

# PROJECT COMPETITION FOR THE NEW ITU HEADQUARTERS BUILDING IN GENEVA

## QUESTIONS FROM COMPETITORS AND ANSWERS

### Connection between the New Building and Montbrillant building

#### Question 1:

What types of “functional connections” are envisaged between the New Building and the Montbrillant building? The paragraph p.21 explaining this link is not explicit or exhaustive and the Client’s expectations are not clear.

#### Question 2:

Is it possible to be more precise as regards the connection between the New Building and the Montbrillant building, and in particular the types of link for people (internal services only or general public?) Does every floor need to be connected or only some floors? In the latter case please indicate which floors.

#### Question 3:

With regard to that connection, since there is some distance between the site perimeter and the facade of the Montbrillant building, are we to understand that the link can be provided only via the existing passageway? Or is it restricted to that structure but with vertical additions built on? Or it is left to the discretion of the competitor as regards use of the area between the site perimeter and the facade of the Montbrillant building? Please clarify this point.

#### Question 4:

In the feasibility study, does the siting of the link with the Montbrillant building reflect the wishes of the Client or is it just a schematic representation?

#### Question 5:

What distance must be maintained in relation to the Montbrillant building? Would an adjoining building be possible?

#### Question 6:

*Preamble – Connection between buildings and movement on the site*

“The connection between the Montbrillant building and the New Building will be very important from a logistical point of view... Functional connections between the New Building and the Montbrillant building will be essential...”

Would it be functionally advantageous to provide a connection between the Montbrillant building and the New Building at all levels (floors)? Or is a link at ground floor level sufficient?

#### Question 7:

Do we have to keep the (existing) upper-ground level connection?

#### Question 8:

Can the connection to the Montbrillant building be made using other levels than the ground floor?

**Answer:**

The nature of the connection is left to the discretion of competitors, taking into account:

- there is currently a link (covered and enclosed footbridge) between the first floor of the Varembe building and the first floor of the Montbrillant building;
- for minimum change to the Montbrillant building the same connection points could be used;
- the link between the New Building and the Montbrillant building is reserved for staff working in these buildings and for delegates;
- a link at ground-floor level is not possible owing to the existing rights of way for vehicles and pedestrians (access to public car park);
- the extensive natural light to the Montbrillant building is to be maintained.

**Thematic area**

**Question 9:**

What is the “possible thematic area”? (Specifications, section 2.01, and item 5 of the Programme table)? Is it an exhibition area or something else?

**Question 10:**

Can you clarify the term “optional” in relation to the thematic area? Does this mean an element that the competitor may choose either to include in the design or leave out altogether? Or should the design leave open the possibility of implementing or not implementing this element by ensuring that the design remains coherent whether or not the option is actually implemented?

**Question 11:**

Is it possible to specify as a minimum the function of the optional 1 000 m<sup>2</sup> thematic area (free open space or cursory specifications of the composition of functional areas)?

**Question 12:**

What is the role of the thematic area in the overall project design? Will it help to define ITU’s identity, and if so, how?

**Question13:**

Are the thematic area and the exhibition area mentioned in the Programme one and the same thing? If that is not the case, for which public will the exhibition area be intended and to which areas will it be connected?

**Question 14:**

Could the thematic area be integrated into the reception area, or should it be an area separate from the entrance hall?

**Question 15:**

Who is to use the thematic area? (staff members, visitors, or both?)

**Answer:**

The thematic area will be an uncommitted space of 1 000 m<sup>2</sup>, also open to the public, comprising a completely open area the layout of which will be decided at a later date. It will be useful if this element is close to the semi-public zone. The design should leave open the possibility of implementing or not

implementing this element by ensuring that the design remains coherent whether or not the option is actually implemented.

The element should be developable into an exhibition space, a conference space or other public or semi-public area in an action subsequent to the project. The thematic area and exhibition area mentioned in the Programme are one and the same thing.

The thematic area should not be integrated into the reception hall, which is a reception and registration area for delegates and visitors. It is open to everyone – staff, delegates and visitors.

## **Offices and workplaces**

### **Question 16:**

We have difficulty understanding the office layout. As regards the 723 workplaces requested, including 332 and 372 workplaces, are these organized by department? How are they organized among themselves? What links and connections are required between them?

