

Guidelines for the Conduct of Architectural Competitions

PREFACE

Architectural competitions

While there is growing recognition of the intrinsic, long-term value of design, options for the procurement of architectural services are expanding, and the roles and responsibilities of all key players in the design and construction process are undergoing constant change.

An architectural competition, when conducted appropriately, can generate a broad range and high level of innovation in design solutions. However, if the competition process is flawed, there can be significant negative outcomes for all participants – sponsors/clients, entrants, jurors and advisers.

There is therefore a need for clarity, consistency and equity in the conduct of architectural competitions as part of the procurement process.

Policy framework

The Australian Institute of Architects (the Institute) has established a detailed policy on architectural competitions. The policy clearly articulates a set of principles and performance requirements that represent the Institute's position on good practice in the conduct of architectural design competitions in Australia.

The policy is available at: www.architecture.com.au >About Us >Policy & advocacy.

The policy sets out high level, in-principle criteria only. It is not a 'how-to' guide. To assist those proposing to run an architectural competition, the Institute has prepared two companion documents to the policy:

- *Model Conditions for an Architectural Competition*
- *Guidelines for the Conduct of Architectural Competitions (ie. this document)*

The Policy, the Model Conditions and this Guidelines document are complementary. Information provided in one is not generally repeated in another, except where greater clarity results from doing so. However, users of the Model Conditions and the Guidelines must refer to the Policy to ensure they have a complete picture of all relevant matters.

Model Conditions

One of the more challenging aspects in the conduct of an architectural competition is establishing fair, equitable and appropriate rules. The document, *Model Conditions for an Architectural Competition*, provides a template set of rules that can be easily adapted, as required, for most typical competitions. Using the model conditions as the basis of an architectural competition assists in ensuring a high level of compliance with the Institute policy, and thus an easier pathway to Institute endorsement.

This document

This document, *Guidelines for the Conduct of Architectural Competitions* provides details of the considerations and tasks typically required to plan and implement an architectural competition in line with the Institute's policy. Information is provided in the form of responses to frequently asked questions, and as a series of checklists for those organising an architectural competition.

Details are also provided on how to engage with the Institute's endorsement process for prospective architectural competition Sponsors.

Using the Guidelines

These guidelines have been prepared to assist the key parties involved in the planning and implementation of an architectural competition. They represent an informed view about current good practice in the conduct of architectural competitions, but individual judgement will be required in applying them to all situations and circumstances.

Jurisdiction

These guidelines, consistent with the Institute's policy, are primarily applicable to architectural competitions conducted within Australia, irrespective of the location of the project or site. However, while some aspects may be inconsistent with practices and requirements outside Australia, there is no formal restriction on their use for architectural competitions conducted elsewhere.

Disclaimer

The use of or reliance upon these Guidelines is entirely at the risk of the Sponsor and/or Client of the relevant architectural competition. The guidance information provided is general and may not be applicable for all types, sizes and configurations of architectural competition. The approaches suggested may or may not be sufficient to comply with the laws and regulations of all relevant jurisdictions. Competition Clients and Sponsors must thus obtain their own separate legal advice regarding the compliance of their particular competition provisions.

The Australian Institute of Architects accepts no liability whatsoever for any loss or damage suffered directly or indirectly by any party as a result of using or relying on the guidance information provided in this document.

CONTENTS

PREFACE	i
<i>Architectural competitions</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>Policy framework</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>Model Conditions</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>This document</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>Using the Guidelines</i>	<i>ii</i>
<i>Jurisdiction</i>	<i>ii</i>
<i>Disclaimer</i>	<i>ii</i>
CONTENTS	iii
1 Deciding to undertake a competition	1
1.1 <i>The competition as a procurement option</i>	<i>1</i>
1.2 <i>Why run an architectural competition?</i>	<i>1</i>
1.3 <i>Why not to run an architectural competition</i>	<i>1</i>
1.4 <i>When is a competition appropriate?</i>	<i>1</i>
1.5 <i>What are the key risks associated with a competition?</i>	<i>2</i>
2 Establishing the governance structure	3
2.1 <i>Governance of architectural competitions</i>	<i>3</i>
2.2 <i>What is the Client’s role?</i>	<i>3</i>
2.3 <i>If separate from the Client, what is the Sponsor’s role?</i>	<i>3</i>
2.4 <i>What is the role of the competition Organising Committee?</i>	<i>4</i>
3 Setting the Competition Budget	5
3.1 <i>The need for adequate funding</i>	<i>5</i>
3.2 <i>Who should be responsible for setting and managing the budget?</i>	<i>5</i>
3.3 <i>What are the key costs that need to be covered?</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Checklist A: Competition Budget</i>	<i>6</i>
4 Selecting/appointing the professional adviser	7
4.1 <i>Why have a professional adviser?</i>	<i>7</i>
4.2 <i>What attributes are required of a professional adviser?</i>	<i>7</i>
4.3 <i>What are the key roles of the Professional Adviser?</i>	<i>7</i>
4.4 <i>When should the Professional Adviser be appointed?</i>	<i>7</i>
4.5 <i>What remuneration should the Professional Adviser receive?</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Checklist B: Professional Advisor selection criteria</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Checklist C: Professional Advisor role and duties</i>	<i>9</i>
5 Determining the competition type	10
5.1 <i>Competition configuration</i>	<i>10</i>
5.2 <i>What is the purpose of the competition?</i>	<i>10</i>
5.3 <i>Who should be eligible to enter?</i>	<i>10</i>
5.4 <i>How many stages should there be?</i>	<i>11</i>
6 Establishing the competition timing	12
6.1 <i>The significance of timing</i>	<i>12</i>
6.2 <i>What are the key program milestones?</i>	<i>12</i>
6.3 <i>What is a reasonable contingency allowance in the program?</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Checklist D: Program preparation</i>	<i>13</i>

7	Determining competition prize money	14
7.1	<i>The significance of prize money</i>	14
7.2	<i>How many prizes should there be?</i>	14
7.3	<i>What should the value of prizes be?</i>	14
7.4	<i>When are participant fees or honoraria appropriate?</i>	15
7.5	<i>How and when should prize and other payments be made?</i>	15
7.6	<i>Should prize money be deemed part of the fee for the winner?</i>	15
8	Selecting/appointing other advisers	16
8.1	<i>The need for specialist advisers</i>	16
8.2	<i>When is a Probity Adviser required?</i>	16
8.3	<i>When is a cost consultant required?</i>	16
8.4	<i>Which other specialist technical advisers are required?</i>	16
8.5	<i>How do technical advisers or technical panels relate to the jury?</i>	17
9	Selecting/appointing the jury	18
9.1	<i>Quality of the jury</i>	18
9.2	<i>How many jury members should there be?</i>	18
9.3	<i>What factors need to be considered in juror selection?</i>	18
9.4	<i>How should the jury chair be appointed?</i>	18
9.5	<i>How should jury decisions be determined?</i>	18
9.6	<i>How should jury member remuneration be determined?</i>	19
9.7	<i>When are reserve jury members required?</i>	19
	<i>Checklist E: Jury selection</i>	20
10	Determining entry deliverables	21
10.1	<i>Limiting deliverables</i>	21
10.2	<i>What 'products' should entrants provide?</i>	21
10.3	<i>Should a fee proposal be part of the submission?</i>	21
11	Developing the competition conditions	23
11.1	<i>Purpose of competition conditions</i>	23
11.2	<i>What needs to be covered in the competition conditions?</i>	23
11.3	<i>What fundamental principles must be evident?</i>	23
11.4	<i>Is a suitable template available for the competition conditions?</i>	23
11.5	<i>What if the conditions need to change after publication?</i>	24
11.6	<i>How will non-compliant submissions be dealt with?</i>	24
11.7	<i>How should copyright and moral rights of entrants be treated?</i>	24
11.8	<i>Is formal legal review of Conditions necessary?</i>	24
	<i>Checklist F: Competition Conditions</i>	25
12	Developing the project brief	28
12.1	<i>Purpose of the project brief</i>	28
12.2	<i>What needs to be covered in the brief?</i>	28
12.3	<i>Are all brief requirements mandatory, or are some optional?</i>	28
13	Obtaining Institute endorsement	29
13.1	<i>The value of Institute endorsement</i>	29
13.2	<i>Is Institute endorsement necessary?</i>	29
13.3	<i>What are the key requirements for endorsement?</i>	29
13.4	<i>When should the Institute be approached about endorsement?</i>	30
13.5	<i>Can a competition be dis-endorsed?</i>	30
13.6	<i>How is the endorsement process managed?</i>	30
13.7	<i>Is endorsement by a government or other Institute sufficient?</i>	30

13.8	<i>How is Institute endorsement communicated?</i>	30
	<i>Checklist G: Institute endorsement</i>	31
14	Compiling the competition package	32
14.1	<i>Coordination of competition documents and processes</i>	32
14.2	<i>What are the key elements of competition information?</i>	32
14.3	<i>What are the essential qualities of competition information?</i>	32
14.4	<i>How should each element of the package be communicated?</i>	33
15	Announcing and promoting the competition	34
15.1	<i>Communicating with potential entrants</i>	34
15.2	<i>Is there a need to communicate with the broader profession?</i>	34
15.3	<i>When should a competition be promoted to the public?</i>	34
15.4	<i>How should the competition be announced?</i>	34
15.5	<i>What are the key stages in competition promotion?</i>	34
16	Managing the launch to submission period	36
16.1	<i>Importance of the pre-submission period</i>	36
16.2	<i>What are the tasks and obligations of the Professional Adviser?</i>	36
16.3	<i>How can entrants be most effective during this period?</i>	36
16.4	<i>What additional briefing will be provided to entrants?</i>	37
16.5	<i>How will questions from entrants be dealt with?</i>	37
16.6	<i>How should visiting the site be managed?</i>	37
17	Receiving and validating the entries	38
17.1	<i>Integrity of the submission procedure</i>	38
17.2	<i>Should entries be submitted electronically or in hard copy?</i>	38
17.3	<i>What flexibility can there be around the submission deadline?</i>	38
17.4	<i>What is the Professional Adviser's role in validating entries?</i>	39
17.5	<i>What is the role of technical advisers in checking entries?</i>	39
17.6	<i>What needs to happen before entries are presented to the jury?</i>	39
18	Judging the entries	41
18.1	<i>Integrity of the judging process</i>	41
18.2	<i>How and by whom should the evaluation criteria be established?</i>	41
18.3	<i>What process should the jury follow?</i>	41
18.4	<i>What involvement does the Professional Adviser have in judging?</i>	42
18.5	<i>What happens if a juror is unavailable?</i>	42
18.6	<i>Is the jury's preferred concept necessarily the winner?</i>	42
18.7	<i>What can be negotiated with the jury?</i>	43
19	Announcing the winner(s)	44
19.1	<i>Maximising exposure of the winning entry(ies)</i>	44
19.2	<i>What is the best way to announce the winner(s)?</i>	44
19.3	<i>What needs to be in place before the announcement?</i>	44
19.4	<i>Is there a preferred order for informing people of the outcome?</i>	44
20	Publishing or exhibiting competition entries	46
20.1	<i>Public exposure of all or selected entries</i>	46
20.2	<i>How should entries be published or exhibited?</i>	46
20.3	<i>Which entries should be included?</i>	46
20.4	<i>Can entries be published before the winner is announced?</i>	46
21	Publishing the jury report	48
21.1	<i>The objective of the jury report</i>	48

21.2	<i>How should the jury report be published?</i>	48
21.3	<i>When should the jury report be published?</i>	48
21.4	<i>What should be in the jury report?</i>	48
21.5	<i>Who is responsible for preparing the jury report?</i>	49
21.6	<i>Who should be able to access or read the jury report?</i>	49
22	Commissioning the winner	50
22.1	<i>Appointing the winner in project competitions</i>	50
22.2	<i>What should happen regarding engagement before announcing the winner?</i>	50
22.3	<i>What needs to happen if someone other than the winner is engaged?</i>	50
23	Wrapping up the competition	52
23.1	<i>The need for a positive conclusion</i>	52
23.2	<i>What still needs to be done after the winner is announced?</i>	52
	Appendix A: Definitions	53

1 DECIDING TO UNDERTAKE A COMPETITION

Policy reference if applicable

1.1 The competition as a procurement option

The procurement of professional services for the design and construction of built environments is increasingly complex. The roles and responsibilities of all key players are continuously changing.

