mind(21)factory

a factory of the future, where fabricating means the same as learning _vilém flusser

AN INTERNATIONAL IDEAS COMPETITION FOR STUDENTS AND GRADUATES OF ARCHITECTURE OF ALL EUROPEAN UNIVERSITIES

protocol of the jury session

Open one- stage and anonymous competition
Admitted area: Europe

Jury Session:

Location:
TU Graz, Rechbauerstrasse 12

Duration:
18. 10. 2006

09.15	Start of the jury
09.30 - 13.00	Presentation of the projects and first round of evaluation
13.00 - 15.00	Break for lunch
15.00 - 18.00	Next rounds of evaluation and awarding of the prizes

Attendant:

Jurymembers:

Angelika Fitz	Curator and cultural theorist, Vienna / A
Georg Flachbart	Philosopher, Director of mind(21)factory for Knowledge Engineering and Knowledge Design Stuttgart_Frankfurt/M_Berlin / D
Marie-Therese Harnoncourt	Architect, Next ENTERprise – architects Vienna / A
Urs Hirschberg	Professor for Architecture and Media Dean of the Faculty of Architecture TU Graz / A
Neil Spiller	Professor for Architecture and Digital Theory Vice Dean of The Bartlett School of Architecture London / GB
Lubica Vitkova	Associate Prof. of Urban planning Vice Dean of the Faculty of Architecture TU Bratislava / SK

Organisation:

Marlis Nograsek, Vice Leader of the Institute of Housing TU Graz / A

Team of the pre-examinators:

Institute of Housing:

Marlis Nograsek

with the studying assistants:

Katja Hausleitner

Wilhelm Haub

Johannes Pointl

and the students:

Nicole Bergmann, Martin Grabner, Nina Kolowratnik, Renate Ziegler

18.10.2006

Start of the Jury Session at 09.00 a.m.

Introduction:

Marlis Nograsek welcomes the attendant members of the jury and excuses the absence of Prof. Hansjörg Tschom because of illness. After the introduction of the jurors and the team of the pre-examination, Wilhelm Haub and Katja Hausleitner introduce to the further procedure of presentation of the projects.
207 students and graduates of architecture (136 teams) from 21 European countries were registered for the competition, 33 projects came in finally.

Mode of Presentation:

The jury received the paper of pre- examination consisting of briefing, overview of the formal pre-examination, summery and a short version in English.
Projects are presented in four parts. Main information about each project based on the topics location, architecture, function and extensibility are given. There is the possibility to hear a short neutral summary (short version in English) too, if more information is requested. After each introduction a digital presentation of the project is shown.

The jury accepted the mode of presentation.
Flachbart is elected for president of the jury. Spiller is elected for vice-president of the jury.
Fitz is elected for the recording clerk, but she asks members of the pre-examination to make notes.

Presentation of projects 1 - 8

Harnoncourt asks for an explanation of the exact task of the competition, because she was not at the mind(21)lecture.
Flachbart explains the main points.

Presentation continues with projects 9 - 33

The jury takes a little coffee break and starts studying the panels of each project individually.

Hirschberg quits the jury for another meeting at 12.00 a.m.

1. Round of Evaluation

The jury decides to make a first round of evaluation. Each project needs at least the voice of one member to come to the second round. Hirschberg can bring in again a dropped- out- project, if requested, afterwards, when he comes back.
As a result the numbers 2, 4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 32 are dropped out.

Comments:

 2   not more than a shopping mall
 4   only technical, no virtual innovation
 7   no reason for this system of architecture
 9   normal architecture for an exhibition hall
10   project does not work
12   primitive presentation of cyberspace. Interactive, project is depending on machines, there is
        no new space production
13   project is not understandable, how it functions, random congestions of public space
15   naive virtual communication
17   gangways, knowledge space very normal
        idea good: monks in monastery, but this was given for this location.
18   research engine, too abstract
19   research engine like wikipedia - already existing
21   obviously college project, no virtuality in the project
22   not interesting approach
24   just implanting a cave
25   does not work, only screens, just technology of projection
26   normal conventional spaces
27   the new spaces are not satisfying
28   the same as 27
32   just office building for start-ups

Lunch break from 13.00 to 15.00

15.00:
The members of the jury take some time for a second individual view on the panels.
Hirschberg is back and does not agree to the drop out of the project number 2 and takes the project back to the second round of evaluation.
Afterwards the jury intensifies the discussion about the remaining projects.
.