### **Question 17:**

Do the 332 and 372 workplaces (of 9 m<sup>2</sup> and 6 m<sup>2</sup> each respectively) all have to be convertible into open plan and enclosed offices? Or is that the case only for a certain specified number (percentage) of places?

### **Question 18:**

Scenario 2 « DUO » as set out in the feasibility study offers an option involving 50 workplaces over 450 m<sup>2</sup>, but this option is not included in the Programme. Can this be clarified and confirmed?

### **Answer:**

The workplaces will be organized by departments of varying sizes, but to date these departments are not formally defined and approved.

However, in the first stage, aside from the zone for the 5 elected officials the competitors must take into account the hypothesis that workplaces will be organized into 14 departments consisting of the following:

- 1 office (D1-D2) of 18m<sup>2</sup>
- 23 workspaces of 9m<sup>2</sup>
- 26 workspaces of 6m<sup>2</sup>

Adjacent premises such as: meeting areas, enclosed meeting areas, acoustic-controlled spaces for telephone calls, photocopy areas, filing, coffee/snack area etc. at the discretion of the competitor. The 9m<sup>2</sup> or 6m<sup>2</sup> workplaces shall be open plan. Organization of workspaces is left to the discretion of the competitors.

The option involving 50 additional workplaces mentioned in the feasibility study has been dropped.

## **Cafeteria and kitchen**

### **Question 19:**

Is the restaurant for the public or only for VIPs? How many places would be provided?

**Question 20:**

Is the cafeteria connected directly to the kitchen or is it required to provide a separate snack bar service?

**Answer:**

The cafeteria with 400 places is open to the public, the restaurant of around 80 m<sup>2</sup> is reserved for VIPs. A connection between the cafeteria and kitchen is desirable. There is no requirement to create a separate snack bar-type area.

**Meeting rooms**

**Question 21:**

Page 23 paragraph 3: conference halls. Could you explain “arranged in boardroom style”

**Question 22:**

Scenario 2 “DUO” in the feasibility study provides for an option involving four meeting rooms for an additional 100 people; this option is not included in the Programme. Have these rooms been replaced by the second and third meeting rooms that are included in the Programme? Can this point be clarified and confirmed?

**Question 23:**

Do the meeting rooms have to be grouped together on one floor or can they be spread over different floors?

**Question 24:**

Is it possible to have meeting rooms without direct natural light or with artificial light only?

**Answer:**

“Boardroom style” means a room with centre-facing seating, such as a square, elliptical or circular arrangement, potentially with inner and outer annuli.

If the Programme and feasibility study differ, the Programme is deemed to be authoritative and must be taken into account. For information: the need for four meeting rooms each for 100 people has been superseded by the new Popov (500 seat) room designed to be divided up.

The conference halls should be grouped, preferably on one floor, as should be meeting rooms with capacities of 30 or more. Smaller meeting rooms can be distributed around the building.

The provision of natural light in conference halls and meeting rooms is left to the discretion of the competitors.

**Height of New Building**

**Question 25:**

The LCI (*Loi sur les constructions et les installations diverses*) refers to a height of 21m in Zone 3, while the documents submitted indicate 21.5m. Which of these should be adopted?

**Question 26:**

The height of the Montbrillant building is 27.10 m. Can the new building be aligned on this height?

**Question 27:**

What is the Client's position regarding the proposal for a tower?

**Answer:**

The LCI limit for zone 3 is 21m, noting that 27m can be permitted in some cases. The 21.5m building (Varembé) was authorised in the 1950's. The 27m building (Montbrillant) was authorised in 1990's. Height increase of a nearby office building in rue de Varembé was authorised in 2015 to 27m, and an office building in the same zone has been authorised at 36m. The proposed height of the New Building is left to the discretion of the competitors but a height substantially above the current legislation is unlikely to be approved.

**Other questions:****Question 28:**

Is it possible to clarify the functional differences and define the elements that distinguish public and semi-public spaces?

**Answer:**

The public space is accessible to anyone obtaining accreditation (badge) at the building entrance for the purpose of, for example, visiting the cafeteria or thematic area. Public spaces should be easily accessible from reception, for instance close-by on the ground floor. Only delegates or staff can access semi-public areas.