1.2 Complex environment

1.3 Value of design

At the same time, society is increasingly recognising and responding to the intrinsic, long-term value of design.

An architectural competition can generate a wide range of innovative design solutions. But it won't always be the best procurement option. Other options to be considered include:

- direct appointment of the architect and/or design team (based on reputation or recommendation);
- competitive selection of the architect and/or design team (based on experience and credentials – referred to as 'qualification-based selection, or QBS); or
- competitive selection of the entire project delivery team, including the architect (either qualification-based or tender-based).

1.2 Why run an architectural competition?

2.1 Advantages

Compared to other options, an architectural competition may:

- generate a greater number and range of design ideas;
- identify a more diverse range of potential architects;
- develop public interest;
- build Client consensus on design direction and design team; and
- create greater public exposure of the project or Client.

1.3 Why not to run an architectural competition

2.2 Disadvantages

On the other hand, an architectural competition may:

- limit exposure of the design team to the Client, users or stakeholders;
- restrict opportunities for value management and budget control;
- result in a large number of architects spending significant amounts of unpaid time; and
- severely limit the time frame for addressing complex brief requirements.

1.4 When is a competition appropriate?

2.3 Appropriate context

A competition should generally be considered when:

- the project is of public significance; and
- a wide degree of design investigation is needed; or
- the site is significant or unusual; and
- it will generate and benefit from heightened public interest; or
- it will promote a high level of design excellence.

1.5 What are the key risks associated with a competition?

The outcome of an architectural competition can be substantially at risk when: [2.4 Inappropriate context](#)

- inadequate time is available to plan, organise, manage and judge it;
- the time allowed for entrants to undertake the necessary design work is insufficient;
- the jury is not appropriately qualified;
- the competition budget is insufficient;
- there is doubt about the project proceeding;
- a sound and well-developed brief is not available;
- the brief is inconsistent with development controls for the site;
- inadequate prizes are offered;
- a professional adviser is not appointed; or
- the competition Conditions are not comprehensive, fair and equitable.

When an architectural competition is poorly managed or in some way goes wrong, it can expose the Client, Sponsor, Organising Committee and Advisers to significant risks including: [5.8 Risks](#)

- financial losses;
- exposure to litigation;
- disputation over competition processes or outcomes;
- low number or quality of entrants;
- compromised approval processes by regulatory authorities; and
- reputational damage for all parties.

All those involved in organising or managing an architectural competition should thus ensure that they have:

- undertaken a thorough risk assessment of the competition;
- implemented an effective risk management process, including appropriate mitigation strategies;
- clearly defined the roles and responsibilities of all key members of the competition management team; and
- obtained legal advice in relation to all formal competition documents.

2 ESTABLISHING THE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

Policy reference if applicable

2.1 Governance of architectural competitions

Governance of an architectural competition is a team effort, involving:

- the project Client;
- a Sponsor, who may be the Client or separately appointed by the Client;
- a Professional Adviser,
- a Probity Adviser, where appointed, usually for larger or more complex competitions; and
- an Organising Committee, comprising all or some of the above, and possibly other appropriate members.

The governance team is responsible for ensuring that:

- everyone involved in the competition meets all their obligations;
- all resources required for conduct of the competition are available, including financial resources;
- decisions made regarding the competition are fully informed and cognisant of relevant risks;
- issues or problems are promptly identified and appropriately resolved; and
- all participants are treated fairly and equitably.

2.2 What is the Client's role?

4.3 Client

The Client for an architectural competition is responsible for:

- ensuring the Sponsor, where not the Client, has all necessary authority to conduct the competition and to make all required decisions and payments to competition participants;
- ensuring the Professional Adviser or Probity Adviser is made aware of any actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest;
- ensuring impartiality of the jury;
- accepting the decision of the jury as final; and
- engaging the winning entrant in a project competition as architect on the basis specified in the competition conditions.

In order to preserve the integrity of the competition, the Client should not be involved in its day to day conduct, other than as a member of the Organising Committee. By staying at arm's length, the Client helps ensure that entrants perceive the competition as fair, and that they thus feel motivated to devote substantial effort to their entry.

If the Client wishes to be more directly involved, it is likely that an alternative procurement method (such as QBS) would be appropriate.

2.3 If separate from the Client, what is the Sponsor's role?

4.2 Sponsor

The Sponsor of an architectural competition is responsible for:

- making or endorsing all significant decisions and determinations in relation to the overall governance of the competition;
- ensuring that all competition participants (entrants, advisers, jury members) are paid all agreed prize money, honoraria or fees, or

awarded any commission within the time and on the basis prescribed in the conditions;

- ensuring that all advisers and jury members comply with the competition conditions;
- ensuring that effective provisions are in place to preserve anonymity and confidentiality, where these are conditions of the competition;
- ensuring that moral rights and copyright of entrants are protected;
- ensuring the Professional Adviser or Probity Adviser is made aware of any actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest;
- ensuring and not in any way compromising impartiality of the jury; and
- accepting the decision of the jury as final.

The Sponsor is the ultimate authority for the competition, and all others involved in its management and governance are effectively delegates of the Sponsor.

2.4 What is the role of the competition Organising Committee?

The Organising Committee is responsible for:

- general oversight of the conduct of the competition;
- reviewing and endorsing the details contained in all formal competition documents before they are released publicly, and
- providing relevant advice to, and endorsing decisions of, the Sponsor and Professional Adviser when requested to do so.

The Organising Committee operates like a board or executive committee, overseeing the management of the competition, without getting unnecessarily involved in detailed operational matters.

It is responsible, however, for ensuring effective communication between the key players and for quality control of all aspects of competition management that could expose the Client or Sponsor to legal or financial risk.

3 SETTING THE COMPETITION BUDGET

Policy reference if applicable

3.1 The need for adequate funding

5.9 Costs

Some Clients may consider an architectural competition to be a low-cost option for procuring architectural and related services. Depending on all the circumstances of the project, this may occasionally, but is usually not, the case.

In reality, conducting an architectural competition is a substantial undertaking, with all the advantages and challenges set out in **section 1**. There can be many additional costs that are not attributable to other procurement options.

Before making an absolute commitment to proceed with a competition, the Client and Sponsor should consult with the prospective Professional Adviser to ensure that they have properly allowed for all reasonably anticipated costs.

If sufficient funds are not available, many of the risks set out in **section 1.5** can become much more likely to arise.

3.2 Who should be responsible for setting and managing the budget?

Setting the competition budget is a key responsibility of the Sponsor, in consultation with the Professional Adviser.

Managing costs against the budget is usually the responsibility of the Professional Adviser.

The Organising Committee is responsible for approving the initial budget, monitoring performance against it and authorising any required changes in budget allowances.

3.3 What are the key costs that need to be covered?

In addition to all other project costs and consultants fees, there must be an adequate allowance for the cost of planning and running the competition, including:

- Sponsor direct and indirect costs, including staff and travel costs;
- fees for all Advisers, including expenses and administrative support costs;
- jury and technical panel fees, honoraria and expenses, and all costs associated with meetings of the jury;
- costs of acquiring and documenting relevant site information, including site survey, geotechnical and topographical surveys, archaeological and heritage reports, zoning information, planning reports and a site model, as appropriate;
- exhibition costs, whether physical or online;
- media, public relations and publications costs (including preparation and graphic design for the Competition Brief and Conditions); and before, during and after the competition; and
- prize and honoraria costs.

Checklist A: Competition Budget

Client, Sponsor and Organising Committee

- personnel time
- travel, accommodation and meals
- administration and clerical support

Professional Adviser, Probity Adviser and other Advisers

- professional fees (fixed or time-based)
 - Professional Adviser
 - Probity Adviser
 - Technical Advisers
 - Cost consultant
 - Legal consultant
- expenses:
 - travel, accommodation and meals
 - clerical and administration assistance
 - communications

Jury

- juror fees or honoraria
- juror expenses:
 - travel, accommodation and meals
 - clerical and administration assistance
- communications
- jury meetings:
 - venue costs and catering
 - audio-visual and communications

Site information and brief

- consultants fees (land surveyor, specialist consultants for cost, planning, heritage, archaeology, etc)
- site model (physical or digital)
- brief preparation

Entry submissions

- submission receiving, collation and storage (physical or online)
- jury viewing arrangements (venue or online)
- submission return (where provided)

Promotions, exhibitions and publications

- exhibition venue and display system
- transport and storage
- graphic design, printing and website (if applicable)
- advertising, promotion and public relations
- media package
- administration and clerical support

Entrant prizes and fees

- prize money
- honoraria

4 SELECTING/APPOINTING THE PROFESSIONAL ADVISER

Policy reference if applicable

4.1 Why have a professional adviser?

4.4 Professional Adviser

Like any organisational exercise, an architectural competition needs an appropriately qualified and experienced person to assume day to day operational responsibility. The Professional Adviser is effectively the Chief Operating Officer for the competition.

Unlike most other types of organisation however, the Professional Adviser must be independent of the key stakeholders (Client/Sponsor and entrants) in order to preserve the integrity of the competition.

Appointing a suitable Professional Adviser represents good practice in competition management. It is also a mandatory requirement of the Australian Institute of Architects' *Architectural Competitions Policy*.

4.2 What attributes are required of a professional adviser?

4.4 Professional Adviser

A Professional Adviser must be an architect, or an architectural academic, critic or commentator who has:

- formal education or training in architecture or design; and
- a thorough understanding of and commitment to comply with the Institute's Architectural Competitions Policy; and
- a high level of familiarity with these Guidelines.

In addition, the Professional Adviser should have experience in the conduct of architectural competitions and a skill set attuned to the needs of the role (refer **Checklist B**).

4.3 What are the key roles of the Professional Adviser?

The Professional Adviser will generally be responsible for all key operational aspects of the planning and running of the competition, as set out in **Checklist C**.

4.4 When should the Professional Adviser be appointed?

The Professional Adviser should be appointed as early as possible, ideally before there is a firm commitment to proceed with the competition, and before any other adviser or jury appointments are made.

This enables the Professional Adviser to advise the Client and Sponsor about a range of matters that need to be determined or resolved before any public announcement of the competition (eg. the budget, jury composition, type of competition, number of stages, etc.)

