

**New Universities: Architectural Design Competitions**  
**Sol Plaatje University and University of Mpumalanga**  
**Competition Administrators report:**

## A1: Summary

The report consists of the following files:

- A:** Administration and Tender
- KIM:** Sol Plaatje University Architectural Competition: EOI, Stage 1 & Stage 2
- MP:** University of Mpumalanga Architectural Competition: EOI, Stage 1 & Stage 2
- KIM 2:** Sol Plaatje University Architectural Competition: Jurors score sheets
- MP 2:** University of Mpumalanga Architectural Competition: Jurors score sheets
- KIM 3:** University of Mpumalanga Architectural Competition: Stage 1 Submissions
- MP 3:** University of Mpumalanga Architectural Competition: Stage 1 Submissions
- KIM 4:** University of Mpumalanga Architectural Competition: Stage 2 Submissions
- MP 4:** University of Mpumalanga Architectural Competition: Stage 2 Submissions
- EOI:** University of Mpumalanga and Sol Plaatje University Architectural Competition: Expression of Interest submissions

This summary details the process that was followed by the Competition Administrators in the running of the two Architectural design competitions for the two New Universities in Kimberley and Nelspruit, namely the Sol Plaatje University and the University of Mpumalanga.

The summary refers to the various documents issued during the course of the competitions. These references all correspond to the file names above.

### Introduction:

The South African Institute for Architects in their introduction to Architectural Competition Guidelines puts forward an appropriate justification as to the necessity for Architectural Competitions and the benefit of competitions for projects like that of the two New Universities:

*Architecture is the most visible and public of the arts. Every addition to the built environment should therefore contribute in a meaningful way to our surroundings, the built and natural environment that make up the human experience.*

*Architectural competition promotes interest in a project from inception to completion, and the promoter stands to gain a sense of achievement and enhanced pride of ownership in a project. The South African Institute of Architects considers that it is in the best interests of the promoter, the profession and the nation that important public buildings should be the subject of architectural competitions. It is also ideal for the design of projects in the private sector.*

*Design competitions offer a number of benefits to the promoter of an architectural competition:*

- *Attaining an outstanding and often unique design by stimulating a range of design concepts and explorations*
- *Sound and experienced judgement and advice from the jury*
- *The opportunity to comprehensively test the project brief*
- *Promotion of the promoter and the project through publicity and exhibitions*
- *Opportunities to discover talent and skill which, but for a competition, would remain unknown*

*Design competitions also benefit the competitor entering an approved competition since they afford opportunities:*

- *To undertake work which might not otherwise have been possible*
- *For young unknown talents to come to the fore and be noticed*
- *For a fair and transparent way of selecting professional expertise, and*
- *If the winner lacks experience, to monitor and give support when it is necessary*

An important function of an Institute of Architects is to recognise and promote excellence in architecture and to create public awareness and debate on the built environment. The South African Institute of Architects (SAIA) represents the majority of Professional Architects in South Africa, and members of the Institute are encouraged to enter competitions that are approved and endorsed by SAIA.

With this knowledge and understanding the importance of the two New Universities for our young democracy, the Department of Higher Education and Training and New Universities Team decided to promote competitions for the design of the two new Universities. These would be two separate competitions that would be run by the same team.

In early 2013 Prof Paul Kotze was approached by the DHET New Universities Team to consider the position of the Competition Administrator. Prof Kotze undertook to be the administrator with the assistance of Michael Scholes Architects who would be assisting on the project. The formal start of the Competition Administration was from 14 March 2013.

### **The Competition Team:**

The following were the Competition team that ensured the Competitions' establishment, organisation and realisation:

**Promoter:** (a person/or group who initiates a design competition on its own behalf or on behalf of another person in accordance with these Standard Conditions for Design Competitions)

For the two competitions the promoter consisted of the DHET New Universities Project Management Team. This team included the following:

The Department of Higher Education and Training;

The University of the Witwatersrand represented by Emmanuel Prinsloo, Spencer Hodgson and Dean Barnes;

Ludwig Hansen of Ludwig Hansen Architects and Urban Designers;

Dr Ron Watermeyer;

**Competition administrator:** (a person who functions as an impartial intermediary between the promoter, jury, participants and technical advisors)

The Competition Administrator for the two competitions was Prof Paul Kotze of the University of the Witwatersrand. He was assisted by Michael Rayne and Mark Schaefer of Michael Scholes & Associate Architects.

