

**New ECB Premises
Urban planning and architectural design competition**

Issuing authority

European Central Bank
Kaiserstrasse 29
D-60311 Frankfurt am Main
Germany

**MINUTES OF THE JURY MEETING
ON 12/13 FEBRUARY 2004**

Frankfurt am Main

New ECB Premises

Urban planning and architectural design competition

Second phase of the Competition – Jury meeting held on 12-13 February 2004

Venue: Städel Kunstmuseum, Dürerstrasse 2, Frankfurt am Main

12 February 2004, 9:00 a.m. – 8:45 p.m. and

13 February 2004, 9:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m.

Attendees

Members of the Jury

Lucas Papademos, Chairperson

Françoise-Hélène Jourda, Vice-Chairperson

Liam Barron

Oriol Bohigas

Kees Christiaanse

Craig Dykers

Sirkka Hämäläinen

Yves Mersch

Hanspeter K. Scheller

Edwin Schwarz

Ernst Welteke

Michael Wilford

Alternates

Hans-Georg Fabritius

Klaus Gressenbauer

Brian Halpin

Thomas Rinderspacher

Fernand Yasse

Dirk Zimmermann

Experts

Willi Bogner – ECB expert
Norbert Fisch – Energy design
Günter Flohr – ECB expert
Gerald Grisse – ECB expert
Francis Gross – Secretary
Georg Gruber – ECB expert
Dierk Hausmann – Urban development, City of Frankfurt
Martin Hupka – ECB expert
Dieter Jäger – Functional performance, Space efficiency
Robert Klimowski – ECB expert
Markus Knörr – ECB expert
Dieter von Lüpke – Urban planning and Building law, City of Frankfurt
Malachy Neeson – ECB expert
Alexander Pfältzer – ECB expert
Georg Radloff – Building regulations, City of Frankfurt
Reinhard Ries – Fire department
Volker Rödel – Protection of historical monuments, City of Frankfurt
Alexander Scheidler – Costs
Frank Zimmermann – ECB expert
Dietmar Zwipp – Costs

Assistance / Interpreter

Ralf Friese, Interpreter
Sybille von Müllmann, Interpreter
Stephanie Rosenberg, Interpreter
Rebecca Seamans
Sandra Waibel

Consultant responsible for the management of the Competition

Heike Babucke
Hans Baumann
Barbara Ettinger-Brinckmann
Carsten Rüdtenklau
Tanja Schkwirko
Ulrich Walberg

1 Welcome (9:00 a.m.)

The Chairperson opened the second Jury meeting by welcoming the participants (Members of the Jury, Alternates, Experts and the Consultant) and explained the purpose of the meeting, namely to select the three prize winners from the remaining 12 design concepts in the Competition. He stressed the importance of the project to the ECB and the City of Frankfurt and based on previous experience with the Jury, he was confident that everyone would fully co-operate and constructively contribute to the discussion in order to achieve a successful conclusion at the end of the meeting. The Chairperson recalled that the new ECB premises should reflect the values of the ECB and certain principles underlying in the ECB's notion of public service, for example efficiency, stability and transparency. The Chairperson also thanked all those who contributed to the pre-examination phase and developed the pre-examination report.

The Consultant, Mrs. Ettinger-Brinckmann, introduced the main topics of the day, namely the procedure of the Jury meeting.

2 Completeness of the Jury

The Consultant ascertained which members of the Jury were present. As Mr. Massimiliano Fuksas was not present at the meeting, the Chairperson named Mr. Craig Dykers to take his place. During the absence of Mr. Edwin Schwarz between 7:30 p.m. and 8:45 p.m. on 12 February 2003 Mr. Dirk Zimmermann took his vote.

Ms. Martha Schwartz could not attend the Jury meeting.

The Consultant confirmed that the Jury was complete.

3 Secretary

Mr. Gross was named as the secretary to prepare the minutes (in co-operation with the Project Manager and the Consultant).

4 Procedure of the meeting

The Consultant outlined the procedure for the selection process and highlighted the following points:

- The Consultant/Secretary would shortly present the minutes of the Jury meeting on the first phase to be approved by the Jury;
- The Competition is a two-phase process. The purpose of the Jury meeting was to select the three prize winners from the design concepts submitted to the second phase;
- After the description of the pre-examination method and procedure, all design concepts and the corresponding models would be explained in neutral terms in an information round;
 - The selection should be based exclusively upon the selection criteria as laid down in the Competition Rules / Competition Brief and the Jury is obliged to evaluate each design concept carefully against these selection criteria. The Jury shall – according to the Competition Rules – endeavour to adopt decisions by consensus; this must be considered especially in the first round of deliberations. If a consensus cannot be achieved, decisions shall be made by a majority vote;
 - Prior to the final selection of the short list, motions to reconsider any excluded design concepts could be made at any time;