2. Round of Evaluation

Harnoncourt wants to make groups of projects based on the sort of category, such as 3, 2, and 16, because they are all creating building typologies.
After the second round the projects 1, 2, 6, 11, 23, 29, 31, 33 where dropped out. The other projects where discussed again.

   1   There is an interesting starting point of a multiverse of nano cubes, clouds built by energies, as a new material. The data visualization has an aesthetic quality, but not more. In comparison to the outside of the structure the inside of it could be interesting, The author did not manage to present this kind of project, so it is far under the elaboration for a further discussion and dropped out by the jury with 5:1 votes

   2   This project is criticised by the majority of the jury for not being more than a shopping mall. Some members of the jury are impressed with how its structure captures some of the

characteristic features of the internet: travelling without moving and lack of hierarchy. But it does not connect the real and the virtual.

The project is dropped out with 3:2 / 1 abstention from voting

6 Space is too little elaborated. Project is dropped out with 6:0 votes.

11 The idea of the project is not really convincing. The structure is not pneumatic.
Project is dropped out with 6 : 0 votes

23 Virtual architecture is used for revitalization of old spaces. The potential, which atmosphere comes with the virtuality, is not shown in the project. The rest is a problematic solution.
Project is dropped out with 5 : 1 votes.

29 Implant, very simple idea. Ambitious starting point, but it doesn't fulfil the function.
Project is dropped out with 6 : 0 votes.

31 The brilliant name only should get a price. The idea of a matrix is already existing in our daily life. Thousands of people live in such a kind of virtuality and forget their responsibility in the real world.
The project seems to be a satiric and critical statement about the subject of the competition and on virtuality
Project is dropped out with 6 : 0 votes.

33 Project is not worked out at all. Main processes are not explained like: how does it work to from one level to the next one ?
Project is dropped out with 6 : 0 votes.

3. Round of Evaluation

Discussion about the projects 2, 3, 16, 30

No. 2 is brought back to discussion again, because the jury wants to find a prize for a project which works with typologies.
The structural approach to the project seems to be stronger than in No. 16. For others the project is essentially just a box with a circulation system, using some trendy forms.

Project No. 3 is discussed, and the students of the pre-examination ask, if they can say their opinion. They are allowed to do this. They like the idea, that the surface of the building is the website at the same time. But the jury doesn't think that the project does anything remarkable with this idea.

3 The conceptual idea of project no. 3 does not go anywhere. It has no special choreography, but good parts. The idea is not innovative because it already exists in Google Earth in some way.
Project is dropped out wit 6:0 votes.

16 It is a pretty project, but it does not work. Specific elements are elaborated but not consequently worked out through the concept.
Every function has its own architectural skin. This difference is a quality of the project. The architectural structure has nice forms but must be further elaborated for a logical process of functions.
Project is dropped out with 6:0 votes.

Project No. 30 is fixed as best project in this group and Nr. 2 is fixed as mentioned.

Discussion about the projects 5, 14, 20

20 An interesting idea, looking for new market place. But will this project improve the working market situation? It could work for everything.
The market is producing the project itself, the project depends on the market.
Project is dropped out with 6:0 votes.

14 It is a nice project, but it is more an art installation than an architectural work. It does not make an environment. It creates more fun, than knowledge. The most members of the jury would have found it interesting, if the project would have concentrated just on one topic with a deeper elaboration.
Project is dropped out with 6:0 votes.

Project Nr. 5 is fixed as best project of this group.

