

Market Fountain Competition

Minutes from the judging panel session on 4 and 5 June 2019

Organiser

City of Chemnitz
Urban Development and Construction Department
Friedensplatz 1
09111 Chemnitz
www.chemnitz.de

Coordinators

Steffi Mehner
Martina Schönherr

Secretary

Steffi Mehner

The judging panel for the two-phase open international design competition to construct a market fountain in Chemnitz met to conclude phase 2 of the competition on 04.06.2019 at 9:00 a.m. at the Chemnitz Art Collections, Theaterplatz 1, 09111 Chemnitz.

Prof. Else Gabriel, chair of the judging panel, greeted those present, and thanked everyone involved for their participation in the public event the previous evening. She thanked Dr Bußmann in particular for opening this house for the exhibition and for the opportunity to conduct this session of the judging panel here inside the gorgeous chambers of the Chemnitz Art Collections. This showed once more just how much appreciation the city has for the artists in the competition and the idea of building this fountain.

1. Attendance and establishment of a quorum

Mr Tino Fritzsche of the Chemnitz city council (CDU/FDP group) excused himself for the duration of the panel session in phase 1 in order to perform other duties, and was thus absent in phase 2 as well. His place was taken by Mr Sandro Schmalfuß of the VOSI/PIRATEN group.

The following members of the judging panel were in attendance:

Professionals and experts with voting rights:

- | | |
|----------------------------|---|
| - Ms Susanne Altmann | Cultural historian and author, Dresden |
| - Dr Frédéric Bußmann | Art historian, General Director of the Chemnitz Art Collections |
| - Prof. Karl Clauss Dietel | Artist and designer, Chemnitz |
| - Mr Matthias Flügge | Rector of the Academy of Fine Arts Dresden |
| - Prof. Else Gabriel | Professor of Sculpture, Weißensee Academy of Art Berlin |
| - Mr Stefan Leiste | Landscape architect, Chemnitz |
| - Prof. Jörg Steinbach | Professor of Surface Design, University of Applied Sciences Zwickau, Faculty of Applied Arts Schneeberg |

Deputy expert panel member (without voting rights):

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| - Mr Ferenc Csák | Art historian, Head of Chemnitz Department of Culture |
|------------------|---|

City officials with voting rights:

- Mr Michael Stötzer Mayor in charge of Urban Development and Construction, Chemnitz
- Prof. Christian von Borczyskowski, Henry van de Velde Gesellschaft, Sachsen e.V.
- Mr Ulf Kallscheidt City Council, SPD group
- Mr Thomas Lehmann City Council, BÜNDNIS 90/DIE GRÜNEN group
- Mr Kai Tietze City Council, DIE LINKE group
- Mr Sandro Schmalfuß Group staff member, VOSI/PIRATEN group

Deputy city official panel member (without voting rights):

- Mr Joachim Zschocke City Council, PRO Chemnitz group

Thus it was determined that a quorum was present.

The rules for substitutions were explained. In particular, it was noted that all panel members were required to be present on both days. While the panel members who were city officials could be temporarily replaced by their deputies as long as they remained involved in the decision-making process, the rules were different for expert panel members. If an expert panel member were to be absent, they would be required to appoint another expert panel member in their place for the duration of the proceedings. Any replacement would have to have been present for all sessions to date.

Appointment of secretary

Ms Mehner, a specialist at the construction department, was appointed as secretary.

Obligations on those in attendance

Prof. Gabriel obliged all panel members to evaluate the proposed designs according to objective criteria based solely on the rules of the competition, and to respect the confidentiality of the deliberation process.

Assurances from attending panel members

All members of the judging panel assured that they had not previously discussed their opinions concerning the competition with any of the participants in the competition, nor would they do so for the duration of the session.

The judging panel discussed the possibility of prejudice on the part of Prof. Borczyskowski, who had worked with Rolf Lieberknecht on another project and might therefore be biased in his judgement.

The selection of entries in phase 1 of the competition was anonymous, preserving the neutrality of the process. The selection process in phase 2 of the competition would not be anonymous, making it impossible to rule out the potential for instances of personal contact between the judges and the participants in the competition. Such associations do not impair the ability of an expert judge to perform his or her task.

The panel decided that there was no reason to assume any prejudice on the part of Prof. Borczyskowski.

This decision was made unanimously.