- The Jury meeting for the second phase should conclude with recommendations for the modification and further development of the three prize winners in a possible revision phase;
- The authorship of the design concepts must remain anonymous through the end of the Jury meeting of the second phase;
- The minutes of the second Jury meeting have to be approved and finalised before lifting the anonymity of the candidates; a certain time span is reserved for the finalisation of the minutes after the closure of the Jury's deliberations. The Jury shall break up into smaller groups, which will then individually evaluate the design concepts that have been selected or excluded;
- After the decisions on the three prize winners, the formulation of the recommendations and the signing of the minutes, the Author's Declarations would be opened and the identity of the prize-winners would be revealed by the Consultant. The opening ceremony would be documented in separate minutes. The Chairperson of the Jury would inform all candidates of the outcome of the competition without undue delay by calling the candidates individually starting with the first prize winner and continuing in decreasing order;
- All attendees at the Jury meeting were requested to participate in the deliberations of the Jury and to support and explain their point of view. The right to vote was limited to the 12 members of the Jury – in the case of a tie, the Vice-President of the ECB would have the casting vote.

5 Presentation and approval of the minutes of the first Jury meeting (9:30 a.m. – 9:35 a.m.)

The Consultant presented the minutes of the first Jury meeting consisting of a general part already approved by the Jury and two annexes containing the individual evaluation of all design concepts. The two annexes were approved by all Jury members. There were no comments to the two annexes and the Jury unanimously approved the entire minutes as circulated.

6 Reconfirmation of anonymity and confidentiality (9:35 a.m. – 9:45 a.m.)

The Chairperson of the Jury reminded the members of the Jury of their personal responsibility towards the awarding authority, the candidates and the general public. He further reminded the attendees that they:

- are appointed in their personal capacity;
- shall base their decisions exclusively on the selection criteria laid down in Section 9.4 of the Competition Rules;
- shall not have had any contact with any candidate except during the presentation meeting with regard to the task / purpose of the competition;
- shall not have had any information on the design concepts before the Jury meeting unless he / she was involved in the pre-examination;
- shall avoid speculating about the identity of the authors of the design concepts during the meeting.

7 Presentation of the pre-examination report (9:45 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.)

The Consultant briefly described the pre-examination procedure and presented its findings as described in the pre-examination report.

The pre-examination procedure was based on the following points:

- Control of due date of submission / receipt;
- Opening of deliveries, marking with code numbers and creating a receiving list;
- Revision of prepared pre-examination checklists;
- Checking of formal requirements;
- Quantitative pre-examination;
- Qualitative pre-examination:

Checking the compliance with the mandatory requirements set by the ECB, in particular the spatial and functional requirements and town planning requirements, etc. as well as a preliminary assessment in accordance with the following four selection criteria laid down in the Competition Rules / Competition Brief:

- Overall town-planning, architecture and landscape;
- Compliance with the main features of the functional and spatial programme;
- Feasible energy / environmental concept and compliance with the main features of the ECB's technical requirements;
- Compliance with the relevant regulations: building law and environmental law.

The outcome of the pre-examination was summarised in a pre-examination report that was handed out to all attendees at the briefing meeting on 11 February 2004 or at the beginning of the Jury meeting.

As regard the formal requirements the pre-examination report can be summarised as follows:

- The deadline for submission of the design concepts was 12 December 2003; the models were to be submitted by 6 January 2004.

All design concepts met the deadlines for the submission of the plans and models. All 12 candidates admitted to the second phase of the competition submitted design concepts.

- The design concepts had to be submitted to the Consultant in an anonymous format. The candidates had to mark all documents with the code number they used in the first phase of the competition. The Consultant provided the same three-digit identification numbers as used in the first phase to cover the original codes. No breaches of anonymity occurred during the pre-examination. All marks on the packages containing the plans, documents or models which could have indicated the origin of the candidates were thoroughly deleted by employees of the Consultant not involved in the pre-examination process period. Hence, anonymity was maintained.
- No significant damage to the plans was detected during unpacking. However, one model required some degree of repair by a model-maker using plans as a basis.
- Each candidate was allowed to submit one design concept only. Variants were not accepted. Items not requested would be excluded from the selection process. Annotations on plans and all other written documents were required to be in English. There were no significant breaches of the formal requirements.

- With regard to the requirements set out in the Competition Brief the pre-examination focused on one point:
 - that one design concept exceeded the 150 m height limit.

The Jury unanimously decided to admit all design concepts to the selection procedure.

8 Information round (10:00 a.m. – 12:45 p.m. -)

During the information round the Consultant presented each of the 12 submitted design concepts to the members of the Jury describing the initial design idea and the major findings. This round was conducted without any judging by the Jury.

9 First examination round (2:00 p.m. – 4:15 p.m.)

Before starting the first examination round the members of the Jury exchanged their first impressions gained during the information round.