4.5 What remuneration should the Professional Adviser receive?

Fees for the Professional Adviser can be time-based or, where the scope of the role is reasonably clearly defined, fixed. In either case, the total fee should fairly reflect the overall time commitment envisaged.

The rate per hour should be aligned with a typical current charge-out rate for a senior, experienced architect.

Checklist B: Professional Advisor selection criteria

<input type="checkbox"/>	Architect, or architectural academic, critic or commentator
<input type="checkbox"/>	Formal education or training in architecture or design
<input type="checkbox"/>	Understanding of and commitment to Institute's Policy
<input type="checkbox"/>	Familiarity with Institute's Guidelines
<input type="checkbox"/>	Respected within the architectural profession
<input type="checkbox"/>	Past exposure to architectural competitions
<input type="checkbox"/>	Clear awareness and understanding of the competition objectives
<input type="checkbox"/>	Technical understanding of the proposed competition process
<input type="checkbox"/>	Commitment to the value of the project itself
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sensitivity to the Client's objectives, approach, and situation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Capacity to reflect Sponsor intent in the competition process
<input type="checkbox"/>	Familiarity with group or committee clients
<input type="checkbox"/>	Availability throughout the competition period and at milestones
<input type="checkbox"/>	Ability to write precisely and concisely
<input type="checkbox"/>	Competence with operational management
<input type="checkbox"/>	Personal acumen, integrity and fairness
<input type="checkbox"/>	Acceptable remuneration proposal

Checklist C: Professional Advisor role and duties

The Professional Advisor will generally be responsible for:

- Acting as delegate of the Sponsor in planning and coordinating the competition and making all necessary operational decisions
- Coordinating the development of the project brief and competition conditions
- Coordinating the process of seeking Institute endorsement
- Coordinating the jury selection and judging process
- Ensuring that everyone involved with the competition complies with the competition conditions
- Preserving anonymity and confidentiality, in accordance with the competition conditions
- Arranging venues for storage, judging and exhibitions
- Verifying the compliance of entries with the competition conditions
- Disqualifying (in consultation with the Probity Adviser, where applicable) any entry that does not fully comply, except as provided in the conditions
- Coordinating entrants' opportunity to ask questions and receive answers to all questions asked by all entrants
- Taking appropriate action in relation to any actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest
- Ensuring impartiality of the jury process and each jury member
- Arranging for exhibition and publication of entries/winners

5 DETERMINING THE COMPETITION TYPE

Policy reference if applicable

5.1 Competition configuration

Generally, an architectural competition should be configured to determine, as quickly as reasonably possible, a small number of appropriately qualified entrants. This ensures that the amount of unproductive work required of many architects is kept to a minimum. It also means that the short-listed entrants can reasonably be expected to give detailed consideration to the design challenge.

The key exceptions to this principle are where the competition is of national significance, or where it is primarily aimed at generating a large number of diverse design ideas.

5.2 What is the purpose of the competition?

3.1 Competition purpose

The purpose of an architectural competition generally falls into one of two categories:

- *ideas competitions*: used primarily to explore design issues or opportunities, where there is no expectation that the winner will be commissioned as project architect; and
- *project competitions*: which aim to select the architect who produces the best response to a defined brief and which lead to the winner being commissioned as architect for the project.

Any other purpose, especially one that has no benefit to the public or the profession, is unlikely to be well regarded by prospective entrants and is also unlikely to achieve Institute endorsement.

5.3 Who should be eligible to enter?

For a design competition to be considered an *architectural competition*, entrants should be any or all of the following:

4.1 Entrants

- *Architects*: registered, or eligible for registration, in the state or territory where the project site is located;
- *Graduates*: of a university architecture course recognised for the purpose of registration as an architect in Australia;
- *Students*: currently enrolled in a university architecture course; and
- *Teams*: comprising multi-disciplinary professionals, led or coordinated by an architect.

Taking account of the above, architectural competitions can be configured to limit entrant eligibility to varying degrees:

3.2 Competition eligibility

- *open competitions*: limit eligibility of entrants only to a very broad cohort (e.g. architects, design professionals, students, etc.);
- *limited (open) competitions*: limit eligibility to a defined section of a specific cohort (e.g. architects with particular experience, etc.);
- *limited (select) competitions*: limit eligibility to a specific cohort but entrants are selected from that cohort by the Sponsor, based on qualifications, or an initial, broad design concept; and
- *select competitions*: limit eligibility to a small group of entrants selected directly by the Sponsor.

5.4 How many stages should there be?

3.3 Competition staging

Competitions will generally comprise one, two or three stages:

- *Expression of Interest (EOI) Stage*: Entrants submit details of relevant qualifications, background and experience only. No design proposals or fee proposals are provided at this stage;
- *Initial Concept Stage*: Entrants prepare an initial concept design, at a broad level, for assessment by the jury, which determines a short list for progression to the next stage;
- *Final Concept Stage*: Entrants at this stage prepare a final concept design for assessment by the jury, which determines the winner.

A single-stage competition involves only the Final Concept Stage.

A two-stage competition can include either the EOI Stage or the Initial Concept Stage followed by the Final Concept Stage.

A three-stage competition would involve all three stages.

The decision on how many and which stages to include is a matter for agreement between the Sponsor and the Professional Adviser. Generally, the more detailed the final required design response, the more stages there should be, to ensure that entrants are not put to unnecessary work if their basic concept isn't preferred by the jury.

6 ESTABLISHING THE COMPETITION TIMING

Policy reference if applicable

6.1 The significance of timing

5.1 Planning the Competition

Failure to allow sufficient time for planning and implementation is one of the most common mistakes made in the conduct of architectural competitions. Invariably where this occurs and the completion date is fixed, the time available for entrants to prepare their submissions can be unrealistically curtailed. Both entrants and the competition organisers suffer as a result.

It is thus imperative for the Client, Sponsor and Professional Adviser to agree on a workable program from the very beginning, including a reasonable allowance for contingencies.

6.2 What are the key program milestones?

Key milestones in an architectural competition are (in order):

- appointment of the Professional Adviser;
- agreement on the competition configuration (purpose, eligibility, and stages);
- completion of a detailed, effective and realistic program for the entire competition;
- appointment of Organising Committee, other advisers and jury;
- compilation and review of competition documents (brief, conditions, site information);
- establishment of website, if applicable;
- launch of the competition, publication of competition documents and promotion to potential entrants;
- conclusion of registration period (if any);
- deadline for first stage submissions;
- review and evaluation of first stage submissions, and invitation to next stage (if applicable);
- deadline for second stage submissions (if applicable);
- review and evaluation of second stage submissions, and invitation to next stage (if applicable);
- deadline for final stage submissions;
- review and evaluation of final stage submissions;
- public announcement of winner(s);
- public exhibition or publication of entries;
- establishment and mobilisation of the project team for the commission arising from the competition.

6.3 What is a reasonable contingency allowance in the program?

More often than not, pre-competition planning and post-competition negotiations and promotion take longer than originally envisaged. A prudent Professional Adviser will therefore generally recommend a contingency allowance of 10-20% of the overall program period (ie. 3-6 weeks for a 6 month competition duration).

Checklist D: Program preparation

- Decision to undertake a competition
- Establish the governance structure
- Select/appoint the Professional Adviser
- Determine the competition type
- Establish the competition timing
- Determine competition prize money
- Select/appoint Probity/Technical Advisers
- Select/appoint the jury members
- Determine entry deliverables
- Develop the competition conditions
- Develop the project brief
- Obtain Australian Institute of Architects endorsement
- Promote the competition
- Launch the competition (Stage 1: EOI, if applicable)
 - Manage the launch to submission period
 - Receive and validate EOI submissions
 - Evaluate the EOI submissions
 - Select entrants to proceed to next stage
- Launch next stage (Stage 2: Initial Concept, if applicable)
 - Manage the entry preparation period
 - Manage the Q&A period
 - Receive and validate submissions
 - Judge/evaluate the entry submissions
 - Determine the short-list to proceed to next stage
- Make all required payments to entrants, advisers and jury members
- Launch the competition (Stage 3: Final Concept)
 - Manage the launch to submission period
 - Manage Q&A period
 - Receive and validate submissions
 - Judge/evaluate the entry submissions
 - Determine the winner(s)
- Announce the winner(s)
- Make all required payments to entrants, advisers and jury members
- Publish and/or exhibit competition entries
- Commission the winner (project competition)
- Wrap up the competition

7 DETERMINING COMPETITION PRIZE MONEY

Policy reference if applicable

7.1 The significance of prize money

5.6 Prize Money & Honoraria

While there are a number of non-financial benefits for architects who participate in competitions (recognition, creative exploration, talent development, etc.) prize money also has a significant impact on the quality of competition outcomes.

In particular, where prize money and other entrant payments are appropriate, entrants in an architectural competition will generally:

- be more inclined to enter the competition in the first place;
- be prepared to expend considerably greater time and cost in preparing their entry;
- be more highly motivated to undertake relevant background research;
- perceive the risk of participation as more justifiable;
- be more likely to include experienced and senior personnel in their team; and
- strive more aggressively to achieve an innovative design solution.

As competition prize money will ultimately represent only a very small percentage of the total project cost, competition Sponsors can contribute significantly to the ultimate quality of the project outcome by ensuring they get this aspect right.

7.2 How many prizes should there be?

At least one and preferably no more than three prizes should be awarded.

Awarding only a single winner can increase the perception of risk by prospective entrants, and thus may reduce the number and quality of entrants.

Awarding more than three prizes can devalue the sense of achievement associated with being one of the premiated entries. It also results in each successful entry receiving a smaller share of the prize pool, and thus creates a potentially unsatisfying outcome for all those awarded prizes.

7.3 What should the value of prizes be?

There is no simple formula for the value of prize-money. The total value of prizes will depend on:

- the nature and size of the project;
- the type of competition and the number of stages;
- the anticipated number of entrants;
- the amount of work required by entrants;
- the likely costs of preparing a compliant submission; and
- the basis of any post-competition commission.

Entrants should be able to expect that, if they win, they will recover all the costs of entry preparation plus a premium as reward for winning.

If they are placed second or third, they will expect to recover at least 50% of the cost of entry preparation.

Unplaced entrants will generally accept the cost risk of participation, provided they are not expected to undertake unreasonable amounts of work.

7.4 When are participant fees or honoraria appropriate?

Where the competition configuration requires more detailed design work from entrants, those entrants should be paid a participation fee or honorarium, in addition to any prize money and any fees associated with a post-competition commission.

This will typically apply to all entrants:

- in a select competition;
- in a limited (select) competition; or
- in the final stage of a multi-stage competition.

The value of the participation fee or honorarium will vary on similar criteria to those that apply to prize money, but should be a reasonable reflection of the entrant's cost of preparing a submission.

7.5 How and when should prize and other payments be made?

Payments to all awarded entrants and any honoraria or other payments for participating in an architectural competition should generally be made within 30 days of the announcement of the winner or of any shortlist for a subsequent stage.

Where this is not considered achievable for the Sponsor, the proposed payment timing must be clearly set out in the competition conditions.

Payment of prize-money and honoraria to the winner should also be made within the stipulated time, regardless of whether the amounts payable are to be off-set in any way against later professional fees.