Prof Kotze is the convenor of the Architecture programme in the faculty of the Built Environment. He has a Bachelor of Architecture, Bachelor of Architectural Studies and Masters in Urban Design. He is the organizer and convener of the Carl & Emily Fuchs Foundation Prestige Prize in Architecture. Previously, he has been the organizer of the Murray & Roberts Des Baker Competition, the PG Glass Competition for architectural students, the ISAA Rome Scholarship Competition for the British School at Rome. He has been a jury member of several student and professional architectural competitions. See Annexure A\_6 for Prof P Kotze's profile. Prof Kotze was approved by SAIA as the Administrator for the competitions.

According to the Standard Rules of a Competition the following were the duties of the competition Administrator:

**12.1** The competition administrator shall be responsible for:

- receiving and registering all submissions;
- returning late submissions;
- receiving written questions from participants and answering such questions;
- confirming that submissions and the actions of the participants are in accordance with the submission requirements;

- e) briefing the jurors;
- f) issuing the submissions to the jury;
- g) arranging for the attendance of any technical advisors if required by the jurors;
- h) informing participants of the results;
- i) making arrangements for the exhibition; and
- j) Liaising with the competitors for the retention or return of submissions.

**12.2** The competition administrator shall upon receipt of submissions:

- a) confirm compliance with the requirements of 5.1 and 9 and disqualify any submission which is in breach of such requirements;
- b) exclude any drawings, photographs, models or other documents not required in terms of the competition data from a competitor's entry;
- c) review each submission and prepare a brief report which highlights any failure in a submission to address requirements of the brief or to provide information that is required and deviations from competition requirements;
- d) submit the report referred to in c) together with the associated submissions to the jury.

**12.3** The competition administrator shall notify all participants admitted to the second stage of the competition as well as those who failed to be so admitted.

**12.4** The competition administrator shall safeguard the envelopes containing the participant's declaration and shall only open these envelopes after the jury has completed its work and has notified the competition administrator of their findings.

**12.5** The competition administrator shall notify all participants admitted to the second stage of the competition as well as those who failed to be so admitted.

**12.6** The competition administrator shall assist the jury and be present during adjudication, but shall not participate in any discussion relating to the merits of any submission or express an opinion during the deliberations of the jury relating to the award of prizes and the ranking of submissions.

## **The Two Competitions:**

### **The Architectural Design Competition for the Sol Plaatje University The Architectural Design Competition for the University of Mpumalanga**

It was decided that the two Universities were to be run as two separate competitions.

The sites and context for the two Universities were such that the outcomes of each would be decidedly different. By running two competitions it also encouraged local architects in Kimberley and Nelspruit to enter as they had the benefit of local knowledge, context, climate and easier access to the site.

The two competitions start approximately one month apart. This allowed for participants to decide whether they enter one or both of the competitions. Due to the tight time constraints it also allowed for the promoters and administrators to prepare the documentation for the competitions.

### **Type of Competition**

A two Stage Design "Ideas" competition was proposed that would be linked to a procurement process during stage 2. Both Stages would be evaluated by a Jury.

The 1<sup>st</sup> stage of the competition was for a Methodology and Approach submission. This 10 page submission included text and concept drawings that would include the thoughts and ideas of the participant rather than a building design.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> stage of the competition was for a building on the new campus. A complex brief and accommodation schedule was proposed that tested the skills of the participants to highlight their ideas and creativity as well as thoroughness that will be required to design a new university.

The first stage allowed for Architects to put forward their ideas in text and images for the jurors to assess. As it was limited to 10 pages and 5 questions/ criteria it was not an overly time consuming submission. The reduction to participants by the jurors meant that fewer architects would be required to put in a larger amount of effort required for stage 2. As the numbers in Stage two were restricted to 10 the potential reward for work put in was likely to be far greater with up to 5 architects for each competition to be selected.

The final design proposed in Stage 2 was never intended to be built but rather used to select a number of Architects to be awarded framework contracts for the design of the new universities in Kimberley and Nelspruit.

Part of the stage 2 competition was a tender submission- this included a financial offer and Preference (BBBEE). This submission was made in a separate envelope and evaluated by a tender evaluation committee. This submission was kept separate from the design submission to ensure the anonymity of the participants to the administrators and jury. The inclusion of the tender during the competition process allowed for a competitive pricing structure and ensured that participants recognised the importance of the BBBEE points and need for transformation. It also prevented manipulation or perception of manipulation of results after the Awarding of the Design Competition winners where the names of winners would not match those who had been appointed framework contracts. A separate report has been prepared by Dr Ron Watermeyer for the two tender evaluations. The tender documents issued to the stage 2 participants are found in Annexures **T\_1, T\_2 & T\_3**.