The Jury conducted intensive discussion of each design concept based on the pre-defined selection criteria laid down in the Competition Brief, including a review of the author's explanations and the results of the pre-examination, with special attention to the criteria relating to architectural quality, town planning, functional and spatial programme, energy / environmental concept and / or buildings and environmental law. In this first round the Jury placed particular emphasis on the way the overall architectural design of each design concept would reflect the values of the ECB and convey an appropriate image for the institution. The Jury also paid particular attention to the way the design concept preserved the fundamental appearance of the Grossmarkthalle. The Jury decided unanimously to exclude the following design concepts:

Design 107
Design 133
Design 152
Design 159
Design 163

Therefore the Jury agreed to limit further consideration to the following seven design concepts:

Design 101
Design 120
Design 124
Design 140
Design 145
Design 157
Design 168

10 Second examination round (4:35 p.m. – 8:45 p.m.)

During the second examination round, the Jury conducted an in-depth review and discussion of each one of the remaining design concepts, leading to a refined evaluation of each design concept against the pre-defined selection criteria and to the formation of opinion among the Jury members. Following that review and discussion round focused on individual design concepts, the Jury had an intensive exchange of views in which the design concepts were subjected to a relative evaluation of their merits. That discussion resulted in the unanimous decision by the Jury to select the following shortlist of three design concepts to be considered for ranking and awarding of prizes:

Design 140

Design 145

Design 157

Consequently the Jury unanimously agreed not to further consider the following four design concepts:

Design 101

Design 120

Design 124

Design 168

End of the first day of the Jury meeting: 8:45 p.m.

Continuation of the second Jury Meeting: 13 February 2004, 9:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m.**11 Welcome and introduction (9:00 a.m.)**

The Chairperson opened the second day of the second Jury meeting by welcoming the participants.

The Chairperson briefly introduced the further procedure. He proposed to conduct a final assessment of the three short-listed design concepts and of the nine design concepts excluded in the course of the Jury meeting. The Chairperson requested that these assessments should be based upon the criteria set out in the competition brief and recorded, highlighting both the positive and the less positive aspects of each design concept. As a procedure for the development of these assessments, the Chairperson proposed to form five break-out groups who would draft either two or three assessments each, following which all of these drafts would be presented to and finalised by the full Jury.

12 Preparation of final assessments (9:10 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.)

The Jury and some experts divided up into groups, which then individually evaluated a sub-set of the 12 design concepts admitted to the second phase of the competition. The Jury then discussed these draft assessments in plenary composition.

The assessments are attached in the annex, beginning with the group of the three design concepts short-listed, followed by the group of the nine design concepts excluded, in arithmetic order within each group.

13 Ranking of the shortlist and awarding of prizes

Following a further exchange of views on the short-listed designs, the Jury then proceeded to rank the three short-listed design concepts and to decide on the awarding of prizes. After this decision was made the Chairperson requested the members of the Jury to vote for the concept they would support for rank 1. This vote resulted in ten votes for design concept 145 and two votes for design concept 140. The Chairperson then asked the Jury whether rank 1 for design concept 145 could be accepted by all members as a consensus decision. The answer was unanimously positive.

Next, the Chairperson requested the members of the Jury to express their preference for the design concept among 140 and 157, which they would support for rank 2. The resulting vote yielded seven votes for design concept 140 and five votes for design concept 157. The Chairperson noted that this vote indicates rank 2 for design concept 140 and rank 3 for design concept 157. He then asked the Jury whether the ranking resulting from that vote could be accepted by all members as a consensus decision. The answer was positive.

Thus the resulting ranking is as follows:

- Rank 1: Design concept 145
- Rank 2: Design concept 140
- Rank 3: Design concept 157

The decision on the award of prizes to the three design concepts ranked as above was taken as follows by a unanimous agreement:

- 1st prize: EUR 100,000 awarded to design concept 145
2nd prize: EUR 70,000 awarded to design concept 140
3rd prize: EUR 50,000 awarded to design concept 157

14 Finalisation of the minutes

The draft minutes were presented to the Jury. After having discussed the wording of the draft minutes they were unanimously approved by the Jury.

The Jury was informed that, in accordance with the Competition Rules, the minutes will be accessible to all candidates.

15 Approval of the pre-examination report

The Jury approved the pre-examination report as prepared by the Consultant.

16 Next steps

The Chairperson informed members of the Jury on the next steps:

- Information of all candidates of the outcome of the competition without undue delay by calling the first three prize winners. All other candidates would be informed as well, attaching the minutes of the opening ceremony;
- Information of the general public via appropriate media;
- Exhibition of all concepts submitted in the first and the second phase in the Deutsche Architektur Museum from 21 February 2004 until 14 March.2004 together with a copy of the minutes summarising the Jury's deliberations and conclusion; the members of the Jury would be invited to a vernissage on 20 February 2004.

13 February 2004

[signed]

Lucas Papademos (Chairperson)

[signed]

Francis Gross (Secretary)

**Urban Planning and Architectural Design Competition for the
New ECB Premises Project**

ADDENDUM

**to the minutes of the Jury meeting
on 12/13 February 2004**

Opening of the Author's Declarations

Upon signature of the minutes of the Jury meeting the Jury asked the Consultant to present the Author's Declarations of all candidates having participated in the Competition. The Consultant confirmed that all Author's Declarations meet the formal requirements set out in Section 8.4 of the Competition Rules.