**Question 29:**

Is there a functional organigram showing the programme elements and their linkages? If so, can it be made available to the competitors?

**Answer:**

In the first stage of this competition there is no such functional organigram.

**Question 30:**

*Reception hall – main entrance*

The description of the reception hall mentions among other things a delegates' and visitors' reception and registration area, a delegates' area, and a cybercafé. What are the precise functions of these areas? Can they be located in a single open area?

**Answer:**

This is left to the discretion of the competitors. See the answer to question 28.

The main entrance to the building is controlled by a reception area which gives access to ITU staff and provides for registration of delegates and visitors.

Beyond this entrance, access to the various activity zones will be differentiated and will be protected by access controls.

Access to public zones (cafeteria and thematic space) and access to semi-public zones (delegate and conference areas) will be clearly separated.

**Question 31:**

What is the purpose of the cybercafé as compared to the cafeteria (item 4)?

Answer:

This is an Internet-connected area where computers and printers (for example) are available.

**Question 32:**

Can the public areas that are envisaged, namely :

1. reception area
3. meeting rooms
4. cafeteria

be brought together in a single common area or do they have to be physically separate?

Answer:

The public areas (cafeteria, thematic area) and semi-public areas (meeting rooms) must be separated by specific access control systems. See answers to question 28, 30.

**Question 33:**

*IT rooms*

Is it essential to locate training workplaces close to the servers?

Answer:

This is not a requirement and is left to the discretion of the competitors.

**Question 34:**

Is it necessary to provide special infrastructure (such as antennas) for ITU on the roof of the New Building?

Answer:

Yes. See Programme §3.02 (description of spaces in new building), item 17.

**Question 35:**

Is it possible in this project to relocate the pedestrian and vehicular rights of way between the rue Varembe and the Nations car park? If that is the case, can they be distinct and separate or must they be kept together?

Answer:

There is a right of way at ground level for vehicles, allowing access to the Nations car park; this access cannot be changed. This also applies to the pedestrian passageway, which cannot be moved.

**Question 36:**

Can the position of the Montbrillant building's goods and deliveries access be clarified, specifically as to whether it can or must be shared for use as the goods and deliveries access required for the New Building?

Answer:

There is no separate goods and deliveries access in the Montbrillant building. Such an access for the whole site must be provided in the New Building; the siting of the access is left to the discretion of the competitors.

**Question 37:**

Can you clarify the constraints that must be taken into account as regards the PLQ (*plan localisé du quartier, or local zoning plan*) perimeter within which the construction of the new building would take place? If possible, please let us have the documents, relevant captions and any associated regulations.

Answer:

The PLQ is to be repealed and therefore need not be taken into account in the present competition.

**Question 38:**

The work site includes a plot between the Nations car park and the Tower extending over the width of the car park as far as avenue Motta behind the Varembe building; the existing premises on this land comprise a basement level and a lower ground-floor level, which appear to be functionally associated with the Tower. Can you confirm whether or not it will be possible to demolish or redesign those premises, which form part of the project site.

Answer:

Yes, these basement level premises can be demolished or redesigned.

**Question 39:**

Does the Tower basement have to be preserved in its entirety? Does the client have any particular wishes as regards the interface with the natural terrain?

Answer:

Within the perimeter of the project, there are no particular requirements to preserve the basement, and this is left to the discretion of the competitors.

**Question 40:**

Does the public car park entrance building have to be preserved?

Answer:

The building situated above the entrance to the underground car park must be demolished, and the car park entrance preserved.

**Question 41:**

Would it be possible to consider keeping any part of the Varembe building?

Answer:

No.

**Question 42:**

*Purpose of the competition – strategy for the headquarters site project*

Where will the functions of the Varembe building be housed once that building has been demolished? Are we required to propose an interim solution during the phase of constructing the New Building?

Answer:

In the first stage of the competition, competitors are not being requested to propose any interim solution for the construction phase.

**Question 43:**

*Objectives of the Client:* “The proposed building design must be capable of adapting easily at all times to ITU’s evolving needs...” What kind of evolution is referred to here (new expansion of headquarters, increased number of staff members, etc.)?

Answer:

Office and workspace areas must be easily reconfigurable between these functionalities.