The weighting of the outcome of Stage 2 jury design ranking in relation to the tender submission was 70% Design to 30% tender (financial offer and Preference). This was to ensure that design quality was by far the highest weighting in the outcome of the Competition winners and make sure that the quality of the buildings would be acceptable for such an important project.

### **SAIA approval**

The South African Institute for Architects' endorsement was sought for the competitions. This was to ensure that there was credibility for the competitions and also to ensure that competitors would feel that the competition would be run in a fair and manner. The competition administrators presented the structure of the first competition for the University in Kimberley and the Standard rules for a competition to Su Lining of SAIA. The endorsement was received on the 6<sup>th</sup> May 2013. See Annexure **A\_3**

### **Programme**

The competitions were kept on a tight time frame. This allowed for the winners of the competition to coincide with the official launch of the New Universities by the Department of Higher Education and training. The tight timeframes required focused attention from the competitors.

See Annexure **A\_2** for a detailed programme of the 2 competitions.

### **Admission to the Competition**

The only qualifying factor for admission to the competition was that the person admitted be a registered Professional Architect with the South African Council for Architectural Professionals. Applicants were requested to supply a copy of their registration Certificate and Identity Document.

### **Prizes**

An honorarium of R40 000 was granted to all Stage 2 participants that the jury deemed were worthy and had put in sufficient effort. The winners of the Competition were all awarded framework contracts for the Design of the New University Buildings.

### **Competition Rules:**



Due to the fact that the competition was being run differently to the standard guidelines that SAIA promotes a new set of competition rules was compiled by Ron Watermeyer. These Standard Guidelines for competitions could be applied to a variety of competitions and consisted of general rules. These rules allowed for the tender processes to be included as part of the competition and made further requests for declarations by the participants. The key difference to the SAIA guidelines for a competition was the inclusion of competition data- this gives specifics to each individual competition and was updated at every stage of the competition. See Annexure **A\_7**

#### **Competition Data:**

These were a documents that established the participant's obligations in participating in the design competition and the promoter's undertakings in administering a design competition and evaluating submissions. The data was updated for the two stages of the competition and can be found in both briefs: **KIM\_S1\_5 & KIM\_S2\_1; MP\_S1\_5 & MP\_S2\_1**

#### **Late Submissions:**

No late submissions for any stage of the competition were accepted. The jury were notified of any late submissions. All late submissions received are recorded in the Stage 1 reports.

#### **Anonymity:**

The anonymity of the participants was essential to ensure the integrity of the competition. At any stage of the competition the only people who may be aware of any of the contestants were the Competition Administrator and assistants. The system of anonymity numbers ensured that even the competition administrator's would not know which submission belonged to a specific firm

The names of the applicants admitted to the competition and to any subsequent phases of the competition were kept confidential until the names of prize winners were announced.

Participants were not to contact the promoter, members of the jury or other participants. They were only able to communicate with the competition administrator through the competition Website.

The issue of the anonymity number was queried in the Stage 1 submission where it was not clear as to whether the website assigned number was to be used on submissions or a user defined number that would be traced back through sealed declarations included with each submission. It was clarified in the Q&A documents that the User defined Number was correct as per the Standard rules of a competition, but a decision was made that due to the lateness of the clarification in the process that either would be accepted. This did not impact on the anonymity of the competitors who remained anonymous during both Stages.

#### **Jury:**

The jury consisted out of 7 people and were appointed to adjudicate the two stages of the competitions. The jury was to consist of the same members for both stages and preferably for the Architect/ Urban design professionals was to be the same for both competitions.

Four of the jurors were to be involved directly in the Architectural profession, be it Architects or an Urban Designer.

An initial list of names was put together by the Competition administrator. Annexure **A\_4**. These names included a mix of people with varying range of experience, race, culture, gender. SAIA was requested to narrow this down to a list of 8 names they felt suitable for the role of adjudication (this list could include a name not included on the list provided by the administrators. From the lists of names provided the administrators contacted people to check on their availability. For the list of architectural jurors see Annexure **A\_4**.

From this list the names of the 3 jurors were narrowed down to:

Sithabile Mathe

Rodney Harber

Luyanda Mphalwa



Mr Cedric Daniels was nominated by UDISA (Urban Design institute of South Africa). It was important that someone with knowledge of urban design be involved who would be able to give input on the frameworks and the appropriateness of the submissions made.

