

# LE:NOTRE *Institute*

*Linking landscape education, research and innovative practice*



## INTERNATIONAL STUDENT COMPETITION FLOWER OF LIFE JURY PROTOCOL

### Key dates of the competition

**Working period:** 7.10.2015 – 08.01-2016 (23:59 CET)

**Registered teams and/or individuals:** 250 from 50 countries

**Submissions received:** 34 from 19 countries

There were 34 entries from 19 different countries: Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, China (5 entries), Croatia, Czech Republic, France (2), Germany (6), Hungary, Indonesia, Iran, Italy, Poland (4), Portugal, Romania, Turkey, United Kingdom, USA (3).

The technical aspects of the competition were managed via the ILIAS platform of HfWU Nürtingen-Geislingen. One virtual feedback colloquium was held with an introduction by the Director of Landscape and Gardening Works of the EXPO 2016 in Antalya, Dr. Ece Gökök.

### Composition of the competition jury

Because of the number of registrations the original jury was enlarged by one member. The additional jury member was Prof. Dr. Nilgül Karadeniz, Faculty of Agriculture, Department of Landscape Architecture at Ankara University.

The jury was composed as follows:

Ir. Jeroen de Vries bnt, landscape architect, board member LE:NOTRE Institute, teacher landscape architecture VHL University of Applied Science, the Netherlands (president)

Dr. M. Beatrice Andreucci, Adjunct Professor, Sapienza Università di Roma, Faculty of Architecture and AIAPP-IFLA Europe Registered Landscape Architect, Italy

Dr. Ece Gökök, Director of Landscape and Gardening Works, representative of the EXPO 2016 organisation, Turkey

Robert Holden, landscape architect, London

Prof. Dipl.-Ing. Karl H.C. Ludwig, landscape architecture professor, Hochschule für Wirtschaft und Umwelt Nürtingen-Geislingen, Germany

Prof. Dr. Nilgül Karadeniz, Ankara University, Faculty of Agriculture, Department of Landscape Architecture at Ankara University

Prof. Dr. Veli Ortaçşme, Akdeniz University, Faculty of Architecture, Department of Landscape Architecture, Antalya, Turkey

Assist. Prof. Dr. Tahsin Yılmaz, Akdeniz University, Faculty of Architecture, Department of Landscape Architecture, Antalya, Turkey.

## Evaluation method and process

All projects were submitted anonymously, bearing an identification code. Each project was only made available to the evaluators via the ILIAS competition platform.

### Round 1

The first round of evaluations took place from 09.01.2016 till the morning of 11.01.2016 and was organised as follows: the jury was divided in 4 groups of 2 persons and each pair of jury members evaluated 8 to 9 entries. Each entry thus received a blind review from two different evaluators. The evaluations were collected online via a survey system. None of the evaluators was able at any time to see the others' evaluations in order to enable neutral perspectives on each project.

The evaluation sheet contained seven criteria, as already outlined in the competition brief:

1. making use of and develop new flower design concepts;
2. show how gardens and landscapes can be especially attractive, instructive and functional for children;
3. show how gardens can contribute to a higher biodiversity;
4. explain landscape design principles that can contribute to the development of greener cities;
5. present innovative concepts of hard landscaping and planting design that are more sustainable, closing of cycles, climate adaptation, water management in the Mediterranean;
6. quality of routing / paths / functionality of the design; and
7. an indication of the feasibility for construction in relation to the budget. This was a general check, no exclusion was effected if the budget was higher than € 20,000. The feasibility was evaluated in the last round.

Each criterion was ranked at a scale 1-4, 4 being the highest score. There was also a comment in written form and a concluding general comment.

The maximum ranking a project could achieve in the first round was 56 (28 by each jury member). The twelve highest ranking projects then entered the second evaluation round. In addition to this each jury member had the opportunity to propose one additional entry from the first round, provided it had not been selected in the top rankings, but was worthy of an additional evaluation. The jury proposed to include the entry with ID number 164 in the second round.

The 13 results achieved in the first round are shown below.