Presentation of the procedure for the judging panel session and the voting process

- The panel members voted to hold an information session
- The judging criteria for the competition were provided
- Requests for the reinstatement of eliminated entries could be submitted at any time

Preliminary assessment report

The preliminary assessment was concerned with verifying compliance with the parameters, criteria and stated specifications for competition entries in line with competition documentation.

All nine entries were submitted on time and in full.

A handout was prepared for each member of the judging panel containing information on each fountain design, including a photograph and the required two A4 pages with:

- a detailed description of the design,
 - a description of the materials to be used and
 - a rough illustration of the production process,
- as well as the honorarium and costs calculated by the participant. Verification that these documents had been submitted in their entirety was documented in the annex of the handout.

The preliminary assessment took place on 20 and 21 May 2019 at the New Town Hall Technical Centre, Rm 122. The presentation models of the entries were assembled in full and were completely accessible to the participants. As required by the competition text, the following city organisations took part in the preliminary assessment:

- Historic Monuments Protection Authority
- Office for Public Order/Dept. for Markets
- Department of Culture
- Urban Planning Office
- Civil Engineering Office
- Parks Office

The individual notes and comments that had been made regarding the entries during the preliminary assessment were listed for each entry in the handout following the table showing how costs and honorarium were calculated. The preliminary assessment determined that, based on the notes given, there was no reason to categorically reject any of the proposed designs. As such, the report recommended that all of the entries that were submitted be included in the evaluation process.

For the actual fountain itself, all of the designs, with the exception of the cloud sculpture, propose using a system that recirculates and reuses the water. Not all of the proposals included exact figures on how much water would be lost due to evaporation and the like or how much energy the fountain would consume.

As the judging panel wished, all of the fountains also included a source of drinking water.

The requirements for calculating costs and honorarium were interpreted in different ways by the participants in the competition. Some of the items were given as combined totals, when they were required to be broken down into component parts (such as No. 3, production costs). Point 4 in particular, the honorarium to the artist as artistic director in the implementation of the project, ranged from €40K all the way up to €120K.

Following Germany's Official Scale of Fees for Services by Architects and Engineers (HOAI), the preliminary assessment report recommended that all agree to a standard honorarium for the artistic direction of the project amounting to 10% (gross) of the total budget.

The judging panel unanimously decided to allow all works to be evaluated.

The judging panel did not deem it necessary to specify a fixed percentage for the honorarium paid to the artist for the artistic direction of the project; it often takes several years to execute projects of this nature, and furthermore, the artist bears a significant amount of risk with regard to his or her business.

Information session

Each of the design proposals was discussed in terms of their content and form, but not evaluated.

A correction to the preliminary assessment report was noted: The *Bowl* by Anna Kubelic does not feature a drinking water station.

1st round of voting

Unanimous vote required for elimination

Dagmara Genda	7 votes → next round
Daniel Widrig	7 votes → next round
Anna Kubelic	5 votes → next round
Rolf Lieberknecht	7 votes → next round
Mojca Kocbek	3 votes → next round
Nina Heinzel	1 votes → next round
Matthias Lehmann	2 votes → next round
Thorsten Goldberg	2 votes → next round
Christin Kaiser	1 vote → next round

Result: All entries remained in the selection process.

2nd round of voting

An in-depth discussion was held on the content and artistic merits of five of the designs, beginning with the ones that received the fewest votes.

Lunch break

An in-depth discussion was held on the content and artistic merits of the last four designs, ending with the ones that received the most votes.

A majority vote was conducted to decide which design would proceed further (7 votes required). The order was the same as in the discussion (beginning with the one that had the fewest votes).

Christin Kaiser	<i>Well House</i>	3 votes → eliminated
Nina Heinzel	<i>Rainbow</i>	1 vote → eliminated
Matthias Lehmann	<i>Datsch</i>	2 votes → eliminated
Thorsten Goldberg	<i>Cloud</i>	3 votes → eliminated
Mojca Kocbek	<i>Red Arch</i>	7 votes → next round
Anna Kubelic	<i>Bowl</i>	1 vote → eliminated
Rolf Lieberknecht	<i>Silver Fountain</i>	5 votes → eliminated
Daniel Widrig	<i>Manifold</i>	9 votes → next round
Dagmara Genda	<i>Fountain</i>	7 votes → next round

Result:

Mojca Kocbek	<i>Red Arch</i>
Daniel Widrig	<i>Manifold</i>
Dagmara Genda	<i>Fountain</i>

proceeded to the next round.

Explanation for eliminated entries:**Well House:**

The proposed design was heavily modified in comparison to how it appeared in phase 1, causing the original concept of a visibly overflowing well house to be lost. Moreover, the colour scheme was altered; the grey in the first design was found to be more appealing.