For the individual competitions the following representatives were nominated by the respective bodies:

Kimberley:

DHET Representative: Dr Diane Parker  
 Local Authority Representative: Godfrey Mashope  
 Interim Council Representative: Dr Marcelle Olivier

Nelspruit:

DHET Representative: Dr Engela Van Jaarsveld  
 Local Authority Representative: Prof Chris De Beer  
 Interim Council Representative: Ms Linda Zulu

In the first round of Nelspruit Dr Luyanda Mpahlwa had to withdraw due to personal circumstances. He was replaced by Prof Walter Peters. Prof Peters was also suggested by the competition administrator as a potential juror. Prof Peters adjudicated for both rounds of the Nelspruit competition.

See Annexure **A\_6** for the Jury Profiles.

As per the Standard Rules for a Competition the role of the jury is as follows:

13.1 The jury shall:

- elect a chairperson if a chairperson is not nominated by the promoter;
- note the contents of the brief report provided by the competition administrator when evaluating a submission;
- be autonomous in its decisions or opinions;
- examine the submissions solely on the basis of the evaluation criteria indicated in the competition data;
- disqualify any design which does not conform to the competition brief;
- endeavour to adopt decisions on each individual submission by consensus and where consensus is not achieved, take decisions based on a majority vote with the chairperson having a casting vote;
- record its preliminary ranking of submissions in a report which summarises the jury's discussions and decision making process made according to the merits of each submission, together with its remarks, observations and any points which may need clarification should the submission be implemented;
- in the case of a two stage competition, identify the participants who have made the best submissions or submissions of sufficient quality subject to the provisions of 3.3 to be admitted to the next stage of the design competition; and
- following the obtaining of answers to questions and clarifications from the promoter and advice from technical consultants, if any, prepare a final report and;
- award the prizes indicated in the competition data to the entries; or
- Decide to award additional prizes or not to award a prize or any prize based on the quality of the submissions received and to determine the quantum of such prizes.

Jurors were required to sign declarations they were not aware of any of the participants and that they did not have any interest in the outcome

See Annexures **KIM\_S1\_14; KIM\_S2\_7 & MP\_S1\_14; MP\_S1\_7** for the juror's declarations.

## Running of the Competition:

### Expression of Interest:

The Expression of Interest was uploaded onto the New Universities Website, which was accessible to the public.

Separate notices were sent out by SACAP and SAIA advertising the competitions to all their members- this was done separately for the two competitions. Adverts were also placed in local newspapers in Kimberley and Nelspruit. See Annexures **KIM\_EOI\_1** & **MP\_EOI\_1** for the adverts placed.

The Expression of Interest was submitted in Kimberley and in Nelspruit respectively at the National Institute for Higher Education offices. A representative of the Competition Administrator was present for the opening of the tender boxes on both dates. In Kimberley this was opened by Mark Schaerer on 27<sup>th</sup> May 2013. In Nelspruit Mark Schaerer and Paul Kotze were present for the opening of the tender box on 20<sup>th</sup> June 2013. For the expression of Interest document see annexures **KIM\_EOI\_2** & **MP\_EOI\_2**

Expression of Interest forms were then evaluated in the offices of Michael Scholes and Associate architects. Applications were checked for compliance to ensure that the person Expressing Interest was a Professional Architect registered with SACAP. Any application whose name or registration number did not appear on the SACAP website was checked up with their offices and checked for confirmation. The list of Expression of Interest Annexures **KIM\_EOI\_3** & **MP\_EOI\_3** and contains the details of all those who applied and if they were excluded the explanations.

Once the Expression of interest was verified an email was sent to every successful applicant to a website <http://www.newuniversities.ac.za/competition/> for Kimberley and <http://www.newuniversities.ac.za/competition-mp/> for Nelspruit. Successful applicants were then requested to register as a participant of the Competition in which they confirmed their email address which would be the only method of contact with each competitor. If a successful applicant did not register their email address was checked for errors and revised or follow up emails were sent to them as a reminder to register.

### The Competition Websites

The competition website was used as the tool for correspondence with the competitors. All framework documents, briefs, clarifications etc. were uploaded onto the website. Every time a document was uploaded an email was sent to the registered participants informing them so. A record of each upload was also kept on the website for those who may have registered later on the website.