ID	Average 2 evaluators
179	25,0
148	23,5
152	22,0
150	21,5
154	21,5
161	20,5
125	20,0
190	20,0
84	19,5
130	19,0
141	19,0
21	19,0
164	18,0

### Follow-up round 1:

After approval of this protocol the authors of the projects that did not reach the threshold of the first round will be informed by e-mail. They will also receive the evaluation made by the two jury members and a certificate of participation.

## Round 2.

The 13 projects that were selected in the first round received additional evaluations from the remaining jury members. Accordingly the jury was divided into two groups and every jury member ranked up to 7 entries (excluding those they had already done) by the same set of criteria. Consequently, each project in the second round received 5 different, blind reviews. Because of technical problems at one of the universities one jury member could not enter the evaluation of the second round. For those entries the average was divided by 4. Again, the evaluators were not able to view each other's comments at any time. This second review was conducted on 11.01.2016 and 12.01.2016. The maximum average score of the second round was again 28.

The results of this second evaluation round are shown below:

ID	Average 4 or 5 evaluators
148	23,0
152	22,5
179	21,6
141	21,2
154	20,0
21	19,8
150	19,0
190	18,8
161	18,8
84	18,6
164	18,6
125	17,4
130	16,8

All projects that were evaluated in the second round were discussed in the final round.

### Follow-up round 2:

After approval of this jury protocol, the authors of the projects that were not awarded with the first, second or third prize will be informed by e-mail. They will also receive the evaluation made by four or five jury members and a certificate of participation.

## Observations during the jury discussion

The 13 entries were presented, with their ranking in an online web-meeting that took place on Tuesday the 12th of January 2015 from 18h00-20h20 CET. First the five entries with the highest ranking were discussed. Jury members proposed that the entries with the numbers 125, 154 and 164 also deserved further evaluation. Finally the jury considered the quality of the remaining entries.

The jury discussed the following aspects:

- the extent to which entries addressed the goals of the competition;
- the feasibility of construction in relation to safety, possible detailing, and available budget;
- the functionality of the design taking into account that it will be an exposition site with many visitors; and
- the architectural and aesthetic attractiveness of the design for visitors, especially children.

On the basis of the discussion three entries were selected for the awards: numbers 148, 164 and 179. All jury members once more assessed these entries for the first, second and third prize.

### First prize: 148 – beBee the pavilion

This design best meets the aims of the competition. The concept of bees representing biodiversity is consistently developed both in the architecture of fences, hard landscaping, planting design and plant assortment. It is an attractive garden and the concept can be very well perceived by visitors. It offers

variety in experience for children and adults alike. Sustainability is addressed by use of renewable materials and selection of drought resistant planting. The routing and shading of paths is functional and well detailed. The design needs some adaptations for reasons of safety (bees, fragility of the construction, shading for summer heat). The design can be kept and maintained in a simplified way in the park after the EXPO 2016 period.

#### *Second prize 164: Plug in garden*

This concept of an interactive garden with a monitoring system of the impact on sustainability appealed very much to the jury. The garden provides possibilities for visitors and children to participate by planting plug plants. The garden is a playground in itself. The pavilion is a symbol for sustainability that monitors the amount of oxygen and shines like a lantern when it is dark. Hard surfacing is reduced to a minimum. The plant selection reflects well the seasons in the Mediterranean landscape. The image depends very much on the standard of daily maintenance and the process of implementation during the EXPO period. The lack of structure in the lay-out does not guarantee an attractive result. It will be not easy to be maintained long-term, but can be developed into a working garden after the EXPO 2016 period.

#### *Third prize 179: Pamuk Kale*

This design highlights in an evocative way the mountain area of Pamukkale and the growing of cotton, an important crop in Turkey. The design is well detailed in the form of a terraced garden with a variety of cotton species from different regions and dyeing plants. The design offers a variety of experiences to the visitors and has an educational value. The reference to the agricultural landscape and traditional craftsmanship is well elaborated. The focus of the design does not fully address the main aims of the EXPO 2016 and the competition. There is some reservation about the sustainability of the mist system in a hot climate and the effects of the mist on the cotton fortress. The design can be kept in a simplified way in the park after the EXPO 2016 period.