The Author's Declarations were then ceremonially opened in the presence of all Jury members and the design entry numbers (six digit code numbers) and the names of all candidates were registered as follows:

Prize Winners

Prize	Design entry number	Name of the Candidate	Country
1 st prize 100.000 Euro	Design 145	COOP HIMMELB(L)AU Vienna	Austria
2 nd prize 70.000 Euro	Design 140	ASP Schweger Assoziierte Berlin	Germany
3 rd prize 50.000 Euro	Design 157	54f architekten / T.R. Hamzah & Yeang Darmstadt / Selangor	Germany / Malaysia

Second Phase

Design entry number	Name of the Candidate	Country
Design 101	Murphy/Jahn Chicago	USA
Design 107	tp bennett London	United Kingdom
Design 120	Barkow Leibinger Architekten Berlin	Germany
Design 124	schneider + schumacher Frankfurt am Main	Germany
Design 133	Estudio Lamela Madrid	Spain
Design 140	ASP Schweger Assoziierte Berlin	Germany

Design 145	COOP HIMMELB(L)AU Vienna	Austria
Design 152	Frank O. Gehry Associates Los Angeles	USA
Design 157	54f architekten / T.R. Hamzah & Yeang Darmstadt / Selangor	Germany, Malaysia
Design 159	Morphosis Santa Monica	USA
Design 163	Enric Miralles Benedetta Tagliabue Barcelona	Spain
Design 168	KHRAS arkitekter Virum	Denmark

First Phase

Design entry number	Name of the Candidate	Country
Design 101	admitted to second phase	
Design 102	NOX Lars Spuybroek	Rotterdam, The Netherlands
Design 103	Helin & Co Architects Pekka Helin	Helsinki, Finland
Design 104	Valode et Pistre Denis Valode Jean Pistre	Paris, France
Design 105	gmp - von Gerkan, Marg und Partner Meinhard von Gerkan Volkwin Marg Hubert Nienhoff Markus Pfisterer	Berlin, Germany
Design 106	mecanoo architects Francine M.J. Houben	Delft, The Netherlands
Design 107	Admitted to second phase	
Design 108	ABB Architekten H.D. Scheid M. Beye L. Scheid	Frankfurt am Main, Germany
Design 109	RHWL Architects Peter Shaw	London, United Kingdom
Design 110	Skidmore Owings & Merrill / NHT + Partner Roger Duffi Hans-Ulrich von Mende	New York 10005, USA
Design 111	Dominique Perrault	Paris, France
Design 112	Paul Andreu Architecte in association with ADPI Paul Andreu	Paris, France

Design 113	IaN+ Carmelo Baglivo Luca Galofaro Stefania Manna	Rome, Italy
Design 114	de architectengroep D.E. Van Gameren M. Loos D.H.P.M. Huls F. Loos	Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Design 115	Studio Valle Progettazioni Tommaso Valle	Rome, Italy
Design 116	Grüntuch / Ernst Architekten Armand Grüntuch Almut Ernst	Berlin, Germany
Design 117	HPP Hentrich - Petschnigg & Partner Joachim H. Faust	Düsseldorf, Germany
Design 118	KSP Engel und Zimmermann Jürgen Engel	Frankfurt am Main, Germany
Design 119	Vasconi Associates Architectes Claude Vasconi Guy Bez	Paris, France
Design 120	admitted to second phase	
Design 121	EEA - Erick van Egeraat Michael Rushe	London, United Kingdom
Design 122	Bolles + Wilson Peter Wilson Julia B. Bolles-Wilson	Münster, Germany
Design 123	Jourdan & Müller PAS Jochem Jourdan Bernhard Müller Benjamin Jourdan	Frankfurt am Main, Germany
Design 124	admitted to second phase	
Design 125	RKW Architektur + Städtebau Friedel Kellermann	Düsseldorf, Germany
Design 126	Behnisch, Behnisch & Partner Günther Schaller Günter Behnisch Stefan Behnisch	Stuttgart, Germany
Design 127	van den Valentyn van den Valentyn	Cologne, Germany
Design 128	Neutelings Riedijk Architecten Willem Jan Neutelings Michiel Riedijk	Rotterdam, The Netherlands
Design 129	Dissing + Weitling arkitektfirma a/s Daniel Hayden Stig Mikkelsen	Copenhagen, Denmark
Design 130	SIAT GmbH Rolf-Harald Erz Dieter Heigl	Munich, Germany

Design 131	Allan Murray Architects Allan Murray Alexander Fairweather	Edinburgh, United Kingdom
Design 132	OMA Office for Metropolitan Architecture David Gorin	Rotterdam, The Netherlands
Design 133	admitted to second phase	
Design 134	Neumann & Steiner Eric Steiner Heinz Neumann	Vienna, Austria
Design 135	3Xnielsen Kim Herforth Nielsen	Aarhus, Denmark
Design 136	Rocco Design Ltd. Sen Kee Rocco Yim	Hong Kong, China
Design 137	Pysall-Ruge Architekten	Berlin, Germany
Design 138	Heinle, Wischer und Partner Thomas Heinle	Stuttgart, Germany
Design 139	Ortner & Ortner Baukunst Manfred Ortner Laurids Ortner	Berlin, Germany
Design 140	admitted to second phase	
Design 141	de Architekten Cie Pi de Bruijn Branimir Medic Pero Puljiz	Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Design 142	Herzog + Partner Thomas Herzog Hanns Jörg Schrade	Munich, Germany
Design 143	Albert Speer & Partner Gerhard Brand	Frankfurt am Main, Germany
Design 144	BRT - Bothe Richter Teherani Hadi Teherani Kai Richter Jens Bothe	Hamburg, Germany
Design 145	admitted to second phase	
Design 146	Gössler / Haberland Architekten Daniel Gössler Jost Haberland	Berlin, Germany
Design 147	Hascher Jehle Architektur Rainer Hascher Sebastian Jehle	Berlin, Germany
Design 148	K+P Architekten und Stadtplaner Wolfgang Voigt Susanne Burger	Munich, Germany
Design 149	Samyn and Partners Phillippe Samyn	Brussels, Belgium
Design 150	Llewelyn Davies Ltd Bert McCabe	London, United Kingdom

