



---

The permanent premises of the  
International Criminal Court  
The Hague, The Netherlands

Architectural design competition

# Minutes of the pre-selection meeting 15-16 May 2008 (excerpt)

## **New ICC Premises Project**

### **Results minutes of the Pre-Selection Meeting (excerpt)**

**Thursday 15 May 2008 / Friday 16 May 2008**

#### **Attendants**

##### **Jury Members**

- Mr Mels Crouwel, Chief Government Architect of the Netherlands (chairman)
- Ms Liesbeth van der Pol, Chief Government Architect of the Netherlands from 1 July 2008 (replacing Mr Dominique Perrault)
- Ms Mirjam Blaak, Representative of the ASP, Uganda, Ambassador
- Mr Kiyokazu Ota, Representative of the ASP, Japan, Minister
- Mr Calin Fabian, Representative of the ASP, Romania, Ambassador
- Mr Pedro R. Reátegui, Representative of the ASP, Peru, Councillor
- Mr Mikko Jokela, Representative of the ASP, Finland, Ambassador
- Mr Hans-Peter Kaul, ICC Judiciary
- Ms Fatou Bensouda, ICC Office of the Prosecutor
- Ms Silvana Arbia, ICC Registrar
- Mr Ed Kronenburg, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of The Netherlands
- Mr Herman Hertzberger, Architect, The Netherlands
- Mr Ricardo Legorreta, Architect, Mexico
- Ms Julia Bolles-Wilson, Architect, Germany
- Mr José Forjaz, Architect, Mozambique
- Mr Ben Maandag, architectural critic (replacing Mr Deyan Sudjic)
- Mr Maarten Schmitt, Municipality of The Hague (City architect, replacing Mr Jozias van Aartsen)

##### **Deputies**

- Mr Yves Haesendonck, Assembly of State Parties (ASP), Belgium, Ambassador
- Mr Donggy Lee, Assembly of State Parties (ASP), Korea, 2<sup>nd</sup> Secretary
- Mr Thomas Schuster, ICC
- Mr Paul W.J. Wilke, Host State

## **Guests**

- Ms Kirsten Meersschaert, Observer CICC
- Mr Jorge Lomonaco, Observer Oversight Committee, Mexico, Ambassador
- Ms Erika Dieterman-Koehler, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Mr Joppe Verhoeff, Municipality of The Hague
- Mr Roelof Pot, Photographer

## **Competition Management**

- Mr Roel van der Mark, Government Building Agency
- Mr Charles van Marrelo, Bureau of the Chief Government Architect
- Mr Martijn van der Weijden, Government Building Agency
- Ms Barbara Ettinger-Brinckmann, ANP, Consultant Rgd
- Ms Anne Bergmann, ANP, Consultant Rgd
- Mr Paul Greim, ANP, Consultant Rgd
- Mr Ulrich Walberg, ANP, Consultant Rgd

## **15 May 2008**

### **Pre-selection meeting**

#### **1 Introduction (3.15 p.m. to 6.30 p.m.)**

The chairman briefly introduced the purpose of the meeting; to select the best qualified up to 20 participants and 5 reserve candidates out of 171 pre-examined applications received from all over the world. He emphasised that the selection should strictly be based on the criteria published in the Announcement. Subsequently, the requested formal and visual material provided by the applicants shall form the basis of the evaluation.

The Chairman referred to the pre-examination, already reported on at the beginning of the meeting. In addition to the verbal report, the method and results of the pre-examination were laid down in detail in a pre-examination report handed over to the Jury.

#### **2 Report on the pre-examination**

The results of the pre-examination were transferred into the overview list. The list was provided for the Jury in three versions:

- As 'blank list', with applicants listed in alphabetical order without any results of the pre-examination;
- As list with applicants listed in alphabetical order, mirroring the results of the quantitative pre-examination and of the pre-examination of the quantified qualitative criteria 'successful participation in competitions' and

'professional prizes, honours and awards', but without assessment of the architectural quality of realised projects (q&q list); and

- As list including the quantitative pre-examination, as well as the results of the pre-assessment of the qualitative criteria (by the pre-examination team) listed in a preliminary ranking order; in case of equal ranks in alphabetical order.