7.6 Should prize money be deemed part of the fee for the winner?

Competition payments and prize-money should be separate from any professional fees payable as part of the subsequent commission that arises for the competition winner.

The idea that the competition process and outcome somehow gives the commissioned architect a 'head-start' is a common misconception among Sponsors. In reality, much of the work done by the winner during the competition will have to be redone or revalidated and the brief will also need to be substantially revisited.

Often, the winning concept is developed without substantial user input; thus detailed consultation with users is still required and may result in further refinement or change to the brief.

Where prize money for the winning entrant is intended to form part of the fees for the subsequent commission, the prize money must still be paid within 30 days of the announcement of the winner and regardless of whether the project is to proceed immediately or not.

8 SELECTING/APPOINTING OTHER ADVISERS

Policy reference if applicable

8.1 The need for specialist advisers

The Client, Sponsor, Professional Adviser and jury will possess much of the knowledge required to fully inform the competition process and the evaluation of entries. However, in some instances, more substantial or specific expertise may be required in relation to:

- conduct of the competition, especially where more stringent than usual legal, financial or prudential obligations apply (as may be the case with government projects, for example); or
- evaluation of submitted design concepts, where the brief, site or construction methodology involve specialist technical requirements or elements that are unusual, novel or experimental; or
- validation or evaluation of compliance aspects of submitted entries, where there are special or stringent planning, heritage, urban design or other regulatory requirements.

8.2 When is a Probity Adviser required?

4.5 Probity Adviser

A Probity Adviser won't be needed for most standard architectural competitions. The Professional Adviser can usually ensure that the competition is fair, equitable and conducted with integrity.

However, appointment of a Probity Adviser should be considered where the competition or the project is:

- subject to public accountability (such as government projects); or
- of exceptionally high value; or
- subject to complex legal or contractual provisions; or
- highly complex, unusual or contentious; or
- especially sensitive politically.

8.3 When is a cost consultant required?

Estimating the cost of each proposed design solution is important to ensure that the concepts submitted are achievable within the project budget and that they can thus be compared on an equal basis.

Commonly the entrant team will include a cost consultant and, provided they are reputable, the entrant's assessment of likely project cost can be relied upon.

However, where a competition meets any of the criteria in **section 8.2** requiring a Probity Advisor, it may also be desirable for the Sponsor to appoint an independent cost consultant to prepare, review or validate cost estimates for each entry.

8.4 Which other specialist technical advisers are required?

The number and expertise of other specialist technical advisers required will depend entirely on the nature of the project and the level of detail required in the entry submissions.

4.7 Technical Advisers or Panels

However, even though numerous specific sub-consultants may ultimately be required as part of the project design team, it will rarely be necessary to involve all but the most essential in evaluating competition entries.

8.5 How do technical advisers or technical panels relate to the jury?

Specialist technical advisers are generally appointed where particular aspects of the brief or submitted design concepts may require expertise beyond the scope or skills of the jury.

Similarly, a technical panel, which is commonly drawn from the professional staff of the Client organisation, can be established to overcome the need for Client subject matter experts to be part of the jury.

In both instances, technical advisers or panels should remain at arm's length from the jury, and their roles should be limited to:

- assisting the Professional Adviser with technical responses to entrant's questions about the brief or site; and
- validating that entrants have provided substantiating technical information in a form and to a level prescribed by the competition conditions; or
- confirming that entries meet any required technical or budget benchmarks and identifying elements that fail to meet such benchmarks; or
- evaluating technical elements of entries and providing the jury with an evaluation report, which may or may not include some kind of rating, ranking or score.

In all cases, the jury will take account of technical adviser or panel evaluations and comments as they deem appropriate. The impact of such advice on the jury's deliberations will be set out in the final jury report.

9 SELECTING/APPOINTING THE JURY

Policy reference if applicable

9.1 Quality of the jury

Engaging an expert jury adds integrity to the competition process. It can also offer the Sponsor a level of architectural review and commentary that is not generally available where the project architect is commissioned directly.

Using an architectural competition to determine who will be the project architect signals the Sponsor's view that the ultimate design solution will benefit from exploration by many professionals. It follows that choosing the best concept should be the task of relevant design experts.

Preparedness to enter an architectural competition will be determined, at least in part, by how confident the prospective entrant is in the ability of the jury to evaluate their work knowledgeably, fairly and equitably. The quantity and quality of entries will thus be strongly related to the perceived quality of the jury members.

9.2 How many jury members should there be?

4.6 The Jury

The jury should comprise the smallest reasonable number of members and will preferably be an odd number not less than three and not exceeding seven.

The precise number will depend on a range of factors, but is likely to be correlated with the size and complexity of the project.

9.3 What factors need to be considered in juror selection?

4.6 The Jury

The jury for an architectural competition should comprise members who are:

- predominantly architects, or other relevant design professionals (depending on the nature of the project), one of whom should be an architect;
- generally experienced in the type, size and nature of the project;
- diverse in terms of gender, age, geographic location and specific professional expertise and experience; and
- predominantly independent of the Client or Sponsor.

More detailed criteria for selection of jury members is set out at the end of this section in **Checklist E**.

9.4 How should the jury chair be appointed?

The jury chair will normally be appointed by the Sponsor, in consultation with the Professional Adviser. In some circumstances, where the Sponsor agrees, the jury may determine its own chair. However, the chair must always be independent of the Sponsor or Client.

9.5 How should jury decisions be determined?

It is almost always preferable for decisions of the jury to be by consensus. However, where consensus can't be achieved, it can be necessary to rely on a majority vote.

Jury deliberations will generally begin with the progressive elimination of less favoured submissions, but as the evaluation process nears its conclusion, more detailed consideration of the merits and deficits of each submission will usually be necessary.

It is important, particularly in the latter part of the jury's deliberations, that simplistic scoring or voting approaches are avoided, as debate and discussion about the pros and cons of each entry is itself an important part of the process, and necessary in formulating the jury report.

9.6 How should jury member remuneration be determined?

Jury members should receive a reasonable fee or honorarium to cover their commitment of time and effort to the competition. As a guide, the amount of remuneration should be commensurate with the typical charge-out rate for the majority of jury members.

In addition, all expenses reasonably incurred by jury members in relation to the competition, including travel, accommodation and related costs, should be paid or reimbursed by the Sponsor.

9.7 When are reserve jury members required?

4.6 The Jury

It can be prudent to appoint one or more reserve jury members to cover the potential absence of a member of the jury, especially where the competition is:

- of particularly high value;
- unusually significant, complex or sensitive; or
- likely to extend over a long time period.

Appointing a reserve jury member can also be wise where one or more of the jury members indicates, at the outset, the possibility of becoming unavailable due to health, professional commitments or any other reason.

Checklist E: Jury selection

<input type="checkbox"/>	Architect, or other relevant design professional
<input type="checkbox"/>	Formal education or training in architecture or design
<input type="checkbox"/>	No undeclared conflicts of interest
<input type="checkbox"/>	Respected by the architectural profession
<input type="checkbox"/>	Some jury members with previous experience in relation to architectural competitions
<input type="checkbox"/>	Clear awareness and understanding of the competition objectives
<input type="checkbox"/>	Commitment to the proposed competition process
<input type="checkbox"/>	Commitment to the value of the project itself
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sensitivity to the Client's objectives, approach and situation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Clear thinking and able to debate in a respectful manner
<input type="checkbox"/>	Commitment to achieving consensus with other jury members
<input type="checkbox"/>	Some jury members with experience relevant to the project type
<input type="checkbox"/>	Commitment to limiting evaluation to stated criteria and the brief
<input type="checkbox"/>	Availability for jury deliberations
<input type="checkbox"/>	Ability to write precisely and concisely
<input type="checkbox"/>	Commitment to maintain anonymity and confidentiality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Agreeable to having no unreported contact with any entrant
<input type="checkbox"/>	Personal integrity and fairness
<input type="checkbox"/>	Comfort with the proposed remuneration of jury members

10 DETERMINING ENTRY DELIVERABLES

Policy reference if applicable

10.1 Limiting deliverables

In the interests of fairness and equity, submission requirements should be kept to the minimum reasonable level, except where entrants are to be appropriately compensated for providing more detailed information.

Submissions need only be sufficient to allow jury evaluation of design intent and should not require detail that is unnecessary or excessively costly or time-consuming to produce.

It is highly likely that excessive deliverable requirements will deter many potentially good entrants from participating, and ultimately result in fewer and lower quality entries.

10.2 What 'products' should entrants provide?

3.4 Competition deliverables

In open competitions, ideas competitions and single-stage competitions, the jury should be able to evaluate concepts and determine the competition outcome based on:

- drawings and diagrams sufficient to explain the concept; and
- a short explanatory statement.

With select competitions and multi-stage competitions, more detailed information may be appropriate, such as:

- developed drawings, diagrams and visualisations to illustrate the design concept;
- written presentation of the concept;
- physical or digital model;
- cost estimate;
- program; and
- compliance statements.

10.3 Should a fee proposal be part of the submission?

3.5 Fee proposals

Institute policy requires that the winner of a project competition should be commissioned as the architect for the project. This in turn requires that, at some point, the Client and the winner will need to agree on a fee basis for the appointment, in line with the draft Conditions of Engagement included in the Appendix of the Competition Conditions.

In general terms, agreement on fees and services can be achieved by:

- the Client stipulating what the fee, or acceptable fee range, will be, as part of the competition conditions (based on expert advice about current industry standards);
- all entrants in the Final Concept stage including a fee proposal as part of their submission; or
- the Client and winner negotiating fees, together with mutually agreed adjustments to the draft Conditions of Engagement, after announcement of the winner.

Where a fee proposal is required as part of the submission for the Final Concept stage of a competition, each entrant's fee submission should be lodged in a separate envelope identified only by the entrant's registration number.

Once the preferred concept is determined by the jury, that entrant's fee submission can then be opened, and:

- accepted, if it falls within the reasonable pre-determined fee range;
or
- negotiated with the author of the preferred design if it is not within the pre-determined range.

If fee negotiations with the preferred entrant are unable to deliver an agreed outcome, the above process can be repeated with the author of the second preferred concept. If successful, that entrant may then be declared the winner.

11 DEVELOPING THE COMPETITION CONDITIONS

Policy reference if applicable

11.1 Purpose of competition conditions

5.3 Competition conditions

The competition conditions effectively represent the contractual agreement between the organisers of a competition and the participants in it. They spell out the context within which the competition is being conducted, the rules of participation and the obligations of each of the key players. The conditions also detail instructions to participants to ensure that they are readily able to follow the required processes for entering the competition and submitting a compliant entry.

11.2 What needs to be covered in the competition conditions?

The competition conditions should set out:

- the basic purpose and objectives of the project and the competition;
- details of the organisers and governance arrangements;
- provisions for ensuring the integrity and fairness of the competition;
- specific instructions for registering and entering;
- the overall competition timetable and number of stages;
- instructions for entry preparation and submission at each stage;
- details of the jury and judging processes;
- details of prizes and other payments to entrants;
- provisions for use of entries for promotion and publicity;
- the basis for engaging the winner as project architect, where applicable;
- relevant general legal provisions; and
- any other necessary supplementary information.