Design 151	Rafael Vinoly Architects	New York, USA
Design 152	admitted to second phase	
Design 153	Baumschlager – Eberle / Itten + Brechbühl Dietmar Eberle Karl Baumschlager Gartenmann Nick	Lochau, Austria
Design 154	Maki and Associates Maki Fumihiko	Tokyo, Japan
Design 155	Friis & Moltke a/s and Bystrup Arkitekten Martin Wienberg	Brabrand, Denmark
Design 156	Meyer en Van Schooten Architecten Roberto Meyer Jeroen Van Schooten	Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Design 157	admitted to second phase	
Design 158	Arup Associates Nick Suslak	London, United Kingdom
Design 159	admitted to second phase	
Design 160	Kengo Kuma & Associates Kuma Kengo	Tokyo, Japan
Design 161	VIIVA arkkitehtuuri Maki Pekka Rauno Lehtinen	Turku, Finland
Design 162	Jakop + Mac Farlane Dominique Jakob	Paris, France
Design 163	Admitted to second phase	
Design 164	United Architects / UN Studio Ben van Berkel Greg Rynn Kevin Kennon	Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Design 165	Bentham Crowell Mels Crowell Jan Bentham	Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Design 166	Stephenson / Traynor / O’Toole Sam Stephenson	Dublin, Ireland
Design 167	Bucholz / Mc Evoy Architects Merritt Bucholz Jana Scheibel	Dublin, Ireland
Design 168	Admitted to second phase	
Design 169	LOVE architecture and urbanism Herwig Kleinhapl	Graz, Austria
Design 170	Leeser architecture Thomas Leeser	New York, USA
Design 171	Prof. Boris Podrecca	Vienna, Austria

Withdrawn candidature during first phase

1. David Chipperfield Architects
London, United Kingdom
2. MVRDV
Rotterdam, The Netherlands
3. Richard Rogers Partnership
London, United Kingdom

Candidates submitting no design concept

1. Architecture-Studio
Paris, France
2. Auer + Weber
Stuttgart, Germany
3. Delugan Meissl
Vienna, Austria
4. Foster and Partners
London, United Kingdom
5. Kohn Pedersen Fox Associates
London, United Kingdom
6. nps partner Architekten
Hamburg, Germany
7. Petzinka Pink Architekten
Düsseldorf, Germany
8. Steidle und Partner
Munich, Germany

After having read out the names of all candidates the Chairperson thanked all participants for their excellent work.

The meeting ended on 13 February 2004 at 6.30 p.m.

13 February 2004

[signed]

Lucas Papademos (Chairperson)

[signed]

Francis Gross (Secretary)

Urban planning and architectural design competition for the New ECB Premises

Annex to the Minutes of the second Jury meeting hold on 12/13 February 2004

The three design concepts on the short list were assessed as follows:

Design concept 140

This design provides the ECB with a unique and dramatic image on the city skyline, thus creating a European identity. Some Jury members however considered it rather dominant. It is a bold striking concept, which aims to express openness, transparency and unity of member nations. The project is strong and a very clear statement. Some Jury members felt that it was light; others questioned the lightness of the project. Some Jury members took issue with the overall acceptability of the project in particular with regard to town-planning requirements. It is a combination of three buildings into one unified composition, which aggregates its constituent parts into a clear, simple structural entity.

The building represents a new urban typology for high-rise buildings, which might ensure an individual expression for the ECB and provide an open palette for individual and memorable experiences. The occupants and visitors would be enveloped and inspired by the ECB.

The open space and landscaping concept is nominally presented and the water basin is an interesting proposal. However, concern was expressed regarding the visibility of the GMH from Sonnemannstrasse due to the position of the project along the street frontage.

For some Jury members the GMH is not adequately integrated into the overall functional concept. The designer proposes to remove the concrete roof of the GMH and replace it with glazing. This modification is feasible and enhances the overall appearance of the GMH, adding a new aesthetic quality. This proposal however conflicts with the currently stated requirement of the monument preservation authority.

The organisation of the office complexes into three high-rise structures without sufficient connections weakens the organisational flexibility and the consolidation of office areas. The percentage of circulation in relation to main usable space is high and the extra capacity of 700 workplaces has to be optimally reduced. The building could be reduced in size (height and plan footprint) to compensate with a consequent improvement in scale and without a loss of presence. There is a bold contrast between the new buildings and the GMH. Connections between conference facilities, social/sport facilities and office functions need to be developed to provide better integration.

