

## **Jury Comments**

*(Written Description of Jury Process.)*

- General thoughts regarding the Design Competition and jury process?

The Design contest process worked extremely well. The fact that nearly 1100 entries were received for inclusion in it is more than a significant indication of its initial international success, putting the Bamiyan project well on the world professional architectural map and ultimately exposing to an enormous general public the work of the Government of Afghanistan, in a productive partnership with UNESCO.

The mechanics of the jury process likewise worked exceptionally well. The jury was chosen from a wide range of people from across the world and Afghanistan itself, each of whose skills as professional architects and mine as a museum and exhibition specialist were used to important effect in the jury's deliberations. The yes/no voting system adopted for the jury, along with the triple large format video screens exposing the submissions, allowed the group to decide on each entry with speed and accuracy. The Unesco staff managing the whole process were seriously well prepared for the work, technically and strategically. The process was intense and complex, but it worked and Unesco has to be praised seriously for its achievements in this regard.

The fact that a very serious decision was taken by the whole group as to the final winner and runners up in the contest is a clear indication as to the ability of the group to work together and to negotiate within itself the right way forward for the competition. This competition was founded on the need for a high-level group of specialists to make up the jury. Nothing else would have worked and it did.

- Describe in words: How did the following factors contribute to the decision making process.

### **I. Submission Design and Technical Requirements**

The design submission format worked excellently well, with the basic information demanded of the various submitting professionals providing all that was needed by the jury. Not every submission was as good as every other. Some lacked some the basic requirements, but almost all of them provided just the right amount of information needed for the jury to do its job accurately and quickly. I for one have no criticism of the form of the submission and the details demanded for it by the UNESCO managers. The three screen format for exposure of the submissions worked easily and well, particularly in the hands of the three UNESCO staff members who worked the three computers and all other attendant technical processes. This process worked without any problem, entirely because it was run by people who knew their jobs, had planned for it all and were prepared to work long and complex days at it too. That issue is above all the main reason why the jury process was as smooth and as successful as it was. It was seriously well planned and that kind of preparation will always be essential any future such process.

The sections that follow here (II and III) contain a list of the information required by the competition managers to be attached to each entry. As basic data need for the work of the jury, the material was entirely sufficient for the jury to do the job, leading up to a serious, buildable, naturally and, in heritage terms, environmentally sympathetic and workable solution to the issue. Submissions that did not provide all the information needed were in the main rejected. Some of them frankly did not think hard enough about the difficult climate and seismic issues that plague the Bamiyan Valley. The heritage context into which the Centre will be placed are of enormous importance and some of the submissions were frankly just mad, most, however, were neutral enough in design terms to find a place on the site without spoiling anything of the valley.

Many of the tenders did not think sufficiently about the issue of exhibition spaces, how to relate the two areas required one to the other and also how to provide easily accessible practical workshop and materials/exhibition object storage space adjacent to the display areas. Security issues related to display areas need seriously to be considered in all of the planning for the new Centre. The display

areas must be provided with strong lockable doors, as must all storage facilities and workshops that might be used for temporary storage of objects and valuable equipment. I would add also that a kind of strong room with ultra heavy doors and locks be installed for the storage of seriously valuable material. It need not be very large, but judged sufficient for this particular purpose for at least the next twenty-five years.

Many designs failed to recognize the fact that winter in Bamiyan is very severe and that protected access from one building to another needed to be built in to the plans for the Centre. Staff cannot be expected in that climate to have to venture outside when they need to go to another part of the complex. Even the design that won the contest needs to be looked at again in that respect.

A final observation about the Cultural Centre site and the Bamiyan valley in general is the need to preserve at all costs the heritage qualities of this region. It is clear from information provided by our jury colleague Jukka J..., that there is a need for at least a minor adjustment to the area covered by the UNESCO World Heritage Site designation, to add more area subject to this protective status and to plan for the long term future of the entire Bamiyan area as an unique cultural area. Poor and random buildings in what seem to be the suburbs of the town are clearly beginning to encroach on the Centre site. This threat needs to be controlled. Nothing we suggest for this site may be permitted to upset or disturb the relatively unchanged heritage character of the area. As any Culture Centre building that we suggest for construction is being planned and then built, at all times must it be inspected for its suitability for this site and, if necessary, adjusted, even during construction to suit local conditions.

## **II. Submission Panels Requirements**

A text describing the design concept. (Maximum 1000 words)

3 panels @ A0 size landscape format.

Master Site Plan Drawing

Floor Plan Drawing for each floor

Building Elevations (2 minimum)

Building Sections (2 minimum)

Typical Building Wall Section (1 minimum)

Interior Views (4 minimum)

Exterior Views (one rendering from Buddha cliff) (4 minimum)

## **III. The Critical Principals of Design.**

- Create an innovative design.
- Create a vital centre for the cultural community of Bamiyan allowing individuals to commune and share ideas.
- Integrate the Bamiyan Valley view into the building design and create a positive visual impact on the cultural landscape of Bamiyan Valley.
- Integrate an environmentally conscious design, which in the Bamiyan context should consider locally resourced materials, climate and efficiency.

11

UNESCO Bamiyan  
Cultural Centre: Confidential

## **Bamiyan Cultural Centre Design Competition**

### **Jury Report**

- Connect to the historical context of the World Heritage property.

