

Nr. Crt.	Question	Answer
1.	Is the field trip compulsory within the scope of this competition?	According to the Competition Rules, participation in the site visit is not a condition for your participation in the competition.
2.	The Competition Rules stipulates that the delivery deadline shall be the date on which the package arrives at the OAR Cluj headquarters, not the sending date of the post office for the package. Being a team from outside Romania, the processing and delivery times will be considerably longer, as such the working time will be shorter. Please clarify if you accept a package sent with the postmark before or 29.01.2021.	According to point 3.8.2, par. (2) of the Competition Rules, "(2) The deadline for submitting the projects to the Competition Secretariat, either personally or by courier, is the one indicated in the Competition schedule. Exceeding the deadline shall lead to the rejection of the offer." Therefore, the date and time mentioned in the Competition schedule, Rules, point 3.17, 29 January 2021, H 16:00, refers to the deadline and time for submitting projects to the Reception secretariat, by handing over or sending the package by courier, with its rejection in the event of exceeding the deadline. This provision observes the legal provisions in the public procurement sector and was announced with the launch of the competition.
3.	I am a Columbian architect and a current resident of Santiago de Chile. Can I participate without being part	Since the purpose of this competition is "to select the best project for the Cluj-Napoca East Park, for the award of the design contract". in order to implement the winning

of any of these countries (Romania, all countries of the European Union, of the European Economia Area or the Swiss Confederation)?

proposal (point 1.2.1., Competition Rules), the participation restriction expressed in point 1.3.1. of the Competition Rules ("The Design Competition is a public, single-stage competition, open to Romania, all countries of the European Union, of the European Economic Area, and to the Swiss Confederation.") is given by the fact that the winning architect must ensure the signing of the technical documentation for the approval-authorization procedure and must undertake the professional responsibilities according to the law.

Therefore, certified architects from the European Union, the European Economic Area and the Swiss Confederation can participate in the competition provided that in case of winning the competition they prove the right to authorize projects as an architect in that country and they initiate the process of acquiring the right to signature for the temporary provision of services in the field of architecture on the Romanian territory according to law 184/2001. Competitors of legal entities and individuals from outside Romania, the European Union, the European Economic Area and the Swiss Confederation may participate in the competition exclusively by association with an architect with the right to sign, a member of the Romanian Order of Architects or a similar organization in his country - an EU member state, of the European Economic Area or the Swiss Confederation – who legally exercises the profession of architect according to the national legislation of the country of origin, in which case the project will be submitted and signed by the architect in question.

Please also see the answer to questions 1-3 from the 1st Q&A Round published on the competition website on November 16th in Romanian:

https://www.oar.archi/ro/concursuri/comunicate/parc-est and in English: https://www.oar.archi/en/concursuri/comunicate/east-park

4.	It is a very interesting competition, i enjoyed reading the brief, I wonder if this is open to those who are not officially architects but have done masters in architecture degree?	For reasons identical to those mentioned in the aswer to question number 3 in the present Q&A document, since the purpose of this competition is "to select the best project for the Cluj-Napoca East Park, for the award of the design contract". in order to implement the winning proposal (point 1.2.1., Competition Rules), the participation restriction expressed in point 2.1.2. of the Competition Rules ("The candidates entering the Competition as legal entities shall have as associate or employee a certified architect, member of the Order of Architects in Romania or of a similar organization in his or her country of origin, legally practicing and having the required qualification as architect, in compliance with the national legislation of his or her country of origin.") is given by the fact that the winning architect must ensure the signing of the technical documentation for the approval-authorization procedure and must undertake the professional responsibilities according to the law. Therefore, you can participate in this competition as long as the requirement expressed by point 2.1.2 is fully met: by employing or in association with a certified architect, member of the Romanian Order of Architects or a similar organization of his or her country of origin, who legally practices the profession in compliance with the national legislation of his or her country of origin. Please also see the answer to question number 5 in the present Q&A document.
5.	In order to participate in the competition as a legal entity (design firm) in the Competition Rules is specified at point 2.1.2 The candidates entering the Competition as legal entities shall have as associate or employee a	Firstly, we present the contents of points 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 of the Competition Rules: "2.1.1 The competitors may be individual architecture offices, partnerships formed by individual architecture offices, or other legal forms of exercising the profession of

certified architect, member of the Order of Architects in Romania. What does the term associate mean? The architect with whom the design company will be associated through the Joint Venture Agreement (Association Form)? architect or urban planner, according to the national legislation of the state of origin or legal persons (design companies) in Romania or in other countries, either individually or as a joint venture. In the case of a joint venture, its leader will register the project in the contest.

