

## **Section 4 Matters related to the Screening and Selection of Proposals**

### **1 Basic concept of screening and selection**

Several excellent proposals for formulation of urban development policies shall be selected.

### **2 Regime for screening and selection**

The Screening Committee of the Executive Committee for the Invitation of Proposals from the Private-Sector for the Second-Development Zone in the Umekita Area (hereinafter, the “Screening Committee”) shall evaluate applications and select excellent proposals.

The Screening Committee will consist of the following six members. (Honorific titles are omitted and names are in alphabetic order.)

Tadao Ando

Architect and Professor Emeritus of the University of Tokyo

Shigenori Kobayashi

Professor Emeritus of Yokohama National University and Professor at Tokyo City University

Kengo Kuma

Architect and Professor at the University of Tokyo

Noboru Masuda

Professor at the Graduate School of Life and Environmental Sciences at Osaka Prefecture University

Yoshiteru Murosaki

Vice Chair of the Hyogo Earthquake Memorial 21st Century Research Institute

Yuji Nemoto

Professor at Toyo University

To ensure fairness in the screening process, names of individuals and organizations will be kept anonymous.

### **3 Method for screening and selection**

#### **(1) Basic sequence**

- ① Confirmation of eligibility
- ② Screening
- ③ Selection of excellent proposals

#### **(2) Details**

- ① Confirmation of eligibility

The secretariat will determine if applicants qualify for the Primary Invitation by examining whether their submissions meet the criteria dictated in “Section 1-7: Requirements for participation

eligibility.” Submissions that do not meet the requirements will be disqualified.

② Screening

The Screening Committee will then review submitted documents from applicants who have been determined to meet the eligibility requirements. It should be noted that submitted documents failing to observe proper formatting and style rules shall not be screened.

The Screening Committee members shall review submitted documents based on the following section titled “4 Evaluation criteria.” Afterwards, scores from individual members will be tallied using a comprehensive evaluation method.

③ Selection of excellent proposals

Two categories of excellent proposals shall be selected:

Excellent proposal A - Proposals deemed to be comprehensively excellent

Excellent proposal B - Proposals that are deemed to present excellent planning and design ideas, although they require additional scrutiny in terms of feasibility and area management/operations

\* Those who submitted proposals that have gained a Excellent proposal A and Excellent proposal B rating shall respectively be called “Excellent Proposer A” and “Excellent Proposer B.”

\* The Screening Committee shall determine eligibility quotas for Class A and B Proposals.

**4 Evaluation criteria**

Each Screening Committee member shall employ the following criteria to evaluate individual elements of the proposal.

Requisite proposal elements	Evaluation criteria
<b>I. Area planning and design</b>	
(1) Concepts of urban development	<p>① A future vision for the overall Umekita area</p> <p>Does the proposal present a vision of what the area should look like in the future? In light of the locational characteristics of the land around JR Osaka Station and its assignment as a Designated Urban Renaissance Urgent Redevelopment Area and a Comprehensive Global Strategic Special Zone, Umekita should become a hub that enhances Japan’s international competitiveness and national strength, while attracting people and investment from around the world, all the while growing in coordination with the existing advanced development zone.</p>
	<p>② Basic urban development policy</p> <p>To realize the above vision, does the proposal clearly define the symbolic position of the area within Osaka and lay out a basic policy for urban development?</p>