Rainbow

Due to the lack of places to sit – a conscious choice on the part of the artist – the design does not achieve the desired quality as a place for people to spend time and interact with one another, and would not liven up the Market Square in the way intended by the organisers.

Datsch

The piece's actual function as a fountain (and the presence of water) plays a secondary role in this design. The name is a play on words, which has the potential to age quickly as slogans tend to change.

Cloud

The thickness of the solid structure that makes up the base of the fountain clashes aesthetically with the sense of lightness envisioned for the cloud itself. The proposed water supply and drainage system does not form a closed loop. This would be extremely difficult to arrange, from both a financial and an environmental perspective.

Bowl

Visually, the "bowl" doesn't stand out strongly enough against the architecture surrounding the Market Square and all the activity going on in the market. The contemplative nature of the piece doesn't work all that well in this particular location.

Silver Fountain

Many different materials go into making up this design, with the result that very little artistic tension arises between the combined elements. Also, the column-like character of the work does not allow for it to be smoothly integrated into the space it would occupy in the Market Square.

Reinstatement request

A request was made to reinstate the entry *Silver Fountain* by Rolf Lieberknecht. The person who made the request explained that there should be a greater focus on the dialectic between water and movement.

5 votes → request denied

Break**Discussion on further proceedings:**

- The final voting stage to determine the winner of the competition was postponed until the following day.
- It was determined that some issues that were not yet resolved (such as the demand that certain apparent inconsistencies be corrected in the way the costs were calculated for

Daniel Widrig's *Manifold*) were part of the risk taken on by the artist and should not be pursued individually in this phase of the competition, for reasons relating to the laws governing the tendering process.

Prof. Gabriel closed the session at 3:30 p.m.

Day 2

All participants were present. There was a quorum, as on the previous day.

Since the judging panel had a quorum, Mr Csák would not be needed in his capacity as deputy. Mr Csák asked that he be excused in order to perform other duties, and he left the session.

3rd round of voting

A discussion was held on the three design proposals remaining to be voted on, based on the judging criteria for the contest and in the following order:

- Dagmara Genda *Fountain*
- Daniel Widrig *Manifold*
- Mojca Kocbek *Red Arch*

An exploratory discussion was held concerning the remainder of the voting process. Each member of the judging panel had one vote. Voting would begin with 3rd place, and votes would be made anonymously. Each member of the panel would write a name on a piece of paper, fold it, and give it to Ms Schönherr and Ms Mehner.

Anonymous vote for 3rd place:

Result:	Dagmara Genda	11 votes
	Mojca Kocbek	2 votes

Anonymous vote for 2nd place:

Result:	Mojca Kocbek	10 votes
	Daniel Widrig	3 votes

Anonymous vote for 1st place:

Result:	Daniel Widrig	10 votes
	Mojca Kocbek	3 votes

As this method of voting allowed the members of the judging panel to make only one positive decision each, the official vote proceeded as follows:

Who is in favour of putting Daniel Widrig in 1st place?

10 votes for
3 votes against

Who is in favour of putting *Red Arch* in 2nd place?

8 votes for
5 votes against

Who is in favour of putting *Fountain* in 3rd place?

10 votes for
3 votes against

Final Result:

Winner	1st place	Daniel Widrig	<i>Manifold</i>
	2nd place	Mojca Kocbek	<i>Red Arch</i>
	3rd place	Dagmara Genda	<i>Fountain</i>

Attached to these minutes is a document explaining the reasons given by the judging panel for selecting these entries.

Discussion on the judging panels' recommendations

1. recommendation

Should the 2nd place entry be built if, for whatever reason, 1st place is unable to be executed?

8 votes for
5 votes against

Result: The judging panel recommends that the entry that won 2nd place, Mojca Kocbek – *Red Arch*, be built if the 1st place entry is not able to be built.

2. recommendation

The judging panel provided the following recommendations for Mr Widrig:

- Consider how the installation may be incorporated into the existing urban environment and the way the space itself is arranged, perhaps rethinking the number of objects and their placement (5 objects, maybe?)
- Redesign the seating, thinking about the proper material to use, the shape, and the layout. The goal should be to enhance the overall aesthetic appeal of the installation and increase the opportunities for people to interact with one another
- Check and verify the structural stability and material strength of the installation, taking into account the water pipes, perforation, stainless steel, corrosion
- Provide more detail in the cost projection
- Planning for the execution of the project is to be coordinated with the city of Chemnitz.