2.1.2 The candidates entering the Competition as legal entities shall have as associate or employee a certified architect, member of the Order of Architects in Romania or of a similar organization in his or her country of origin, legally practicing and having the required qualification as architect, in compliance with the national legislation of his or her country of origin. The candidates, whether individually or as joint ventures, must have the legal capacity of concluding a design services contract in Romania, which will have to be proven to the Contracting Authority, should they win the Competition."

In this sense, the Declaration of association included in *Annex 2 - Competition Rules* (2.2 *Participation Forms*) has legal value for defining the association between the two entities that make up the competition team thus formed.

By these we mean that those entities that wish to participate in the competition as a team (associations of two or more architecture offices, firms) or legal entities that do not meet the condition expressed in point 2.1.2 ("certified architect, member of the Order of Architects in Romania or of a similar organization in his or her country of origin, legally practicing and having the required qualification as architect, in compliance with the national legislation of his or her country of origin") will use the Joint Venture agreement comprised by Annex 2 in order to define the participant team in the procedure.

		Please note that the DEAU form must be filled-in for each tenderer/associate/subcontractor/ supporting third party, as stated by point 2.2 of the Competition Rules.
6.	The Romanian version of the Competition Rules, point 3.6.2 Content of the projects, subpoint c), bullet 2 mentions the identification form for the Competition Exhibition is the model Annex 2.7, while the same document in the English version mentions the same model as Annex 2.9. Please clarify.	The Identification Form is included in <i>Annex 2 – Competition Rules</i> , sub-Annex 2.7 .
7.	The Competition Rules document, point 3.6.2 Content of the projects,, subpoint c), bullet 3 mentions that the USB Drive will contain all the participation documents in .doc format. How will they be signed and stamped? How do you ensure the security of the filled-in data in .doc format, this being an editable format?	According to the Competition Rules, points 2.2 (Participation forms), 3.6 (Content of projects), 3.7 (Anonymity of projects) and 3.8 (Project submission), we remind you that the participation forms signed and stamped (according to point 2.2), together with the stick usb, will be placed in a secreted envelope, according to point 3.6, sealed. The official and reference documents within the acquisition are those signed and stamped, requested in print format. The forms included on the usb stick in .doc format serve to efficiently process the participants' data for the activities within the post-jury sessions competition procedure (announcing the participants the results of the procedure by e-mail, uploading the list of participants in SEAP (The Electronic Public Procurement System), uploading the project gallery on the website the competition etc.). These actions take place after the finalization of the Jury proceedings and the signing of the Jury Report and its

		annexes by all jurors.
8.	In the Design Services Contract, clause 10.1 (2) states: 2) The purchaser is required to release the security for participation within at the most working days after the constitution of the performance bond. Please specify and clarify whether there is a guarantee of participation, as I did not find this specified in the documentation.	The clause was maintained in the contract due to a material error. Participants will not submit a guarantee of participation in this competition. To establish the coherence of the competition documentation, please see <i>Annex 10 - Additional documentation Q&A2</i> , document 2.5 Model contract for design services Q&A2.
9.	The Competition Rules require the filling in of the DUAE form in editable format. The file found in the attached documents is in PDF format and has an atypical format compared to a standard format. Are you going to make another DUAE file available or which procedure do you recommend?	Please find attached in <i>Annex 10 – Additional documentation Q&A2</i> , the DUAE form in a Word editable format.
10.	We went through the Competition Brief in both Romanian and English versions, and we identified a discrepancy in the chapter indicating the required Written materials, thus 4.1. An additional material appears in the Romanian version - 4.1.3. East Park	The piece required by point 4.1.3 of the Romanian version of the Competition brief – Plan de management al Parcului Est (written parts) occurs in the text of the Brief due to a material error. Participants will not include a management plan in the content of the projects.
	management plan, with an emphasis on the management of the nature reserve - which is not found in any form in the English version. Please clarify as	Point 4.1 Written elements will be read as follows: "4.1.1. Financial offer for the design services.