11.3 What fundamental principles must be evident?

5.5 Good practice principles

The conditions for any effective architectural competition in Australia should reflect the following good practice principles:

- the competition should be fully aligned with the *Architectural Competitions Policy* of the Australian Institute of Architects;
- all competition entrants should be treated equitably;
- all entries in open competitions should be anonymous;
- the author of the winning design in any project competition should be engaged as the project architect; and
- a majority of competition entrants should be Australian-based.

11.4 Is a suitable template available for the competition conditions?

In addition to these Guidelines, the Institute has published a separate document: *Model Conditions for an Architectural Competition*.

The Model Conditions provide a suitable base document for adaptation for most architectural competitions conducted in Australia. The document is comprehensive and designed to suit a medium-scale competition. It can readily be edited to suit much smaller competitions or expanded for larger competitions.

11.5 What if the conditions need to change after publication?

Competition organisers should aim to publish the condition, covering all stages, once only, at the launch of the first stage of the competition. The document should be thoroughly reviewed and checked with this in mind.

There will inevitably be occasions however, when an error is discovered or an entrant raises an issue that requires a change to the conditions.

Where this occurs, the Professional Adviser should promptly notify all entrants (and where the competition is endorsed, the Institute) of any material change in the conditions, or to key dates, the project brief, or any change in the key participants, including jurors. The notification must spell out precisely what the change is and why it is necessary, and the amended conditions should be reissued to all entrants.

11.6 How will non-compliant submissions be dealt with?

The competition conditions need to clearly state what will happen in the event of a breach, in relation to:

- submissions that do not comply in all respects with requirements of the competition conditions; or
- concept design proposals that do not meet all mandatory requirements of the competition brief.

It should be clear who is responsible for making determinations about breaches of the conditions (usually the Professional Adviser) and whether any sanction, including disqualification, is mandatory or discretionary.

11.7 How should copyright and moral rights of entrants be treated?

5.7 Copyright and Moral Rights

In most circumstances, prospective entrants will not be prepared to enter a competition unless they are confident their intellectual property rights will be protected. Unfortunately there have been competitions organised by unscrupulous Sponsors where entrants' copyright or moral rights have been disregarded.

As a result, the conditions must be very clear that copyright is retained by each entrant and that their moral rights (including attribution and no derogatory treatment) will be fully respected.

It is reasonable however, for organisers to seek the consent of entrants, through appropriate provisions in the conditions, to use the material submitted in entries for the purposes of the competition, provided each use is appropriately attributed to the entrant.

11.8 Is formal legal review of Conditions necessary?

The consequences and costs of disputation or litigation arising from a dispute over competition conditions can be substantial, and often out of all proportion to the budget for the competition.

It is thus imperative that formal legal advice is sought before the public dissemination of the conditions, to minimise legal and financial risks associated with them. This applies however the conditions are prepared, including where they are based on the Institute's *Model Conditions for an Architectural Competition*.

Checklist F: Competition Conditions

Overview

- Project objective
- Invitation
- Competition purpose
- Competition eligibility
- Competition staging
- Endorsement by Australian Institute of Architects

Competition Governance

- Client
- Sponsor
- Organising Committee
- Professional Adviser
- Probity Adviser
- Contact information

Competition integrity

- Equity of treatment and access
- Authorised and unauthorised communications
- Lobbying or seeking assistance
- Anti-competitive behaviour
- Anonymity and confidentiality
- Complaints procedure

Entry Requirements

- Entrant eligibility and ineligibility
- Entrant obligations
- Registration
- Withdrawal of an entry
- Non-compliant entries and disqualification
- Entrant anonymity
- Entrant declaration
- Retention of entries

Competition Timetable

- Registration
 - Stage A: Expression of Interest
 - Stage B: Initial Concept
 - Stage C: Final Concept
-

Stage A: Expression of Interest (if applicable)

- Outline brief and site information – Stage A
- Deliverables – Stage A
- Procedure – Stage A
- Submission requirements – Stage A
- Other specific requirements – Stage A
- Judging procedure – Stage A
- Evaluation criteria – Stage A
- Presentation – Stage A
- Outcomes of Stage A

 Stage B: Initial Concept (if applicable)

- Purpose of Stage B
- Brief and site information – Stage B
- Stage B questions and answers
- Entry deliverables – Stage B
- Submission requirements – Stage B
- Entry deadline – Stage B
- Other specific requirements – Stage B
- No presentation to Jury – Stage B
- Judging procedures – Stage B
- Evaluation criteria – Stage B
- Technical and cost assessment – Stage B
- Outcomes of Stage B

 Stage C: Final Concept

- Purpose of Stage C
- Brief and site information – Stage C
- Stage C questions and answers
- Entry deliverables – Stage C
- Submission requirements – Stage C
- Entry deadline – Stage C
- Other specific requirements – Stage C
- Presentation to Jury – Stage C
- Judging procedures – Stage C
- Evaluation criteria – Stage C 20
- Technical and cost assessment – Stage C
- Fee submission – Stage C
- Outcomes of Stage C

**Competition Judging**

- Jury chair
- Jury members
- Jury obligations
- Judging procedures
- Evaluation criteria
- Jury report

**Honoraria, Prizes and Prize Money**

- Obligation to make payments
- Honoraria for Entrants
- Prizes
- Payment of honoraria and prize money
- Prize money and professional fees
- GST

**Promotion and Exhibition**

- Use of submitted entries
- Promotion of the Competition
- Exhibition of entries

**Post-competition engagement**

- Client to commission the winner
- Form of contract
- Professional fees under the contract
- Other matters relating to Post-Competition Engagement

**General Conditions**

- Intellectual property and copyright
- Moral rights
- Entrant costs
- Conflict of interest
- Changes to these Conditions
- No liability
- Indemnity
- Governing law and jurisdiction

**Appendices**

- Definitions
- Related Documents
- Entrant Declaration Form
- Draft Conditions of Engagement for the Project Architect

12 DEVELOPING THE PROJECT BRIEF

Policy reference if applicable

12.1 Purpose of the project brief

The project brief provides all the information that entrants need about the project that is the subject of the architectural competition. It must be clear and as comprehensive as possible, recognising that in some situations the feasibility of the project may be uncertain, or possibly reliant on the outcomes of the competition.

It must be remembered that the brief will be the primary basis on which entrant's design concepts are developed and on which the jury will evaluate those concepts.

12.2 What needs to be covered in the brief?

5.4 Competition brief

The project brief should set out, as a minimum:

- a clear vision for the project, including a detailed statement of the project's purpose and objectives, the Client's aspirations for the project, and their intentions regarding its implementation;
- detailed project background information, including social, economic, technical, historical and organisational data;
- site information including appropriate plans, photographs, topographical and climatic data, existing buildings, services locations and other relevant contextual information;
- functional and spatial requirements of the Client to be accommodated in the design concept, in sufficient detail to support the level of detail required in entrants' submissions;
- budget, including a clear indication as to whether the budget is for construction only or includes fitout and other project costs, as well as whether it is a target, and estimate or an absolute upper limit;
- key regulatory constraints, planning limitations and the like, apart from standard building code provisions which entrants should be familiar with;
- the proposed form of contract and specific provisions for post-competition engagement of the winner; and
- any other relevant information or details reasonably required for entrants to be able to develop design concepts appropriate to the Client's objectives.

12.3 Are all brief requirements mandatory, or are some optional?

The project brief can't be entirely optional, as entrants may come up with completely impractical or unachievable conceptual proposals.

On the other hand, mandatory requirements should be kept to a realistic minimum, to encourage creativity, innovation and the potential for advancement of architectural thinking.

It is critical however, that the brief very clearly distinguishes mandatory requirements from those for which the entrant has discretion or freedom of interpretation.

13 OBTAINING INSTITUTE ENDORSEMENT

Policy reference if applicable

13.1 The value of Institute endorsement

6.2 Value of Endorsement

Formal endorsement of an architectural competition by the Australian Institute of Architects can significantly enhance an architectural competition because it can:

- increase the number and quality of entrants;
- offer effective, targeted promotion of the competition to Institute members;
- give all participants in the competition (entrants, sponsor, client, jury and advisers) assurance about the fairness and equity of the competition;
- assist in protecting the rights of entrants;
- include advice to the Professional Adviser and thus assure the Client, Sponsor and entrants that the competition will be well-run;
- reduce the risk of negative publicity; and
- help make sure that the winning entry represents the highest possible design quality.

13.2 Is Institute endorsement necessary?

6.3 When endorsement required

Endorsement of an Australian architectural competition by the Institute is not mandatory or essential.

It does, however offer many benefits for both organisers and entrants, by:

- affirming that the competition conditions are in line with the Institute's Architectural Competitions Policy; and
- enabling the competition to be promoted by the Institute, when requested.

13.3 What are the key requirements for endorsement?

6.4 Minimum criteria for endorsement

The Institute will endorse competitions where the conditions are aligned with Institute policy and allow for:

- all entrants to be treated equitably;
- entries to be anonymous, where required by Institute policy;
- a majority of entrants to be Australian-based;
- entry deliverables to be kept to a minimum;
- conflict of interest to be specifically prohibited;
- entrants' intellectual property and moral rights to be protected;
- fee proposals to be made separately and within a predetermined range;
- the winner of a project competition to be engaged as project architect;
- prize money and honoraria to be paid promptly;
- the Institute to be notified of any material change in the competition conditions;
- the Institute to be provided with a copy of the final jury report.

13.4 When should the Institute be approached about endorsement?

It is preferable if competition organisers approach the Institute at the earliest possible point in planning the competition. This allows the Institute to be aware of the competition, to ensure organisers are familiar with relevant Institute requirements, policies and guidelines, and to agree on key dates for the endorsement process.

However, a formal request for endorsement should not be made until the conditions and other competition documents are virtually complete. To avoid unwanted delays, this means the documents need to be ready well in advance of the planned launch date.

13.5 Can a competition be dis-endorsed?

6.5 Maintaining endorsement

The Professional Adviser must promptly notify the Institute of any material change in the competition conditions, the constitution or identity of any of the key participants, including jurors, or in relation to any of the above minimum criteria. The Institute may then decide to rescind endorsement or may advise of subsequent action required to retain endorsement.

13.6 How is the endorsement process managed?

6.6 Endorsement authority and procedure

Details of the endorsement process are set out in the Institute's Architectural Competitions Policy.

The Institute's nominee has delegated authority to evaluate the draft conditions and to negotiate changes with the competition organisers. Where appropriate, they will seek advice or input from experienced members before making a final decision about endorsement.

13.7 Is endorsement by a government or other Institute sufficient?

6.7 Competition Guidelines of other bodies

Generally, an architectural competition endorsed or approved by an overseas Institute of Architects or any Australian government or authority will not be automatically endorsed by the Institute. Organisers will still need to comply with Institute policy and seek Institute endorsement directly.

The only exception to this principle is an international architectural competition endorsed by the International Union of Architects (UIA). Such a competition will be automatically endorsed by the Institute, even if it has competition conditions that do not fully meet the requirements of Institute policy.

13.8 How is Institute endorsement communicated?

The competition conditions and any associated documents or promotional material may include a simple statement to the effect that the competition is endorsed by the Australian Institute of Architects.

Institute endorsement does *not* confer a right to include or publish the Institute logo in any way associated with the competition. Permission for such use, if desired, must be specifically and formally requested.