Discussion about the projects 18, 23, 28,

The projects number 18, 23 and 28 came back to the discussion, because they are dealing with the given site in Kremnica.
For one juror the project 23 seems to be the best of these three projects.
The architecture is professional, the inner space is augmented by virtual reality. The others can not agree.

Project Nr. 28 is fixed for mentioned as best Kremnica project.

4. Round of Evaluation – Awarding the prices

The jury starts the discussion, how many prices will be given. One suggestion is to give three equal prices and two rewards.
The jury mentions that the most of the projects have a good starting point but are not worked out unto a convincing result.
The projects number 5 and 30 are suggested for the first price.
There is a discussion about project 8. It can not be the same level, as the two other projects, 5 and 30.
Project 23 is suggested for a reward.

Nograsek suggests a break, going for the sheets of authors. The jurors are looking for the projects themselves again.

After the break, the jury decides to award a mixture of approaches to show a broad range of ideas for mind(21)factory.

There will be two first prices, each to 2500 Euro , one third price to 1000 Euro and two rewards, each to 500 Euro.

There is the suggestion to give a reward to project 18. The jury votes 5:0 for this, but one juror was missing, so they discuss again.

The next voting is about project number 28, it gets the reward with 6:0 votes.

There is a proposal to give the third price to project 14. It is the same category as project number 5, so it should not be a price.

Project 8 gets the 3. price with 5:1 votes.

Project 2 gets a reward with 5:1 votes.

Prices:

1st price	Project No. 5	6:0 votes
1st price	Project No. 30	6:0 votes
3rd price	Project No. 8	5:1 votes
Reward	Project No. 28	6:0 votes
Reward	Project No. 2	5:1 votes

Description:

2   Among the conventional sort of projects, **>Space by the hour<** is remarkable for its clarity of representation and for creating a structure that translates some of the essential characteristics of the online world into an architectural parti (concept). Like the internet, it is an un-hierarchical place with neutral spaces that can be used for many different purposes. It would probably lend itself well for the quick use and re-use cycles of information age businesses the author intended it for. Its extensive walkways along similarly shaped multi-purpose spaces allow visitors to "travel without moving": like the urban flaneur they can walk along almost endlessly, check out what's in the spaces, except that, since they keep circling around the same courtyard, they also stay in the same place, just as one does when browsing the internet. The negative criticism of the project is that it does not attempt to connect the virtual and the real and that its typology is essentially that of the common shopping mall, which is not innovative at all.

28 From the projects in Kremnica, **>die denkfabrik als medium<** seems to be the project with the most architectural promise. It was most successful in combining the architecture with the virtual connection and also treats the existing structure in a respectful, but intelligent way.

8   The **>Techtree<** project inhabits mixed reality. It appropriates in an actual forest roosts web-cams in its branches and pushes their output into cyberspace. The jury likes the idea that the topology of cyberspace was based on the complex dynamics of real geographic. The development of the initial good idea (knowledge grows and will further be harvested) is not satisfying. The jury questions the need for the high-tech base-station (the project is more killing the tree than doing something for it), and the avatar inhabitants of the virtual forest. But wow, consider the potential of an idea such as this.

5   The charming idea of the **>Café mind(21)factory<** is situated in daily life. With this project a model of a new but effective connectivity is shown. The jury adores the approach conceiving of the café as a factory in the mind(21) sense, as this continues the traditional role the café has often had as a meeting point for artists, authors and philosophers, a space where not only casual communication could happen, but also ideas were generated (Einstein wrote his ideas on a napkin!). While some aspects of the project are not worked out, its basic concept stands up very well. Especially the fact that the screens are permanent and thus become part of the architecture rather than being seen as a piece of installation is noticed positively. You can order your coffee, you can order your space.
In addition the jury likes at the one side, that the project is down to earth and could be realized immediately with relatively cheap technology and on the other side, that the team focused on one precise topic and did not try to change the whole world with one project.