#### *Honourable mention*

An honourable mention is made for two entries:

- no. 141 because of the innovative approach of the use of plant material (edible forest garden, hydroponic columns) combined with the concept of closing of cycles. It combines columns with edible plants with hanging native plants in an inspiring way; and
- no. 152 a garden beyond paradise, because of the excellent design and detailing, strong spatial structure and possibilities for interaction and education.

### **General observations by the jury**

The jury appreciated the ambition and creativity of all the entrants, where many entries have a high level of design quality and provide an international perspective. After the identities of the authors were made known the jury was happily surprised that students from so many different countries from all over the world took part.

There are however some points of attention:

- participants should be fully aware of addressing and articulating in full the competition themes (sustainable planting design, water management and Mediterranean landscape design for greener cities);
- some designs had faults in the scale of heights, widths and detailing; making a spatial model could and would have helped understanding of correct dimensions;
- technical detailing and adequate planting schemes (with scientific plant names) should be more elaborated and of a high standard;
- the jury had expected much more innovative concepts in flower design; and integrate flower designs in the urban context and fabric;
- some entries mainly focused on the architecture of the pavilion or technical structures, and seemed to be designed by architecture students that did not seek collaboration with landscape architecture students to fully meet the requirements of the competition; the jury encourages a collaboration of architects, landscape architects and other disciplines.

## Identification of finalists

After the judging was finalised the identities of all entries were made known by the support staff. The authors of the winning entries and the honourable mention are shown below:

First Prize ID 148: Zuzanna Banaś and Irene Jackson Gil, landscape architecture, Hochschule für Wirtschaft und Umwelt Nürtingen-Geislingen, International Master of Landscape Architecture (IMLA), Germany.

Second prize: ID 164: Marta Matynia and Paweł Gałeczka, architecture, Wrocław University of Technology, Architecture, Poland.

Third prize: ID 179: Alexandre Marguerie and Camille Dèlegue, Ecole Nationale Supérieure d'Architecture de Paysage de Versailles, France.

Honourable mention ID 141: Kwang Min Lee, Jinsung Kim and Hyunggyu Kim, architecture, Syracuse University, School of Architecture, New York, USA.

Honourable mention ID 152: Narjes Zivdar, Ameneh Karimiand and Samira Eskandari, students of Shahid Beheshti University Teheran, Islamic Republic of Iran.

## Follow-up:

Prize-winning authors will be informed after approval of the jury protocol on the evaluations and the outcome. All authors will receive a certificate of participation and a short evaluation of their project.

All authors will be invited to the award ceremony at the EXPO 2016 that is scheduled for the end of May 2016 and the three prize winners will receive a refund of travel and stay.

The entries of the competition will be exhibited at the EXPO 2016 and Akdeniz University. Results will be documented and published (digitally) on the website of the LE:NOTRE Institute.

The LE:NOTRE Institute will make the posters available for all universities that want to exhibit the competition.

## Competition organising committee

The organising committee prepared the competition brief, materials and jury formation.

- LE:NOTRE Institute – Ir. Jeroen de Vries bnt, landscape architect, board member of LNI, teaching at VHL University of Applied Sciences, the Netherlands,

- EXPO 2016 Antalya Agency – Dr. Ece Gökök, Director of Landscape and Gardening Works Directorate and Mrs. Dila Evcilmen, Landscape and Gardening Works Directorate.

- Akdeniz University, Antalya, Faculty of Architecture, Department of Landscape Architecture, Prof. Dr. Veli Ortaçşme.

Support for the registration, identification and web-platform was provided by Dr. Ellen Fetzer, LE:NOTRE Institute & Hochschule für Wirtschaft und Umwelt Nürtingen-Geislingen, Germany.

This protocol was composed by the president of the jury and approved by all jury members,  
Wageningen, 15th of January 2016,

ir. Jeroen de Vries bnt for the LE:NOTRE Institute