Checklist G: Institute endorsement

- Advise Institute about prospective competition at earliest time.
- Review Institute's *Architectural Competitions Policy*
- Review Institute's *Guidelines for the Conduct of Architectural Competitions*
- Review Institute's *Model Conditions for an Architectural Competition*
- Appoint key advisers and jury members
- Develop program, which allows sufficient time for endorsement
- Develop final draft competition documents (conditions and brief)
- Ensure conditions meet Institute policy and provide for:
 - equitable treatment of entrants;
 - anonymous entries, where required by Institute policy;
 - majority of entrants to be Australian-based;
 - minimal entry deliverables;
 - conflict of interest to be prohibited;
 - protection of intellectual property and moral rights;
 - separate fee proposals;
 - winner to be engaged as project architect;
 - prompt payment of prize money and/or honoraria
 - notification of changes to competition conditions;
 - Institute to be provided with final jury report.
- Submit conditions/brief to Institute with request for endorsement
- Respond to Institute requests for clarification/amendment
- Finalise competition documents
- Resubmit to Institute for formal confirmation of endorsement
- Endorsement confirmed
- Include reference to endorsement in competition documents
- Request Institute promotion of competition
- After confirmation, launch competition
- Ensure any changes in conditions or process are communicated to Institute.

14 COMPILING THE COMPETITION PACKAGE

Policy reference if applicable

14.1 Coordination of competition documents and processes

Many of the problems that occur in architectural competitions stem from either lack of clarity or lack of coordination of the competition documentation and information.

Entrants can misunderstand instructions or the project brief if they are not presented clearly, and they can even miss critical information altogether, if it's hidden away in an unexpected or illogical location.

14.2 What are the key elements of competition information?

Regardless of the size or scope of a competition, the following information components will be required:

- *Promotional information*: informing potential entrants about the existence and objectives of the competition, giving a few key dates and advising where to get more detailed information;
- *Project background*: giving entrants all the information they will require to be able to develop the design concept required by the competition (ie. the project brief – refer **section 12**);
- *Competition background*: the objectives, rationale and history of the competition, as distinct from the project (usually part of the competition conditions – refer **section 11**);
- *Process description*: clear instructions on how the competition will work, each of the steps involved and the timing required (also part of the competition conditions);
- *Formal requirements*: details of the formal rules and obligations (both legal and contractual) of the participants in the competition (also part of the competition conditions); and
- *Options and discretionary choices for entrants*: clear definition of those things entrants must do, those things they can choose to do or not do, and those things they can choose to do in any way they prefer (may be part of all the competition documents).

14.3 What are the essential qualities of competition information?

To be effective, the entire competition information package must exemplify:

- *clarity*: using structure, headings and language to ensure information is presented clearly and without ambiguity;
- *brevity*: keeping it short, avoiding unnecessary repetition and elaboration;
- *coordination*: ensuring information in one document or section is completely aligned and consistent with related information in another;
- *singularity*: providing each piece of information once only, in the most logical or obvious place;
- *one voice*: using language and style to present each discrete piece of information as if it's coming from the same author; and
- *simplicity*: less, not more.

14.4 How should each element of the package be communicated?

Information for entrants will generally be communicated through one or more of three channels:

- *printed documents*: to ensure equity of access to information by entrants, all competition documents should be available (even if only on request) as hard copy, printed documents;
- *online*: most potential entrants have internet access and thus online availability is the most efficient and practical – also allowing for updates or changes to be made available to all entrants or potential entrants; and
- *in person*: some information, especially anything that might benefit from immediacy in terms of questions, discussion or experience (eg. the site and site context) is best communicated directly, in person.

15 ANNOUNCING AND PROMOTING THE COMPETITION

Policy reference if applicable

15.1 Communicating with potential entrants

Persuasively informing potential entrants about the nature and timing of a proposed competition can have a significant positive impact on the number and quality of entrants.

Even in the case of a select competition, where the Sponsor may have a particular list of participants in mind, failing to effectively promote the competition can mean that some potential entrants could decide against being involved or may simply be unavailable.

15.2 Is there a need to communicate with the broader profession?

Whether entrant eligibility is 'open' or 'select,' the whole architectural profession will generally be keenly interested in who is participating and ultimately, who wins.

Most architects and their practices are simply unable to enter every competition that comes along, but they will want to monitor other competitions for fairness and credibility, and to debate the outcomes, especially where a prominent, public project is involved.

Promoting to the whole profession can also mean that younger architects, who are employed in medium or larger practices, can also be aware of the competition and potentially participate, even when their practice is not planning to be involved.

15.3 When should a competition be promoted to the public?

The details of every competition that involves any kind of 'public interest' or a prominent site location should be made as widely available to the public as possible.

In some such instances, it can also be valuable to facilitate direct public involvement, through a 'people's choice' or similar component of the competition. Public or user input into the project brief can also be valuable.

15.4 How should the competition be announced?

5.3 Competition conditions

Announcement of open or limited (open) architectural competitions should be by publication online or in relevant print journals or other media that is commonly accessed by architects.

Invitation to participate in a select or limited (select) competition should be issued simultaneously to all selected entrants, preferably by direct contact (in person or by telephone), followed up in writing (hard copy or email).

Public announcement of a select or limited (select) competition should also be made, to ensure the profession is aware of the competition, and of the basis on which it is being conducted.

15.5 What are the key stages in competition promotion?

Each phase of an architectural competition generates different opportunities and needs for communicating with entrants, the profession

and the public. A communications plan should be devised as early as possible in the conduct of the competition.

Depending on the structure and objectives of the competition, promotional and communications activities may be desirable or necessary at a number of points, including:

- prior to the competition launch;
- after the competition launch and before the final date for submissions;
- after submissions have been lodged;
- after completion of judging, when winners are announced; and
- as a final wrap-up of the competition.

16 MANAGING THE LAUNCH TO SUBMISSION PERIOD

Policy reference if applicable

16.1 Importance of the pre-submission period

The period between launching a competition and the deadline for submission of entries is crucial for the overall outcome. This is when the quality of work put into the competition planning phase pays off, in terms of the quality of design thinking that the project brief and competition structure and conditions can facilitate.

In turn, the effectiveness of this phase sets up the next phase of evaluating, short-listing and ultimately awarding the best entries.

16.2 What are the tasks and obligations of the Professional Adviser?

4.4 Professional Adviser

Much of what happens prior to the entry submission date depends on the ability of the Professional Adviser to respond and react in a timely and appropriate way to the questions and issues that inevitably arise.

A detailed summary of the role and duties of the Professional Adviser is shown in **Checklist C**.

16.3 How can entrants be most effective during this period?

4.1 Entrants

Entrants who are organised, professional and confident will give themselves the best chance of success in an architectural competition. To maximise their opportunity in a competition, entrants should:

- quickly and decisively determine membership of the competition team, including both practice staff and other multi-disciplinary contributors;
- develop a detailed program, production schedule and determine individual roles and deadlines to ensure that the required work can be fully resourced;
- study in detail and ensure compliance with every aspect of the project brief and the published competition conditions;
- ensure that all necessary licenses and agreements are obtained to protect moral rights and copyright of others in relation to development of the design concept and entry;
- promptly inform the Professional Adviser or Probity Adviser of any actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest;
- thoroughly evaluate the jury members to identify likely preferences and key jury concerns that might influence the design approach;
- identify and submit, as early as possible, any questions or uncertainties that require response or clarification by the Professional Adviser;
- ensure that all required measures are taken to maintain anonymity and confidentiality, where these are competition requirements;
- submit the entry in the form required, to the place specified and before the submission deadline;
- ensure that no member of the team attempts to contact or unfairly or inappropriately influence the jury process or any jury member; and
- be willing and prepared to accept the decision of the jury as final.

16.4 What additional briefing will be provided to entrants?

In most architectural competitions there should be no need for additional briefing of entrants, beyond the material contained in the project brief and the competition conditions. If the formal competition documents don't provide all the information necessary for entrants to properly develop their entry, providing supplementary information to a large number of entrants on an equitable basis can be extremely challenging.

The key exception to this principle can be in the case of multi-stage, select or limited (select) competitions. Where the final stage of a competition requires a significant level of detailed design consideration, it can be practical to leave detailed briefing until the final stage participants are determined. Such briefing can then be provided directly to the final shortlist by additional documents, in-person briefings, site visits or visits to existing facilities, as appropriate. This approach avoids unnecessary amounts of detailed information being provided to all entrants at the outset.

16.5 How will questions from entrants be dealt with?

The competition conditions should specify precisely how and when questions from entrants are to be raised and answered. It should be possible for entrants to ask questions or seek clarification about:

- the competition conditions;
- the project brief;
- any supplied or missing background, contextual or site information;
or
- any other details reasonably required to prepare a complying entry.

To ensure that considered responses can be prepared and disseminated, competition conditions should require all questions to be in writing (directed to the *Professional Adviser*) and to be submitted by a deadline substantially prior to the entry submission deadline.

Any questions raised and the responses to each should be provided to all entrants, unless the particular question or answer needs to be kept confidential and doing so has no impact on the fairness of the competition.

16.6 How should visiting the site be managed?

Because many architectural competitions will attract entrants from distant locations, site visits may not be feasible for all entrants. As a result, the project brief needs to include comprehensive information about the site and its context.

In some instances, where sensitive operations are undertaken on the site (eg. hospitals, laboratories, correctional facilities) visiting the site may need to be explicitly prohibited.

However, where site visits can be practically and equitably arranged, the competition can benefit from a greater level of design context. Where possible, visits should be scheduled to ensure that multiple entrants aren't on site at any one time.

17 RECEIVING AND VALIDATING THE ENTRIES

Policy reference if applicable

17.1 Integrity of the submission procedure

If there is any doubt in the minds of competition entrants about the fairness and equity of the submission procedure, the whole outcome of the competition can be severely compromised.

It is essential that all obligations relating to the submission process, pertaining to both entrants and the competition organisers, are strictly enforced. Any sense of favouritism, inequitable leniency or differential treatment will certainly bring the integrity of the competition into question. Such breaches can also lead to time-consuming and costly dispute resolution processes or even litigation.

17.2 Should entries be submitted electronically or in hard copy?

Some competitions require hard copy submissions, some require submissions digitally (online or via a digital data storage device) and some require both. Ultimately, it is a matter for the competition organisers to determine their particular preference.

Hard copy submissions have advantages that they are:

- relatively easy to specify to ensure equity;
- when properly packaged, less subject to possible degradation during transit;
- essentially ‘what you see is what you get;’ and
- ready and available for exhibition to the jury or public.

On the other hand, digital submissions may be preferred because they:

- remove inequity that can arise from the different times required for mail or courier delivery over long distances;
- enable the inclusion of richer information and animations, fly-throughs and similar presentation options;
- can require supporting data to be presented in a format that is more amenable to technical review;
- can facilitate jury and public review remotely;
- are smaller and simpler to transport;
- don’t need extensive storage and display facilities; and
- are much more easily incorporated into post-competition publicity and publications.

17.3 What flexibility can there be around the submission deadline?

In all but the most exceptional circumstances, any entry not received in the form required by the time and date specified should be excluded from consideration. Failure to abide by this principle exposes the competition organisers to a potential claim of unfairly advantaging a non-compliant entry.