**Question 44:**

*Interventions on site:* "For imperative reasons of security, a periphery security system must be set up and complemented by access control systems."

Is the periphery security system intended for vehicles or will it also include pedestrians?

Answer:

Periphery security needs to be in place for vehicles and pedestrians.

**Question 45:**

How many competitors are registered for the competition?

Answer:

The number of competitors will be made known at the end of the competition and communicated in the final jury report.

**Question 46:**

Is it possible to construct on the land parcel 5011?

Answer:

No.

**Question 47:**

Can we demolish the Tower and its basements?

Answer:

The Tower will be kept, however it will be possible to demolish certain basement areas within the perimeter of the project, if it is deemed necessary for the New Building.

**Question 48:**

Is the Tower for sale?

Answer:

This is the intention.

**Question 49:**

"During the period of the works, a weatherproof, secure pedestrian connecting walkway shall be maintained at all times between the Montbrillant building and Tower". Should we present a design of this walkway?

Answer:

No, this walkway will be dealt with as part of the building site and does not need to be taken into account for the first stage of the competition.



**Question 50:**

Does the competition have a target area (gross and net) for the new building?

Answer:

No, there is no target area.

**Question 51:**

When calculating areas, should elevators be counted once or on each floor?

Answer:

The calculation of areas should be simple.

This means calculating the gross surface area of all levels (including walls and façade as well as elevators on each floor).

**Submission of project documents :**

**Question 52:**

If we submit the project via mail, we must provide a sender's address. How can we keep anonymity?

Answer:

The Secretariat of the competition will receive the envelopes, packets or scrolls. These documents will be transmitted directly to the notary, who will open them and ensure the anonymity of the entries.

**Question 53:**

Regulations in English, PAGE 14, Last sentence: "These copies will not be subject to assessment". But in French file "Exemplaires non affichés pour le jugement". Could you please explain if the A3 copies should not be attached or if that sentence means something else?

Answer:

The A3 copies are for ease of reference by the jury. The A0 projects will be judged, the A3 copies will not be judged.

**Question 54:**

Could you explain in section 1.22, submission of projects, page 16, "all documents shall be submitted anonymously in a portfolio or roll". What kind of portfolio? Should the A0, A3 or any of the documents be mounted on a foam board?

Answer:

Portfolio: your plans should be enclosed between folded cardboard.  
The boards need not be mounted on a foam or hard panel.

**Question 55:**

If the project documents are sent by mail, is the post mark before the deadline (19 June 2017, 17h00) sufficient? Or do the documents have to be sent before this date?

Answer:

The competitors must take all necessary measures to ensure that the project documents reach the Secretariat on 19 June 2017 at 17h:00 at the latest.

**Question 56:**

Do the documents for the first stage need to be submitted in electronic format?

**Answer:**

Yes, the project documents must also be submitted on CD-ROM or USB key.

**Question 57:**

Regulations in English, PAGE 14, Last sentence: "These copies will not be subject to assessment". But in French file "Exemplaires non affichés pour le jugement". Could you please explain if the A3 copies should not be attached or if that sentence means something else?

**Answer:**

The A3 copies are for ease of reference by the jury. The A0 projects will be judged, the A3 copies will not be judged

**Documents provided to competitors**

**Question 58:**

In the document in English "Regulations, specifications, site programme", page 19-20, 2.04 Competition Site Perimeter and Legal Provisions, the last five links are not available. Could the competition organisers please provide those files? Additionally, the website concerning the fire insurance regulations is only in German – could you please provide these regulations in French or English?

**Answer:**

We've tested the links on the web sites and they are easily accessible. Furthermore, there is a language selection tab on the site concerning the fire insurance which will give you the French translation. Any further questions on this issue can be sent to the coordinator.

**Question 59:**

The dwg file is not in North direction. Is it correct?

**Answer:**

The file is in North-west direction and this should not be modified for the presentation of the projects.

**Question 60:**

Can we have aerial views?

**Answer:**

Aerial views of Geneva are available on the following site:

<http://ge.ch/sitg/cartes/professionnelles>

**Question 61:**

Is it possible to have plans of the other ITU buildings?

**Answer:**

For the first stage, the plans in the feasibility study are sufficient.

However, two cross-sections and the ground floor plan of the Montbrillant Building are available on the competition platform.