Questions regarding security, fire safety, natural lighting of offices, wind currents, energy and integration of growth modules represent some problematic issues, which have to be resolved.

Structurally the design concept is feasible. Vertical cores, contained in the floor plans provide overall bracing. The west side however, seems to be soft and requires careful study. The multi-storey braced beams in the bridge floor might interfere with the functionality of the activities at these levels.

The single access route from the city streets to the main entrance and the security barriers need further elaboration, as it has to cover both vehicles and pedestrians. The growth module is located too close to the site boundary on the east, thus not respecting the required stand-off distance.

The Jury considers this project to have a strong identity.

Design concept 145

The design conveys a powerful image. It is an appealing and sophisticated design and yet easily readable.

The scheme consists of three elements: a high-rise, a base and the GMH. The design reflects the values of the ECB such as transparency, communication, efficiency and stability. The high-rise is a sculptural hybrid of two towers connected by an atrium. In the transparency of the multipurpose atrium, the idea of communication is reflected. The two tower elements are twisted, directing the atrium both towards the city centre of Frankfurt and the Main river. The twisted shape generates a 360-degree dynamic experience of changing vistas, but nevertheless conveys a sense of stability. The building establishes a strong and unique identity in the skyline of Frankfurt. In spite of its relative complexity, the design is clear on all levels.

This project is compatible with the urban design concept of the City for the area of the Main river. Therefore it can be expected that this proposal would have a high acceptance in the community.

The atrium forms a diagonal lobby in the base that refers in dimensions to the GMH, by which it is connected to the main entrance. Although the project is very well integrated the relationship between the base building and the GMH could be improved by linking more effectively the new building with the GMH. The GMH itself is well respected, both on the level of external visibility as well as its interior architectural articulation. Like in most other projects, the extension-module is inadequate; this aspect should be improved in a revision phase.

The landscaping is not fully developed, although the delicate positioning of entrance pavilions and other service buildings, sunken in the relief of the landscape looks promising. The transition between the landscape and the ground floor should be further developed, by linking the GMH with the new building in a more effective way.

The general functional requirements are fulfilled. In general the workplace quality is good. The distance between the congress and dining facilities and the decision-making bodies in the top of the high-rise are satisfactory. While there is a lack of workspace capacity on the whole, the flexibility of office-typologies in the high-rise, as well as its net-gross performance, should be optimised. In order to improve the orientation of the offices and their exposure to the sun a slight change of orientation of the high-rise should be explored.

The security requirements need to be further developed. However, there seems to be no particular problem in incorporating a workable system, provided that the extension module and the degree of accessibility of the site are revised. Stand-off distances should be observed.

The concept for the management of the climate inside the building is ambitious. Based on natural ventilation and openable windows without air-conditioning, it uses the atrium as a climate buffer. Although similar concepts have been realised it is expected that the climate in this building cannot be controlled without a supporting system. In the cost-calculation for climate installations and energy use, air-conditioning is incorporated; even so the project performs better than average. It is, therefore, expected that appropriate climate installations can be reworked into the design without many problems.

The high-rise consists of two elements stiffened by cores. The connection between the two results in a stable building. The concrete ribbed floors are an adequate solution, and can accommodate technical equipment. Although the submitted documents do not contain any information on the support-structure this is not considered to be problematic.

In general, the design complies with the major relevant building regulations. However, the emergency and escape requirements should be revised and the atrium will need additional provisions for fire-protection.

In conclusion, the Jury considers this project a most appropriate concept for the future ECB headquarters.

Design concept 157

Through the contrast between the north-south axis of the tower buildings and the horizontality of the lower elements, this project offers a clear contrast to the east-west orientation of the GMH. The free-standing situation of the GMH shows respect for the local urban environment.

A majority of the Jury members took issue with the capacity of this design concept to reflect the core values of the ECB; however, other Jury members considered it to stand for transparency, efficiency and stability. This project is in the spirit of the urban design concept for Frankfurt's Ostend. Therefore, it can be expected that the local community would accept this proposal.

As a discrete high-rise cluster the project integrates well into the skyline; the orientation allows both openness to the Main, and visibility from the city centre.

The horizontal structure integrates well with the landscape and is a counterpoint to the vertical high-rise slabs. This is a classic design, detailed in an elegant and sensitive tone.

The local traffic concept is convincing, except for the use of the Rueckertstrasse. The site circulation, zoning and barrier concept need further elaboration.

The project would profit from the growth modules and three high-rises would be better than two. The grouping of the buildings could be optimised further in view of linking the buildings with each other. The access level is still not optimal. Internal access lacks clarity; this makes orientation more difficult. The access levels also lack generosity, logical orientation and do not invite people to stay.

The organisation of the office floors with a fixed core is not optimal but can easily improved. In view of spatial efficiency and reversibility the cores have to be arranged in a more efficient manner.