	soon as possible if this piece has been removed or if it is necessary and provide us with additional information about the desired format - number of pages, number of words, etc.	4.1.2. Brief description of the architectural-landscape conception; the conceptual basis of the proposed solution will be explained and the punctual decisions leading to the adopted approach will be motivated. Explanatory texts, other than captions and image titles, will not exceed 1000 words and will be conveniently arranged on the drawing boards."
11.	We noticed that the implementation area does not coincide with some private property boundaries, expecially from the C.2 zone to the Lake 2 and around the Lake 3. In particular, on the plan it seems like Lake 3 is not totally walkable on the north side. We have anyway to consider the given implementation area as it is?	Yes. The study area indicated by the Competition Brief (Figure 13) must be taken into account and approached as indicated by the Brief.
12.	In the Competition Brief point 4.2. Drawn parts, Board 3 requires: Board 3: the plan presenting the proposed design for Zone C.2 – Designing the access to the biotope protection area, arranging the slope area – C.1, designing the crossing apparatus throughout the protected area – scale 1: 200; the plan, sections and elevations of the cultural pavilion or the sports building – scale 1:200; illustration of the landscape integration of the proposed building. According to Fig. 13 the public garden is zone B, and the detailing plan refers to C.2 and C.1, respectively,	The title of Board 3 implicitly refers to the arrangement of zone B – public garden. Therefore, compared to Board 1, Board 3 requires a detailing of the important areas of the public garden, especially that of the spaces of transition between zone B, C and A. An illustration of the landscape integration of the proposed buildings, which are located without exception in zone B, is also required. However, the details with the maximum degree of difficulty are in the intermediate areas C1, C2, which deal with the transition from the public garden to the ecosystem protection zone. The spatial-functional relations between the human and the wild habitat constitute the keystone of the proposed solutions.

the protection strips of the ecosystem. Please clarify. 13. We would like to draw attention to some specifications The reference system for the envisaged projects is the Competition Brief, namely the in the Competition Brief that are not in line with the possibility that – depending on their location – the proposed buildings in the public garden may need special foundations, reaching depths of 50 meters. The aspects mentioned in the Geotechnical study attached to the Competition Brief. The Competition Brief requirements indicated in the Brief resulted from the corroboration of several repeatedly specifies the problematic foundation specialized studies. conditions, namely in the chapter "3.1. Conditionings", The relevant geotechnical data for this matter can be found in a more detailed in subchapters 3.1.3 Geological configuration (page geotechnical study, commissioned by RADP Cluj-Napoca, from where we transcribe 17); 3.5.3. Architectural expression(page 24); 3.7. an extract regarding the foundation conditions: "marly base or salt. Attention is drawn Conclusions: Multicriterial performance (page 25). A to the fact that the base layer can be located at depths greater than 50 m". series of problems are mentioned in relation with the ("Geotechnical study, Masterplan of the East green area ...", prepared by S.C. foundation conditions in case of closed constructions or Geodesign S.R.L., project no. 1157/2018, page 16) open pavilions, as well as the need to opt for a solution using eraser foundation on piles, constructive elements that can go down to a depth of 50.00 m in the ground. However, the Geotechnical study says otherwise. In the chapter "Geotechnical assessment", point 2. Foundation conditions, it is specified as follows: The good foundation layer is the layer of dusty sandy clay, brown, plastic vartoosa (2) - [which is at the level -2.60m] for F1, Sandy clay, brown-gray (3) for F2-[located at elevation -1.00 m], Dusty sandy clay, gray [located at elevation -1.00m] for F3 and Sand Gravel (3) intercepted on the depth of the boreholes [which are at -5.00m] "(p. 11). Indeed, the same foundation system is