Special consideration should only be given to validating a late entry, where:

- the entrant has taken every reasonable action to submit the entry in sufficient time for it to be received by the required time and date;

- the cause of the late arrival of the entry is entirely outside of the control of the entrant;
- the Professional Adviser is certain that the entrant has not and will not gain any unfair advantage over other, complying entrants; and
- the jury is informed of any late entry and the circumstances that led to it being late.

Even where the above criteria are met, the competition conditions should ensure that the Professional Adviser retains absolute discretion to disqualify any late entry, without need for justification.

17.4 What is the Professional Adviser's role in validating entries?

Only valid entries should be considered by the jury. It is generally the Professional Adviser's role to ensure this by checking that each entry:

- is submitted by an entrant, whether an individual or team, that meets all stipulated eligibility criteria;
- is from an entrant properly registered for the competition;
- includes a properly completed and signed entrant declaration form;
- includes every deliverable as specified in the conditions;
- has removed from it any material that exceeds specified limits;
- is received at the place and by the time and date stipulated;
- complies with all requirements necessary to maintain anonymity and confidentiality, where applicable;
- is not subject to any unresolved conflict of interest; and
- does not in any other way breach the competition conditions.

17.5 What is the role of technical advisers in checking entries?

Where the project brief includes requirements that are especially complex or sophisticated, technical advisers or technical panels (refer **section 8**) may be required to review entries for their response to, or compliance with, such requirements.

Review of submitted entries by technical advisers or panels can take place before or after initial consideration by the jury, but should generally be finalised and presented to the jury before the jury evaluates a final short-list of entrants.

Technical review of entries should be coordinated and overseen by the Professional Adviser.

17.6 What needs to happen before entries are presented to the jury?

Before any entries are presented to the jury for review and evaluation, the Professional Adviser should ensure that:

- only validated entries are presented to the jury (refer section 17.4);
- regardless of how they were submitted, entry materials are formatted for jury evaluation in a manner acceptable to the jury;
- dates, times and venues for jury sessions are established, and communicated and agreed to by all jury members;
- all jury members have completed and signed a formal agreement covering their role, obligations and entitlements;

- the jury has been fully briefed by the Professional Adviser, has access to the project brief, competition conditions, and any other material provided to entrants, including during the Q&A period; and
- the jury fully understands and endorses the evaluation criteria to be employed.

18 JUDGING THE ENTRIES

Policy reference if applicable

18.1 Integrity of the judging process

Of all the elements that together constitute an architectural competition, the way in which entries are judged is commonly the one that comes under most scrutiny. Certainly, there will be many more entrants at the end of the competition who are critical of the jury or the judging process than of any other aspect of the competition.

For this reason alone, but for more principled ones as well, the Sponsor and Professional Adviser must go to extreme lengths to ensure the integrity of the judging process.

18.2 How and by whom should the evaluation criteria be established?

Inclusion of specific evaluation criteria in the competition conditions is fundamental to transparency of the judging process. Knowing these criteria before they even start preparing their entry gives entrants a sense of confidence that they have given appropriate emphasis in their design proposal to the things that will actually matter.

Because of their centrality to the process, evaluation criteria must be very carefully considered. Ideally, the Sponsor or Client, the Professional Adviser and the jury chair (if not the whole jury) should be involved in formulating the evaluation criteria and in any prioritisation or weighting of individual criteria.

Once adopted and published in the competition conditions, there should be no significant changes to evaluation criteria. The jury must also be very clear that all of the stated evaluation criteria (in whatever priority or weighting may be agreed), and no other criteria, must be taken into account in the judging of entries.

18.3 What process should the jury follow?

At its first meeting, the jury should elect a chair (if not already determined) and agree on the process it will follow to reach a final determination on the winning entry and any other awards.

Specifically the jury will need to establish or confirm:

- where, when and how (in person or remotely) it plans to meet;
- broadly, the process it plans to follow;
- whether judging will be by vote or by consensus (or commonly a combination of both – consensus in the early stages of judging and voting, if required, to determine a short-list or the winner);
- whether all jurors will initially view all entries or whether each juror will be allocated a portion of the entries for initial review;
- whether each entry will be formally scored or ranked against each of the evaluation criteria, or a more informal approach adopted;
- how the evaluation process will be documented and/or recorded, to assist in preparation of the jury report;
- how and when it prefers to be provided with technical evaluations from specialist advisers; and
- who will be responsible for drafting the jury report.

There are a number of different process variants the jury can adopt. The initial stages of evaluation will generally be either:

- a scoring or ranking exercise, in which all entries are given a formal, initial score against the evaluation criteria by each or most jurors; or
- a simple 'culling' exercise – removing from further consideration all those entries that, by consensus, have insufficient merit to justify more detailed evaluation.

The choice between these two alternatives will be largely dependent on the number of entries and whether or not the purpose is to determine the final winner, or a short-list of entrants to proceed to the Final Concept Stage.

Once a more manageable list of contending entrants is determined, the consideration of each entry should become more detailed and formal. This ensures that when a winner is finally decided upon, there is an objective 'audit trail' of the jury's thinking and discussions. The record of these discussions can then form a useful basis for the jury report. It can also be of great assistance in the event of a dispute about the result.

18.4 What involvement does the Professional Adviser have in judging?

Apart from initial validation and an overall coordination, facilitation and logistics management role, the Professional Adviser should have no involvement at all in the jury's evaluation of entries.

18.5 What happens if a juror is unavailable?

There needs to be a clear contingency plan for the unexpected absence of any member of the jury. Such a plan will depend on a number of factors including budget, size of the jury, nature and size of the competition and the project, and the level of specialist expertise required of each jury member.

In some instances, it may be acceptable to simply reduce the size of the jury. Where this is an undesirable option, one or more reserve jury members need to be appointed, to observe deliberations from the outset and then step in if any jury member is unable to continue.

Once a reserve jury member is substituted for an original member, the process should not be reversed.

18.6 Is the jury's preferred concept necessarily the winner?

Based on all the information available to it, the jury will generally be capable of determining which design concept, among all those submitted, best responds to the design task and the project brief. The entrant responsible for that concept will normally be declared the winner.

However, there may, on occasions, be matters of which the jury is not fully aware, or on which it has not been briefed. Often these will be minor and readily dealt with as part of the architectural commission that follows the competition. Sometimes, however, such matters may be sufficiently critical that the validity or suitability of the jury's decision can be called into question. Examples include:

- the fee proposal of the preferred entrant being outside the range specified by the Client, and attempts to negotiate an acceptable outcome being unsuccessful;
- an extraordinary and unforeseen change in Client or user requirements that renders the design impractical or unsuitable;
- an extraordinary and unforeseen change in regulatory or legislative requirements that impacts significantly on brief or budget; or
- an error or discrepancy identified in the preferred entry.

Where circumstances such as these arise before the winner is announced or informed, the Sponsor and Professional Adviser should make every conceivable attempt to negotiate an acceptable outcome with the preferred entrant.

Where it is simply not possible to accommodate substantially changed circumstances, the preferred entrant should be declared the winner, but either the project or the engagement of the winner as architect may not proceed.

18.7 What can be negotiated with the jury?

As a general rule, no entrant or representative of the competition organisers, including the Professional Adviser, should seek to negotiate anything with the jury with the intention of impacting on the outcome.

However, in extraordinary circumstances such as those noted in **section 18.6**, or where the Professional Adviser is concerned that an aspect of the jury process could lead to an unfair outcome or one not based on merit with respect to the stated evaluation criteria, they should request the jury to amend their process accordingly.

19 ANNOUNCING THE WINNER(S)

Policy reference if applicable

19.1 Maximising exposure of the winning entry(ies)

Part of the value of an architectural competition, and a reason why many architects will participate, is that, regardless of who wins or loses, the outcome represents a great opportunity to promote quality architectural thinking and design to the community.

For this reason, and others to do with the specific objectives of the project, maximising public exposure of the winning entry and other placed entries (at least) should be an essential element of every architectural competition.

19.2 What is the best way to announce the winner(s)?

There is probably no right or wrong way to announce the results of an architectural competition, but whatever methods and channels are used, the aim should be to reach the largest and most diverse possible audience.

Both the public and the profession will have a keen interest in the outcome, possibly for quite different reasons, so both the general media and the architectural media should have the opportunity to publish the results. Both print media and online channels should also be utilised, including the Client's website.

19.3 What needs to be in place before the announcement?

Before any information is supplied to anyone outside the jury or organising team, there is a substantial due diligence exercise that needs to be completed. This should involve:

- thorough re-checking of the winning entry to ensure it is fully compliant in all respects;
- having heads of agreement in place for engagement of the winner as project architect;
- completion and review of a final draft of the jury report;
- finalisation of any dispute resolution processes or complaints handling (as far as possible);
- drafting and review of all media releases and information packages;
- execution of any licenses, consents or agreements in relation to post-competition publications, exhibitions, etc.;
- dates, times and venues arranged for any events, ceremonies, presentations, interviews or similar media activities;
- finalised plans and dates for post-competition publications and exhibitions; and
- final arrangements in place for any other activity intended to occur after the announcement.

19.4 Is there a preferred order for informing people of the outcome?

There is an important sequence of notification that ensures key players in the competition hear the outcomes at a reasonable time and from an appropriate source.

Generally, advice about the outcomes should occur in the following sequence:

- confidential advice from jury chair to Professional Adviser and Sponsor/Client of jury decisions;
- confidential advice from Professional Adviser to proposed winner, to enable relevant discussions or negotiations prior to public announcement;
- confidential advice to second and third placed entrants;
- confidential advice to unplaced, short-listed entrants;
- individual communication to all other entrants, immediately prior to public announcement;
- public announcement at presentation ceremony or event;
- release of jury report;
- public announcement in news media;
- public announcement in specialist media (architecture, design, Client-related, etc.).

20 PUBLISHING OR EXHIBITING COMPETITION ENTRIES

Policy reference if applicable

20.1 Public exposure of all or selected entries

In addition to publicity surrounding announcement of competition winners, organisers can add further value through public exposure of a wider range of, or ideally, all the entries.

There will be many high quality entries in a competition apart from the winner, and the prospect of their design thinking being presented to the public is a further incentive for many architects – both to enter in the first place, and to maximise their competitiveness. Equally importantly, the community can learn a great deal about the value of design and architecture from the public presentation of competition entries.

20.2 How should entries be published or exhibited?

Competition entries are most commonly presented either as an exhibition or as a post-competition publication. Either can be in physical form or hard copy, or in the form of a digital publication or exhibition. The form of presentation will depend to a degree on the format in which entries were originally submitted.

Some specialist media publications, particularly those with a strong architectural focus, may also be prepared to publish details of a wider range of entries than just the winner(s).

Competition organisers can sometimes choose to combine publication of entries with the jury report, to create a single, comprehensive document as a record of the competition. This can be a useful way of demonstrating accountability and transparency, where the project is a public facility or the Client is government-based.

20.3 Which entries should be included?

Ideally all entries should be recognised in a post-competition publication or exhibition. Ultimately, this will depend on the number of entries and whether the space available (either pages or exhibition space) is limited.

Where budget or space constraints apply, adjusting the space allocation for each entry, based on merit, can enable all entries to be included.

In an open competition, where some entries may arguably be of lower quality, there is still value in presenting the full range of entries as an accurate reflection of the competition.