30 Not that the utility fog idea of the **>cubic cloud< is an original idea,** but nonetheless it is an extraordinary concept. The project conceives of technology as a series of almost weather-like information fronts of differing data densities. To be played with, worn, hung and negotiated... The project has innovative intention and poetry. The jury would like to have seen the project placed in more specific contexts and the idea tested more in this respect, generating more concrete terms. It is a visionary project that can happen on various scales. Beautifully presented with room for the jurors imagination.

Flachbart opens the envelopes with the sheets of authors from the awarded projects.
Nograsek opens the other envelopes and makes the proposal, to write a concept from the protocol, which will be sent to the jurors for correction. The jury agrees and close the jury session.
The authors of the awarded projects were informed by phone from Nograsek in the morning of the 19th of October.

Authors of the projects:

1   human habitat universe
Matthias Printschler, Anna Rottmann
TU Graz / A

2   Space by the Hour
Charlotte Ellerbrok
RWTH Aachen / D

3   Knowledge Building
Sascha Glasl
RWTH Aachen / D

4   Holovision
Knezevic Maja, Lazicic Milorad
TU Graz / A

5   Café mind(21)factory
Julia Schatz, Winfried Ranz
TU Graz / A

6   OS mnd v2.1
Michael Langeder
TU Graz / A

7   D.I.V.E dwelling in virtual environments
Doris Lowry, Rossbacher Alexandra
TU Graz / A

8   TECHTREE
Philipp Erkinger, Lechner Thomas, Reynolds Patrick Colin Alan
TU Graz / A

9   TameD
Julia Hillebrand
TU Graz / A

10 liquid wall
Lanthaler Gary
TU Graz / A

11 Interactive Public Environment
Stephan Brugger
TU Graz / A

12 RAUM FACTORY
Stojanovic Irena, Kelecevic Bojana
TU Graz / A

13 DROP IT
Florian Absenger
TU Graz / A

14 The CITYmindfactory
Vanessa Kleinemeier, Arne Hansen
TU Graz / A und Universität Hannover / D

15 metaphysical cyberspace
Sabine Egarter, Claus Placencia
TU Graz / A

16 ...mit flexibler beständigkeit gesprochen
Sandra Meireis, Alexander Oehme
Staatliche Akademie der Bildenden Künste Stuttgart / D

17 FABRIKA 21
Mert Ayaroglu
Bauhaus- Universität Weimar / D

18 OMNI_
Isak Foged, Anke Pasold
Holstebro / DK, Dresden / D

19 Navigator
Soeren Arentsen, Anette Gammelgaard
Aalborg University, Aarhus School of Architecture / DK

20 mind21 Arbeitsamt
Markus Manahl, Michael Reiner
TU Graz / A

21 MUTABOR
Lisamarie Villegas Ambia
TU Berlin / D

22 The World comes to Kremnica, Kremnica gets to the World
Maria Munoz, Susana Oses
Bauhaus- Universität Weimar / D

23 Dämmerung
Claudia Rockstroh, Karolin Leipold
Bauhaus - Universität Weimar / D

24 virtual cube
Kathrin Jöck, Mario Brömßer
Bauhaus- Universität Weimar / D

25 Gedankenvernetzer
Stefanie Barlach, Thomas Breyvogel
Bauhaus-Universität Weimar / D

26 mind(21)factory school for knowledge design
Philipp Mennigen
Bauhaus- Universität Weimar / D

27 mind(21)factory and elementary school _ kremnica
Norma Tollmann
Bauhaus- Universität Weimar / D

28 die denkfabrik als medium
Patrick Beins, Franziska Cherdron
Bauhaus- Universität Weimar / D

29 Qubits and Branding
Fan Fan
Bauhaus- Universität Weimar / D

30 cubic cloud
Philipp Hoppe
RWTH Aachen / D

31 SATISfactory
Moritz von Sassen, Moritz Reichartz
Staatliche Akademie der Bildenden Künste Stuttgart / D

32 work 2.0
Daniel Duas
RWTH Aachen / D

33 mindCUBE
Michal Suchanek, Zuzana Gladicova, Adam Kuzma
STU Bratislava / SK