**My view is that the winning entry does not at least upset any aspect of the natural or heritage context of the Bamiyan site. Much of it is low and even semi-underground and will scarcely be apparent at all. Careful landscaping of the site area will add hugely to the success of the Centre building itself and its adjacent areas. The building that came second in the contest is a much more apparent structure, providing, if it were ever to be built, a kind of minor monumentality that could have added significantly to the importance of the Cultural Centre site.**

## **Results**

### **Winning Entry:**

**Submission ID: BCC000738**

**Team Leader: \_ Recabarren, Carlos Nahuel (registered architect: 10316)**

**Team Member: \_ Martínez Catalán, Manuel Alberto**

**Team Member: \_ Morero, Franco**

**Country: Argentina**

### **Four Runnerups:**

1. Submission ID: BCC002009

Team Leader: \_ Ahmet Balkan (registered architect: 30603)

Team Member: \_ Emre Bozatlı

Country: Turkey

2. Submission ID: BCC002022

Team Leader: \_ Noel Dominguez (registered architect 50233525000028)

Team Member: \_ Zoe Salvaire

Team Member: \_ Agathe Culot

Team Member: \_ Anna Kampmann

Team Member: \_ Alexandre Ferron

Country: France

3. Submission ID: BCC004104

Team Leader: \_ COSTAS NICOLAOU (registered architect: A161462)

Team Member: \_ CONSTANTINOS MARCOU

Country: New Zealand

4. Submission ID: BCC003532

Team Leader: \_ Graham Baldwin (registered architect: 1.141215.003)

Team Member: \_ Alessandra Covini

Country: Netherlands

### **Winning Entry**

**Name: BCC000738**

**(Notes from the jury deliberation)**

**It was my view on the day that the 2<sup>nd</sup> place entry 2009 would have been the right choice. I still believe that it would have made a completely satisfactory solution to the problem posed in the competition, but I am now of the strong view that the design that gained the most votes of the jury is a deserving winner of the contest and I am happy strongly to support its submission to the the Government of Afghanistan for its approval. The building has clean low, modern lines and could never be a distraction to eye in this most important and famous of cultural regions. If, as it seems the new building will be, it is clad on the outside with handsome local travertine stone, it will be an attractive structure indeed.**

**I am a little concerned about the long unroofed tunnel-like entrance to the complex and wonder how it will be kept free of snow and ice in the winter. It may be possible to roof this area with strong insulating glass and so ease the snow problem. Some practical solution to that issue may need to be sought with the architects.**

**I think also that separation of the administration building from both the exhibition/performance and research areas may be a problem in the winter and that a solution to the need for a covered walkway connecting these three buildings may need to be solved.**

**Further, though there is an issue of the need for a practical day to day workshop being placed near to the area of the exhibition spaces. Along with space for storage of basic materials and tools, there must be a secure space for collection material as well. Both these workshop and storage spaces need to be in close proximity to the focus of their work, the exhibition areas and there will need to new design thought given to how this issue is to be solved.**

### **Four Runnerups (see my remarks below)**

1. Name: BCC002009
  - a. (Notes from the jury deliberation)
2. Name: BCC002022
  - a. (Notes from the jury deliberation)
3. Name: BCC004104
  - a. (Notes from the jury deliberation)
4. Name: BCC003532

12  
UNESCO Bamiyan  
Cultural Centre: Confidential

### **Bamiyan Cultural Centre Design Competition**

#### **Jury Report**

- a. (Notes from the jury deliberation)

### **HONORABLE MENTIONS OF THE JURY MEMBERS:**

1. Cameron Sinclair (Insert Entry)
2. Elizabeth O'donnell (Insert Entry)
3. Young Kim (Insert Entry)

4. Ajmal Maiwandi (Insert Entry)

5. Zahra Bereshna (Insert Entry)

#### **6. Robert Knox (Insert Entry)**

- i. I am happy to recommend for honourable mention, the two competition submissions BCC002009 and BCC2022. Both these designs provide everything that is required by the terms of reference in the brief. 2099 is a more obvious 'above ground' building, but it is neutral in most respects and as a buildable design could not be a problem in this important heritage area. Moreover, it is provided with a really serious internal plan, only requiring minor design 'tickles' here and there. It is in my view a structure that could easily replace the first place tender, if for any reason it were not to go forward.
- ii. Design 2022 provides a modern, clean and efficient structure, up to date in character and one that would not be out of place in many complex areas of the world. It is a buildable and good structure and in its way could be easily constructed on the site if the other two designs were not to go forward. It is in that particular and vital respect that I can recommend these two designs for honourable mention, not that they are remarkable or uniquely architecturally innovative designs, but that they could both easily and comfortably 'work' on this particular site, in this important heritage area.

iii. The two designs that came 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> in the contest (4104 and 3532) are in my view entirely unsuitable for the major task in hand and so I decline to recommend them for honourable mention, in the results of this contest. 4104 provides a dark, enclosed, claustrophobic, almost chaotic solution to the matter of building arrangement in the Centre, with no consideration at all, it seems to me, for the hard winter climate of the Bamiyan site. Its dark underground spaces reminded one of our Afghan colleagues on the last day of our deliberations of prison cells, with no natural light or fresh air for their users.

iv. The 5<sup>th</sup> submission (3532) has likewise not thought about the climate. As far as I can judge from the plans, the roofs and walls of the spaces between the distinctive long walls that are the core of the design have to be made entirely of glass. How such a building could be heated in winter, cooled in the summer and cleared of snow and the like (and so lived and worked in day to day over the year), seems impossible. I wld add also that the overtly Buddhist character of the niches and sculpture shown in the design go beyond the realms of architecture and begin to speak of ancient religion in ways that may not be quite appropriate.

7. Jukka Jokilehto (Insert Entry)