Result: The judging panel voted unanimously to give these recommendations to Mr Widrig for the execution of his proposed design.

Communication

The results of the competition were to be announced in a press conference following the session of the judging panel.

Any subsequent communications would be handled by Mr Stötzer.

Conclusion of proceedings

At the conclusion of the proceedings, the chair thanked everyone involved for their constructive participation. She thanked the preliminary assessors for their excellent documentation and exceptional guidance of the proceedings. The preliminary assessors were unanimously discharged of their duties by the judging panel.

Mayor Michael Stötzer, speaking on behalf of the panel, warmly thanked the chair for her masterful steering of the session. He thanked the members of the judging panel for their dedication and invited them to participate in the press conference that was to follow.

The session concluded at 2:00 p.m.

Prof. Else Gabriel	<i>signed: E. Gabriel</i>
Mr Matthias Flügge	<i>signed: M. Flügge</i>
Ms Susanne Altmann	<i>signed: S. Altmann</i>
Dr. Frédéric Bußmann	<i>signed: F. Bußmann</i>
Prof. Karl Clauss Dietel	<i>signed: K.C. Dietel</i>
Mr Stefan Leiste	<i>signed: S. Leiste</i>
Prof. Jörg Steinbach	<i>signed: J. Steinbach</i>
Mr Ferenc Csák	
Mr Michael Stötzer	<i>signed: M. Stötzer</i>
Prof. Christian von Borczyskowski	<i>signed: C. von Borczyskowski</i>
Mr Ulf Kallscheidt	<i>signed: U. Kallscheidt</i>
Mr Thomas Lehmann	<i>signed: T. Lehmann</i>
Mr Kai Tietze	<i>signed: K. Tietze</i>
Mr Sandro Schmalfuß	<i>signed: S. Schmalfuß</i>
Mr Joachim Zschocke	<i>signed: J. Zschocke</i>

Daniel Widrig, *Manifold*

The judging panel has awarded first place to *Manifold*, by Daniel Widrig.

Rotationally symmetrical sculpted objects are one of the archetypical forms of the Industrial Age. The sculptures in *Manifold* stand up to three metres in height, each one varying in width from broad and bulky to narrow and seemingly fragile.

The effect of water pouring down the sculptures combined with an alternating lighting scheme gives the contours a living, animated appearance. Together, the sculptures form a group in the Market Square.

The sculptures are characterised by a stylistic idiom that recalls the early days of the Industrial Age while at the same time giving rise to shapes that hint at what's to come.

The mirrored surface of the sculptures not only reflects the surrounding Market Square, but also enters into dialogue with the viewer. Fine threads of water add variety to the scene and make it a space that people will enjoy taking in.

The judging panel believes that this design has the greatest potential to become a lively meeting place amidst the water and the objects that make up the installation.

Mojca Kocbek Vimos, *Red Arch*

The judging panel has awarded second place to *Red Arch* by Mojca Kocbek Vimos. What set the model for this design apart was its distinct shape and the high visibility it would have in the Market Square. The artist incorporated elements of the surrounding architecture, such as the round arches of the town hall, into her design without allowing it to get lost against the backdrop of the city. The result is a design that is impossible to ignore. It thus fulfils the requirement to create a market fountain that would be instantly recognisable. The rather industrial nature of the design draws on the traditions of the region, where mechanical and automotive engineering have long played an important role, as has the textile industry. But rather than singing a song of praise to the technocracy, it superimposes artistic sovereignty and the reference to the styles and forms of the past 50 years upon this subjugation by technology, in effect asserting the primacy of design and of human interaction. The proposed design also shows a high degree of functionality with regard to facilitating encounters between people and giving them the opportunity to interact with one another. The fountain would be made of stainless steel and painted with a coat of polyurethane enamel over an epoxy base coat, promising a high degree of longevity and durability.

Dagmara Genda, *Fountain*

The unique feature of this design is the way in which the fountain is sunk into the Market Square itself, with a jet of water shooting up to various heights. A series of crescent-shaped steps lead down to the water and invite people to stay around, making the fountain an excellent meeting place in the Market Square. The artist chose to make the height reached by the jet of water a reference to the current global conversation on climate change and the problems associated with it. The height of the water represents the sea level at various times of the day. The fountain would be made from European granite worked in different ways in different sections to create a sense of contrast.

The judging panel made its decision in favour of a fountain design that would stand out more clearly in height amidst the surroundings of the Market Square.