The high-rise buildings are braced by cores. The high buildings are susceptible to vibrations. Therefore it may be necessary to apply bonds to the narrow fronts.

While elsewhere the best workplaces are located in the southern portion, here the multi-storey gardens are accessible to everybody. The combination of the climate concept with a public zone is very convincing. The air-conditioning and heating concept is not just a technical concept, but integrates the human level.

This design concept refrains from creating a unique and distinctive landmark for the ECB; however it is efficient, technically and economically feasible and commendable.

The design concepts excluded by the Jury were assessed as follows:

Design concept 101

The Jury noted that this design concept differs completely from the proposal submitted in the first phase of the competition.

Although the project in general meets with the requirements of the brief, it refrains from creating a unique building for the ECB.

The design consists of three main elements, a high-rise in the shape of two connected circle segments, the GMH and a base building connecting the two. The front area along Sonnemanstrasse is an empty strip with two moats and a helicopter platform, a closed front. The entrance lies on the edge of the site and leads to the main entrance of the complex behind the GMH. The high-rise is situated on the far edge of the site, directly adjacent to the railroad. This organisation conveys an impression of introversion against the openness, which the ECB wants to express. The architecture of the project shows no sign of innovation. It refers to rather standard examples that were extensively used in the office culture of the recent past. The towers consist merely of an extrusion of the circular plan, with a conventional facade and the rhetorical ornaments on the roof. The extension module is inadequate and dysfunctional.

The project performs well on all technical requirements and cost efficiency; it was judged to be a very efficient building. The extension is very weak in terms of missing workplaces and its lack of functional integration.

The cooling loads will be high due to the large glass areas, especially in the large number of corner offices. The compact structure minimises paved areas and simplifies the distribution strategy. The considered energy concept is interesting but does not fully meet all technical requirements. Also, humidification is not provided as required.

Design concept 107

The landscape concept was considered innovative and well integrated into the surroundings. The project shows a dynamic character and presents an organic expression toward the city. The double tower and bridge connections present a strong opportunity to create usable and comfortable working conditions. The GMH is integrated well into the scheme and it is innovative in its use for the press and visitor's centre. The secured office areas are well placed.

The project proposed a reasonably flexible layout, including the future use of the growth modules that could be altered during planning.

The workplace arrangement is often secondary to the sculptural intention and creates complex working conditions in many areas. Comfort and usability have suffered as a result of this problem. Bridge connections between the two towers are poorly utilised. The slab sections are minimal and not integrated.

The floor-to-floor heights are also minimal. The restaurant was judged to be too remote. The internal circulation cores are poorly planned and placed. This results in long distances between work areas and circulation cores.

The design's message in relation to the ECB mission is unclear.

There were several security questions. The offices for the decision-making bodies are placed too close to public areas in contradiction with the program. The addition of the growth modules to the overall plan could create limited lighting conditions and complexity in the image.

The orientation of the buildings makes site surveillance difficult and additionally causes problems regarding fire protection especially between the closely adjacent towers. Stand-off distances and the implementation of the security zoning is not well considered. The emergency egress and escape routes are questionable.

Design concept 120

The Jury appreciated the clear and strong design presenting a landmark for the Frankfurt. The idea of integrating open air spaces in the facade oriented in direction of the different EU Member States was found interesting but not fully convincing. There were also concerns that the large slab would create a barrier between the people living in the immediate environment and the river Main and that the visibility of the GMH from the riverside would be reduced. Furthermore, the Jury found that the design was not a full and completed ensemble without the growth modules.

The non-compliance with the spatial requirements of the competition brief and inner circulation concept were assessed negatively. The proposed office layout was considered to be innovative but it did not fully meet the requirement of flexibility and reversibility.

The energy design shows a high level of innovation, however the proposed concept was judged to be overly complicated and doubts were raised with regard to the economic viability in the use of energy sources. The relatively low life cycle costs were considered positively.

The full compliance with building and fire regulations was noted favourably.

Design concept 124

The Jury liked the impressive large-scale design giving a clear message and offering a human environment. However it was judged that the proportion of the building would look too heavy without the growth modules and that the building was not very well integrated with the GMH. The lowering of some of the individual functional areas and the gardens was considered difficult to implement and would result in poor workplace quality in these areas. It was also noted that the interesting facade would probably lose its attractive transparency in the actual construction.

The functional programme and the concept for the internal circulation were well resolved though the spatial sequence created long distances. The innovative office concept with skygardens offers in principle equality of workplaces but the depth of the building was considered problematic.

In general the energy concept was positively assessed; the large areas built below groundwater level would however require increased structural and technical efforts. Doubts were also raised with regard to the technical infrastructure for the growth modules that would in practice have to be installed in the first phase.

The Jury noted the difficulty in complying with fire regulations.

Design concept 133

The approach to meet the requirements of the programme with a low-rise building which at the same time respecting the GMH was welcomed. However, the Jury found that the author's promising idea to create a link between the GMH and the new office building had not been developed into a convincing architectural concept; the serious functional and technical problems created by such a structure were not solved in a satisfactory manner. The invisibility of the GMH from the north and the barrier created by the structure were assessed negatively. The proposal for the integration of the growth modules was not considered to be a convincing solution.