	recommended in the Geotechnical study as the one mentioned in the Competition Brief, but the maximum foundation depth in question is a maximum of -5.00m, not -50.00m. And the depth of frost is -0.90 m, so this factor does not justify the -50.00 m. Is this a drafting issue? Which of the two documents should we rely on in our approach?	
14.	In the topographic survey .dwg file I can see that the drawing is represented at a scale of 1:500 but there is no mention the size of the Board. The scale at which the plan is drawn does not fit 1:1000 on an A0.	In the topographic .dwg file from the Competition Brief, the A0 paper formats, scale 1: 500, are shown on the "Planse" layer. The scale is also mentioned in the border of the plates and in the upper right corner of the topographic.dwg file. For clarification we also specify that in point 4.2 of the Competition brief the formats on which the proposed solutions will be illustrated are described respectively extended A0, with the dimensions 900x1540 mm.
15.	We request the georeferenced topographic survey. Note that the received .dwg is not in Stereo 70 coordinates.	The topographic observations collected since the field phase are determined directly in Stereo70, respectively MN75. For safety, a new topographic .dwg file has been uploaded to the competition documentation, <i>Annex 10 – Additional documentation Q&A2</i> . We kindly ask the participants to consult this document.
16.	For the two Boards, on which the protection areas are indicated (1 - Fig. 13 Functional zoning of the intervention perimeter and 2 - Plan Overlapping urban	The participants shall take into consideration Fig 13.

	networks with the Sopor park area) there are significant differences such as the protection area along the Becaş, respectively the shore of the Lake. Which of the two plates is considered valid?	
17.	In image 115 of the landscape study, what map are you referring to? Is it possible to identify the position of the trees in the current state?	The landscape study does not contain the detailed survey of the trees on the site. The table in Fig. 115 is associated with the plan of Fig. 114, on which the areas with predominantly aquatic or arborescent flora, etc. can be identified. This level of detail is considered sufficient to develop the appropriate project for the design competition. The identification and location on the plan of the valuable trees to be integrated in the composition is one of the tasks that will fall to the authors of the winning projects – the developers of the technical project, respectively of the execution details.
18.	Should the sports fields, the indoor sports building and the amphitheater be placed in a certain place or can we suggest them anywhere, as long as the land allows construction?	Sports fields and buildings designed for the public garden area (B) can be located anywhere, but preferably peripheral to the boundaries of the study area (see the Competition Brief, points 3.2.3, 3.3.2).
19.	Is it possible to bury the gas pipeline in the reservation? If the answer is no, then why?	It is not planned to bury the above-ground portion of the gas pipeline, for technical reasons beyond the scope of this study. Its disadvantageous visual presence will have to be resolved by means of landscaping.
20.	Is it acceptable to reposition the utility pole north of the	Yes. As it is a design competition, the most appropriate solution shall be proposed in

	site in front of the C2 access?	the detailing phase of the technical project.
21.	Is the repositioning of dumpsters and recycling bins allowed?	Yes.
22.	In the case of street furniture, a specific list of manufacturers will have to be followed or we can propose elements appropriate to the proposed solution and general vision?	The designers have all freedom to introduce the urban furniture they consider suitable for their proposed solution. Certainly, the furniture must be aligned with the main requirements of the Brief, such as those concerning the relationship between public lighting and the nightlife of different animal species. Moreover, the participants must take into account the value of the maximum investment cost estimate – Annex 2.6.
23.	Is it possible to find a list of beetles and insects living in the project area?	All available information on wildlife can be found in Annex 4.4 of the competition documentation, "Preliminary Biodiversity Study."

Important

1. The piece required by point 4.1.3 of the Romanian version of the Competition brief – Plan de management al Parcului Est (written parts) occurs in the text of the Brief due to a material error.

Participants will not include a management plan in the content of the projects.

2. Participants will **not** provide a guarantee of participation in this competition. In this regard, clause 10.1 (2) of the Design Services Contract has been removed. Please refer to Annex 2.5. - Design Services Contract Q&A2 attached in Annex 10 - Additional documentation Q&A2.

arch. Mirona Crăciun Professional advisors

Competition Coordinator arch. Kázmér Kovács

arch. Răzvan Vasiu