20.4 Can entries be published before the winner is announced?

In almost all circumstances, there should be no public exposure of any entries until after the winner is determined and announced. This is particularly the case during the period where short-listed entrants are preparing their designs for the Final Concept stage.

One exception to this rule is where there is a ‘people’s choice’ or public consultation component of the competition, for which public presentation of short-listed entries is obviously necessary. Any such publication or display should only commence after the final deadline for submissions.

21 PUBLISHING THE JURY REPORT

Policy reference if applicable

21.1 The objective of the jury report

Publication of a jury report is essential to the integrity of an architectural competition. It is a tangible mechanism for ensuring that the jury is accountable for its decisions. It also ensures transparent access to the jury process and thinking for everyone with an interest in the competition.

The jury report can also set out details of any feedback given to short-listed entrants before completing their Final Concept stage, the response to which can play a key role in the jury's final evaluation. It can also provide a vehicle for the jury to make recommendations to the Client or the winning entrant about further opportunities for refinement of the winning design as it proceeds forward to realisation.

21.2 How should the jury report be published?

The jury report can be published in either hard copy or digital form. Publishing digitally can create the opportunity for access by a wider audience and is thus a desirable option, either solely or in addition to a hard copy version.

21.3 When should the jury report be published?

Ensuring that the content of the jury report is thoroughly edited and reviewed can take time, but ideally the report should be published as soon as possible after the announcement of the winner(s).

21.4 What should be in the jury report?

The jury report should be clear and concise, but contain enough detail to ensure the jury's thinking and key decisions are understood and open to scrutiny.

Generally, the jury report should contain:

- a brief introduction and background to the competition, including a clear statement of the competition objectives;
- a full list of entrants in the competition;
- details of the background and credentials of each member of the jury;
- a brief summary of the judging process;
- a summary of the competition results, including the winning entry, other placed entries and any entries included in a final short-list;
- a summary of the results at the conclusion of each stage of a multi-stage competition;
- a detailed evaluation of the merits of each short-listed design, including strengths and weaknesses;
- a further summary of the key reasons why the winning design was considered to have greater merit than any other scheme;
- non-binding recommendations from the jury for fine-tuning of the winning entry as part of the winning architect's commission;

- appropriate reference to the fee proposal of the winning entrant; and
- any other considerations or details that the jury wishes to include.

21.5 Who is responsible for preparing the jury report?

Overall coordination of the report document, editing, background information, graphic design and printing (if required) should be the responsibility of the Professional Adviser.

Drafting of the jury evaluations and outcomes should be coordinated by the jury chair, with specific individual tasks delegated to other jury members as the jury determines.

21.6 Who should be able to access or read the jury report?

Since the primary purpose of producing a jury report is to maximise transparency of the judging process, its audience should be as wide as practically possible.

At an absolute minimum the following should have access to the jury report:

- the Client;
- the Sponsor;
- the Professional Adviser;
- the Probity Adviser (if applicable);
- the President of the Australian Institute of Architects, where the competition is endorsed;
- all entrants; and
- all jury members.

Ideally, and especially in the case of public projects, the jury report should be publicly available.

22 COMMISSIONING THE WINNER

Policy reference if applicable

22.1 Appointing the winner in project competitions

5.5 Good practice principles

The Australian Institute of Architects Architectural Competitions Policy requires that in all project competitions, the Client must engage the author of the winning design as the architect for the project.

It also requires that where the author of the winning design in an open project competition cannot demonstrate that they have the capacity, resources or capability to act as the architect for the project, they must be engaged to undertake the commission in association with another architect who is acceptable to both the winner and the Client.

22.2 What should happen regarding engagement before announcing the winner?

With a select or limited (select) project competition the credentials and capacity of all entrants will have been established, so no further capability review should be necessary.

With an open project competition, it is reasonable to undertake a thorough review of the capability, capacity and resources of the jury's preferred entrant. This will clearly require confidential engagement with the entrant and, potentially, with another potential associate architect where there are capability concerns.

In all cases, review of the preferred entrant's fee proposal will also be necessary, and in-principle agreement reached on fees, scope of services and the provisions of the Conditions of Engagement.

Once issues of capability and conditions of engagement have been satisfactorily resolved for both Client and winner, formal announcements can be made.

22.3 What needs to happen if someone other than the winner is engaged?

In some instances, the conditions in a project competition may allow for someone other than the winner to be appointed as project architect. Provided that the specific requirements of the conditions have been met, there is unlikely to be any action that the winner or anyone else can take in this situation.

It is highly unlikely, however, that such a competition would receive Institute endorsement.

In the case of a competition that complies with Institute policy, the author of the jury's preferred entry may still not be appointed as project architect, for example where:

- the entrant's fee submission is outside the Client's proposed range and a satisfactory arrangement is unable to be negotiated;
- the entrant is unable or unwilling to proceed with the commission for health, personal or other significant reasons;
- the Client is unable to proceed with the project within a reasonable time after conclusion of the competition; or

- there is a significant material change in the project budget, brief or Client organisation that substantially affects the nature of the project.

In these, or other circumstances that are effectively outside the control of either the Client or the preferred entrant, the following options should be pursued, in order:

- review all options for overcoming the problematic circumstances through support of the preferred entrant by appointment of a suitable associate architect;
- where the preferred entrant is unwilling or unable to accept the commission, review the jury's second preferred entrant and if all conditions can be met, announce that entrant as the winner;
- where the project is delayed or significantly changed, announce the preferred entrant as winner and make every reasonable effort to subsequently negotiate with and engage the winner, either alone or in association, for the project;
- where the project is reasonably expected not to proceed at all, announce the winner, and conclude the competition.

23 WRAPPING UP THE COMPETITION

Policy reference if applicable

23.1 The need for a positive conclusion

The lasting impression of a competition will be stronger and more positive for everyone if it can be brought to a clearly defined conclusion, rather than just progressively petering out over time.

This doesn't mean that all activities must conclude simultaneously on a given day, but rather that the last formal exposure of the competition to someone who has been engaged or interested in it marks a clear point of conclusion.

23.2 What still needs to be done after the winner is announced?

A number of post-announcement activities are covered in detail elsewhere in these Guidelines. However, in summary, the following activities need to be managed after announcement of the winner:

- issue of the jury report;
- notification of the competition outcomes to all entrants, including details of related publications or exhibitions, and an expression of thanks for their participation;
- publication or exhibition of entries;
- media liaison;
- formal engagement of the winner as architect for the project;
- arranging payment of all prizes, fees and honoraria to entrants, jury members and advisers within 30 days of the announcement;
- issue of letters of appreciation to all jury members and advisers;
- organising return or disposal of entry materials, as provided for in the conditions;
- assembly of a competition archive, including all relevant documents and materials that the Sponsor or Client require to be preserved as a record of the competition, for legal or other purposes;
- a brief concluding report from the Professional Adviser to the Client and Sponsor, summarising the competition and providing relevant feedback and recommendations for the conduct of any future competition (which can sometimes be combined with the jury report and publication of entries to form a consolidated summary publication).

APPENDIX A: DEFINITIONS

Policy reference if applicable

For the purposes of these *Guidelines*, the following definitions apply:

Adviser. Any or all of the *Professional Adviser*, *Probity Adviser*, and *Technical Advisers* involved in an *Architectural Competition*.

Architectural Competition. A process by which an architect or architectural design team and a design concept is selected for a project, based on the competitive submission of conceptual designs.

Client. The person or entity who will be the owner or operator of the completed project that is the subject of the competition (may or may not also be the Sponsor).

Competition. The particular *Architectural Competition* to which these *Conditions* refer.

Competition Brief/Brief. Detailed information provided to entrants, which sets out Client and project aspirations, site information, budget, functional requirements and any other parameters relevant to development of an effective design concept for the project.

Competition Conditions/Conditions. The documented set of requirements, principles and timelines that govern the conduct, judging and submission processes of an *Architectural Competition*.

Endorsement. Formal prior recognition by the Australian Institute of Architects that the proposed *Conditions* governing the conduct of an *Architectural Competition* are essentially consistent with the relevant requirements of the Institute's 'Architectural Competitions Policy.'

Entrant. An eligible person, entity or team that responds to an invitation to participate in an *Architectural Competition* and submits a compliant entry.

Expression of Interest (EOI) Stage. A preliminary stage of an *Architectural Competition* in which prospective *Entrants* are invited to submit details of relevant qualifications, background and experience only, which will be evaluated to determine the list of *Entrants* selected to participate in the next stage of the competition.

Final Concept Stage. The concluding stage of an *Architectural Competition*, in which *Entrants* are required to prepare a final design for evaluation by the *Jury* to determine the winning entry(ies).

Guidelines. This document – 'Guidelines for the Conduct of an Architectural Competition,' published by the Australian Institute of Architects.

Ideas Competition. A type of *Architectural Competition* that aims to explore major design issues and opportunities for a subject site, and where it is not the *Client's* intention to engage the author of the winning design to develop the design and complete the project.

Initial Concept Stage. The initial stage of an *Architectural Competition* in which *Entrants* are required to prepare a concept design for

assessment by the jury, which will be evaluated to determine a short-list of *Entrants* to compete in the *Final Concept Stage*.

Jury. A panel of appropriately qualified individuals with responsibility for evaluating the design concepts submitted by *Entrants* in an *Architectural Competition* and for determining the winner(s).

Limited (open) Competition. An *Architectural Competition* that limits eligibility to a defined section of a specific cohort (for example 'architects based in Sydney' or 'architects with demonstrated experience in hospital design.')

Limited (select) Competition. An *Architectural Competition* that limits eligibility to an invited group of participants, from which a final group of *Entrants* will be selected, based on defined evaluation criteria or the outcome of an *Initial Concept Stage*.

Multi-stage Competition. An *Architectural Competition* in which *Entrants* progress to final judging through one or more preliminary submission stages.

Open Competition. An *Architectural Competition* that does not limit eligibility of entrants, other than in a very broad or general way (for example, to 'architects' or 'students of architecture.')

Probity Adviser. An appropriately qualified and independent person, who advises the *Professional Adviser*, *Sponsor* or *Client* on, and validates, the probity, equity and integrity of the processes of an *Architectural Competition*, where the project is of high value, is highly complex, unusual or contentious, or is politically sensitive.

Professional Adviser. A registered architect, or other appropriately qualified person, who advises the project *Sponsor* or *Client* on the conduct of an *Architectural Competition*, and who prepares and coordinates the running of the competition on their behalf.

Project. The development, building, complex, object or physical environment that is the subject of design concepts prepared by *Entrants* in an *Architectural Competition*.

Project Competition. An *Architectural Competition* to select the design that best responds to the *Competition Brief*, and where it is the *Client's* intention to engage the author of the winning design to develop the design and complete the project.

Select Competition. An *Architectural Competition* that limits eligibility to a small group of *Entrants* selected directly by, or on behalf of, the *Client*.

Sponsor. A person or organisation responsible for initiating and funding an *Architectural Competition* in order to select an architect or architectural design team and a preferred design concept for a specific project (may or may not also be the *Client*).

Technical Adviser. An expert adviser, appointed by the *Sponsor*, to provide detailed advice and evaluation of particular aspects of submitted entries, where such advice or evaluation may be beyond the scope or skills of the *Jury*.