The Jury criticised the relatively poor workplace quality. Most of the workplaces offer only limited views and some of them would receive little natural lighting; with the integration of the extensions the workplace quality would deteriorate further. The concept for the inner circulation and the non-compliance with the security requirements was also assessed negatively.

The Jury looked favourably upon the innovative energy design but noted the serious problems with regard to the maintenance of the technical infrastructure and the servicing of the upper slab.

It was judged that addressing the non-compliance with fire regulations would be difficult.

Design concept 152

The project proposes an unusual and innovative master plan. This includes an intriguing range and arrangement of outdoor and social spaces. The building heights are generally low providing a sense of integration with its surroundings. The conference hall is well developed and shows a high quality of interior space. The annexes of the GMH have been well integrated. The general arrangement is green and inviting. Viewed from above the project presents a dynamic sculpture seen as a positive gesture in the overall city context.

The project presents an excessive use of materials and this therefore creates an inappropriate image for the ECB. This has created a series of difficulties that include high maintenance costs related to the roof

and surface materials. No significant detailed description of the materials used was presented in text or in the drawings. That aspect appears to be an afterthought.

The general arrangement creates complex connections between the various ECB activities.

It was judged that there was a lack of natural daylight for many of the workplaces.

The general arrangement is more separating than connecting and there are difficult interstitial spaces. The buildings are spread too evenly across the site leaving the landscape as secondary. The upper levels of the tower buildings have net areas that are too small. The GMH is deliberately excluded from the surroundings in contradiction with the program.

With regard to security and safety regulations, it was noted that the required set back distances have not been respected, especially along Holzmannstrasse. The orientation of the buildings would make it difficult for site surveillance and monitoring by the security staff. There appears to be no convincing physical barrier concept. The emergency egress and escape routes are questionable. There is a high risk of fire spreading between the adjacent buildings.

Design concept number 159

According to the first phase of the competition this design concept offers a brave and innovative approach. Unfortunately, the initial idea has not been further elaborated in the second phase.

The project aims to integrate the GMH, but is not very successful in its attempt and does not offer a suitable identity for the ECB.

The complexity of the volumes gives an image, which is too complicated and too confusing.

The removal of the wings of the GMH is not in compliance with the requirements of monumental protection. The integration into the urban surroundings is ignored.

The distance between the main buildings is too small. Moreover the diagonal structure and the depth of the facade will have an additional negative impact on the natural lighting of workplaces.

From the security point of view the stand-off distance for the growth module is not acceptable.

The proposal of a pedestrian bridge over the Main river has been recognised as an interesting idea.

Design concept 163

The project proposes an interesting investigation into the relationship of the building to the landscape. It explored a collection of a series of more modest buildings although it was not considered fully successful in its final design. The design provides a dramatic contrast between the new buildings and the GMH. The formal composition brings old and new together in a unified manner. The counter urban proposal brings a welcome contrast to all glass international style buildings, incorporating windows rather than curtain walls. However, the project is deficient in workplaces (50%) which if remedied would have a dramatic

negative effect on the scale of the new building elements and the spaces between them. The project does not provide the ECB with an appropriate image of clarity, openness, unity and transparency.

The growth modules are also 50% deficient in workplaces. The circulation connections between the buildings at ground levels are complex and the shape and size of the space between them is considered to be unsatisfactory, creating offices that look into one another and sense of overcrowding.

The concrete outer facade layer will reduce daylight in the offices and its double skin concept is of questionable benefit. The energy supply concept is based on proven technology.

Some of the high-rises contain cantilevers and in general the construction seems feasible.

The integration of the technical distribution routes in the building will require design modification. As the growth modules exceed the site perimeter and provides insufficient stand-off distances. The security zoning is inadequate and contains misinterpretation of entry control point/ security checks. The buildings have some deficits regarding fire protection, emergency egress and escape routes requirements.

Design concept 168

This project was considered the most innovative low-rise scheme in the competition. It proposes a dynamic and innovative network of social and working spaces. The project proposes an innovative use of environmental technology. The individual towers, seen separately from the total complex, were seen to be efficient and functional. The project was seen to express the value of stability and unity in a humane manner.

The GMH is fully incorporated into the concept. There is a wide range of communicative and social spaces between the buildings.

The proposal significantly alters and covers the roof of the GMH, which is in direct contradiction with the historical preservation requirements of the competition brief.

The Jury was not convinced that the layout of the towers would provide the needed amounts of daylight and comfortable working conditions.

Fire protection and emergency escape planning was found to be questionable, especially related to the deepest interior portions of the complex and the glass roof at the conference centre.

The compact nature of the design did not present a useful concept for the surrounding landscape in the master plan. Furthermore, the spatial requirements were not fulfilled as shown.

There are only limited possibilities for further expansion, this being defined by the proximity of the Main river to the extensions. Underground access to the site prohibits a comfortable experience when entering the building complex.

The Press and conference areas are underground and considered unfavourable. The security zoning was not clearly described. There appears to be no convincing site circulation concept. The emergency egress and escape routes are questionable and evacuation of staff is not possible.