. (The scale of the model may be modified upon consulting the Competition Participants).

1.7. Video presentation:
Video presentation of the project, duration 3-5 mins.

1.8. Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design presentation:
A 10 slide-presentation of the Concept for Architecture and Landscaping Design of the project, containing brief description of the concept through slides.

2. The Composition, Contents and Requirements to the Commercial Proposals
The contents of a Commercial Proposal will be specified upon the issuing of the Competition Brief.

The Commercial Proposal shall be presented as an A3 booklet and also
written on a CD/DVD in the PDF format.

The Jury will evaluate Design proposals in accordance with the following criteria:

Creation of a unique and memorable landscape and architectural image of the park in line with the vision stipulated in the Competition Brief.

Conformity of the Design proposal with the requirements listed in the Competition Brief (area schedule, technical and economic indices, due regard for the protected areas of the Moscow Kremlin, the requirements for the protection of perspective views and compliance with the maximum permissible heights of the facilities, etc.).

Compliance with the existing Constructions Standards and Local Building Requirements of the Russian Federation: Fundamental conformity of the design with the construction standards and requirements applicable in the Russian Federation.

A logical spatial arrangement, convenient functional connections and effective interaction between the parts of the park, the territory in the whole and park with the surroundings.

Synergy among the Competition Brief components and their integrability with each other or with the nearby facilities.

Comfortable traffic and pedestrian accessibility of the park and increase in the throughout capability of the pedestrian access points.

Creation of a comfortable environment for visitors and personnel.

The quality of solutions included in the summer and winter operation programme of the park (operation of the open Sites in summer and winter, use of the embankment during the cold winter months, seasonal adaptability of the proposed design solutions, selection of plantings, etc.).

Innovativeness of the architectural design solutions, landscaping solution, construction and engineering technologies.

Environmental sustainability of the design solution and the algorithm of the exact manner of its preparation.

Feasibility of the proposed design in terms of existing technologies and possibility of their use.

Efficiency of the design in terms of construction costs and further maintenance.

The above criteria have no pre-defined priority and may be clarified and extended when issuing the Competition Brief.
APPENDIX 7.
FORM
OF THE AGREEMENT WITH THE PARTICIPANT

[TO BE INSERTED WHEN ISSUING THE COMPETITION BRIEF]
APPENDIX 8.

EXPERTS

[TO BE INSERTED WHEN ISSUING THE COMPETITION BRIEF]