The completed verification and the completed assessment scheme were available during the Jury meeting for each applicant as a print out, including the printed material (application form and images) as submitted by the applicant.

For the selection procedure, a presentation was prepared. In addition, the images of the applications were hung-up in alphabetical order.

### **3 Pre-selection**

The Jury unanimously decided on the following procedure:

- The Jury relies on the results of the quantitative check of the pre-examination;
- The presentation should include all applications including those missing formal or minimum criteria;
- The presentation should be conducted in the first round via 2 projectors showing, on the one hand, the completed application form of the applicant and, on the other hand, the images submitted;
- The order of the presentation of the applications should follow the 'pre-ranking list' from below, but without taking into consideration the ranking and the scores appointed by the pre-examination team to the criterion 'architectural quality of realised projects'.

The Jury looked intensively and in detail at each application. After all the applications had been presented via projector, the Chairman closed the meeting to be continued the following morning.

## **16 May 2008**

### **4 Continuation of Pre-selection (9.30 a.m. to 5.30 p.m.)**

The Chairman welcomed the Jury members and gave a brief opportunity for a further visual inspection of the presented images.

Before the actual deliberations started, the Jury members decided on the basis of the approved material presented by the pre-examination team on the previous day to exclude the applications which were missing formal or minimum criteria. The result was that 156 eligible applications were to be assessed.

The Chairman proposed a 'positive selection process', 'step by step'; the Jury agreed to this proposal:

**Step 1:** In respect of their specific qualification, the Chairman proposed to begin with the 8 architects among the Jury members voteing without any ranking on 10 applications which best meet the criterion 'architectural quality' based on the visual material submitted by the applicants. He proposed that each architect should explain the reasons for his / her choice. During the explanation, the images of the appointed applications were projected on the screen.

The result of this first step was a short list consisting of 35 applications.

**Step 2:** The representatives of the ASP, the observers of the ICC and the ICC were asked for their comments. After this, the ASP members of the Jury were asked to apply 4 votes and the ICC members were asked to apply 2 votes to the applicants listed on the short list and/or add further applications, stating the reasons in respect of their architectural quality. Analogous to step 1, the images of the appointed applications were projected on the screen.

The result of this step was a short list consisting of 39 applications.

In the reverse conclusion, the architectural quality of the 117 applications not appointed for the short list received no merits to have influence on the weight respectively the selection.

The images of the 39 applications of the short list were projected once more on the screen and in addition hang up in one line following alphabetical order.

**Step 3:** The Jury decided unanimously to appoint all applications with 3 or more votes to be selected for participation in the competition.

The result of this step was that 18 applications were appointed.

**Step 4:** In order to select the 2 still vacant positions and the 5 reserve candidates, a list was provided listing the 18 already selected applications as 'IN' and the remaining 20 applications in the order of their sequential number; the former votes were eliminated.

Each Jury member anonymously appointed 5 ranks. The counting was taken under control of all Jury members.

The result of this step was that the two vacant positions were appointed, as well as the first rank of the reserve list.

**Step 5:** As 6 applications received equal numbers of votes, the procedure of step 4 was repeated in an analogous manner in order to select the 4 remaining positions for the reserve list in a ranked order. Each Jury member anonymously appointed 6 ranks.

The result of this step was the final list of participants in alphabetical order and of reserve candidates in ranking.

#### **Next steps:**

The selected participants have to declare their participation within a set time limit. Each applicant admitted to the competition who does not confirm their participation in a given time shall be replaced by the best-ranked applicant from the respective reserve list.

After conclusion, a list of the selected participants in the competition will be published on the website. According to the announcement, the non successful applicants will not be published, in order to protect their privacy.

## **5 Final remarks**

The Chairman thanked all Jury members for their effort and their support in selecting the best qualified architects to take part in the competition. He looked forward to 20 interesting design concepts, as is to be expected in view of the qualification of the selected participants.

The Chairman closed the meeting at 5.30 p.m.

## **Addendum**

The selected office Foster and Partners withdrew its participation. Therefore the highest ranked reserve candidate was asked for participation in the competition. This reserve candidate has already confirmed its participation.

Rgd / ANP  
29 May 2008