	<p>③ Urban development in unison with surrounding localities/beneficial effects on surrounding localities</p> <p>Does the proposal suggest development in unison with surrounding localities? Does it explain the beneficial effects development will confer upon surrounding localities?</p>
(2) Land use plans	<p>① Zoning and land use, urban functions to be adopted</p> <p>Based on the basic development vision and policies described in “(1) Concepts of urban development,” does the proposal present effective land use and facility location plans and provide details on urban functions to be adopted? Moreover, does the proposal indicate how the area will fulfill its functions effectively in collaboration with the advanced development zone, so the entire Umekita area can grow into the future?</p>
	<p>② Functions, roles and scales of “open green space”</p> <p>Does the proposal offer verdant open space accessible freely by anyone within private land? Does the proposed plan explain how public infrastructures such as roads, traffic plaza and parks and “open green space” can serve their purposes in a coordinated manner? Does it elaborate on the functions, roles and scales required to realize “open green space” concepts described in the “Introduction” section and the fundamental philosophy provided in “(1) Concepts of urban development”? Furthermore, does it offer details on how “open green space” will be easy to access and aesthetically continuous with surrounding localities?</p>
	<p>③ Functions and facilities necessary for disaster resilience</p> <p>Does the proposal suggest functions and facilities (spaces) necessary for securing the safety of people in the zone and the surrounding localities and for ensuring uninterrupted economic activity in the event of major disaster?</p>
	<p>④ Environmental considerations</p> <p>Does the proposal address environmentally friendly urban development that takes advantage of advanced technologies such as those for energy efficiency?</p>
	<p>⑤ Transportation networks, circulation plans</p> <p>Does the proposal offer viable transportation (i.e., for cars, pedestrians) and circulation plans that take into consideration the conditions of both the area and the surrounding localities?</p>
(3) Landscaping and spatial design that takes advantage of “open green space”	<p>① Concepts for landscaping and spatial design that take advantage of “open green space”</p> <p>Does the proposal exhibit superior design of “open green space” as a whole? Furthermore, does the proposal provide ideas for highly revolutionary and unique urban spaces that can gain substantial global attention and potentially become the “face of Osaka,” with buildings integrated in the open green space?</p>

	<p>② Concepts for landscaping and spatial design for the north-south plus east-west axes and the traffic plaza</p> <p>Does the plan offer appropriate landscaping and spatial design concepts that fundamentally regard the north-south plus east-west axes and the traffic plaza in accordance with paragraphs (1)①&amp;③ and (3) of section 2-3 “Basic concept of urban infrastructure development,” and, based on this idea, secure “open green space” in the second development zone? Furthermore, do these concepts take into account street-facing buildings and construction in the advanced development area already open to the public?</p>
<p>II. Project feasibility</p>	
<p>(4) Area management/operations</p>	<p>① Concepts concerning systems and procedures for area management/operations</p> <p>Does the proposal present systems through which private entities can manage and operate the area in a stable manner for the overall goal of sustainable area growth? Does it present ideas on how management/operations in collaboration with the advanced development area and surrounding localities can be achieved?</p>
	<p>② Effective utilization of “open green space”</p> <p>Does the proposal explain how “open green space” can be effectively utilized to help achieve the stable area management and operations mentioned in ① above?</p>
	<p>③ Mechanisms and systems for disaster resilience</p> <p>Does the proposal suggest systems and mechanisms necessary for securing the safety of people in the zone and the surrounding localities and for ensuring uninterrupted economic activity in the event of major disaster?</p>
<p>(5) Project feasibility</p>	<p>① Budget planning and philosophy</p> <p>Is the budget formulated according to realistic future estimates? Do the plans have a high level of practicality? In other words, in the course of planning the budget has the applicant assumed the circumstances of private entities?</p>
	<p>② Foundations for the contents and scales of urban function to be adopted</p> <p>Does the plan make reasonable estimates in terms of the demand and scale of urban functions to be adopted?</p>
	<p>③ Division of labor between the public and private sectors regarding the creation and management/operations of “open green space”</p> <p>Does the proposal secure enough “open green space” on private property, in addition to those to be developed on public land such as roads, a traffic plaza and parks? Moreover, does the proposal suggest means for effective and efficient public/private partnerships that assume a high level of feasibility? Such means should address issues including, but not limited to, division of labor between the public and private sector.</p>

④ Content and philosophy of the development schedule

Does the proposal present a viable development schedule? Does it offer noteworthy ideas about how provisional land use can be achieved during construction and how to open parts of the area to the public ahead of schedule, for example, in a sequential manner?