The only correspondence permitted during the two stages of both competitions was then through the competition website to ensure anonymity of the participants. Competitors could use the "submit your question tab" which automatically sent an email to the Competition administrator and assistants. These questions were collated on a weekly basis and answer three days later. All questions were phrased by the Administrator and sent to the promoter for approval. These Q&A's were done in both stages 1 and 2. Refer to Annexure **KIM\_S1\_8**; **KIM\_S2\_4** & **MP\_S1\_8**; **MP\_S2\_4** for the full list of Q&A.

All answered questions were accessible to all admitted participants of each individual competition. While the Administrator had the prerogative not to answer a question generally only repeat questions were not answered, when they had already been answered.

Records of all uploads by the administrators was kept as well as a record of all queries asked by the participants. See annexure **KIM\_S1\_6** & **MP\_S1\_6**; **KIM\_S2\_2** & **MP\_S2\_2**. The users who registered as participants are all confirmed with their email addresses. See Annexures **KIM\_S1\_7** and **MP\_S1\_7**

Further to the Q&A the Tender documents prepared by Ron Watermeyer and explanatory addenda were posted on the website. Annexures **T\_1**; **T\_2** & **T\_3**.

### **Urban Design Frameworks and Briefing Documents:**

The Urban Design Frameworks for both Campuses were developed and prepared by Ludwig Hansen Architects and Urban Designer. They formed the basis of the competition and were referred to in the briefing documents.

The Urban Design Framework for both the Sol Plaatje University and the University of Mpumalanga were presented to the competitors in their entirety. These included the Development Framework for the University, The recommendation on the seats for the New Universities; the Implementation Plans and the Development and Design Frameworks for both Universities. The documents were not edited by the competition administrators.

See Annexures **KIM\_S1\_1 to 4 & MP\_S1\_1 to 4** for all Urban Framework documents supplied to competitors.

#### **Stage 1:**

The task of the administrators was to edit the stage 1 Brief supplied by the promoter and ensure that the requirements were clear and that there was no ambiguity. Included in the brief was to give a background on the competition and its purpose as well as give an understanding of the context in which the University will be built.

Clear requirements as to what was required were set out in the competition data. These included page setup, no of pages, text size etc. this was done to ensure that the submissions were evaluated on an equal footing as well as for ease of reading for the jurors.

The issue of the anonymity number was queried in the stage 1 submission where it was not clear as to whether the website assigned number was to be used or a user defined number. It was clarified in the Q&A documents, but a decision was made that due to the lateness of the clarification in the process that either would be accepted.

For the Stage 1 Brief see Annexure **KIM\_S1\_5 & MP\_S1\_5**

The stage 1 submissions were made at the NIHE offices in Kimberley and Nelspruit. Attached are the two Stage 1 reports which detail the process of submission and adjudication.

See Annexures **KIM\_S1\_9 & MP\_S1\_9**

The following annexures are referred to in the Stage 1 administrators report:

Jurors declarations: **KIM\_S1\_14; MP\_S1\_14**

Individual jurors score sheets: **KIM2\_1 & MP2\_1**

Interim Scores prior to final vote by the jury: **KIM\_S1\_13 & MP\_S1\_13**

The score spreadsheet confirming the juror's final scores prior to their discussions as to whether a submission is to be selected or not.

Minutes of discussions held between the jurors have been recorded confirming their decision:

Annexures **KIM\_S1\_11 & MP\_S1\_11**.

The outcome of Stage 1 was for the jurors to select up to 10 participants for each competition to proceed to stage 2 of the competition.

All participants were requested to fill in declarations confirming that the work was their own and complied with clause 7.2 of the standard Conditions for a design competition. See Annexures **KIM\_S1\_14 & MP\_S1\_14**. These declarations were used to confirm the email addresses of the participants who were selected to Stage 2. The declarations were kept in separate envelopes and only opened by the competition administrators after the adjudication process.

All participants selected to proceed to Stage 2 were notified by email that they had been selected to proceed. They were all requested to re-register on the website, which all of the 17 participants did so. See attached Addenda **KIM\_S2\_2 & MP\_S2\_2** indicating the confirmation of their registration.

All participants who were not selected to proceed were notified via email that they were not selected. Their access to the competition website was withdrawn.

A record of each stage 1 submission is located in **KIM3 & MP3**

### **The Stage 2:**

Stage 2 briefs for both competitions were set up by Ludwig Hansen Architects and Urban Designers. Included in these documents were the criteria that the promoter wished to get a response to and contained the principles and ideas that they wished explored. The brief for Stage 2 for both competitions was a complex array of accommodation and criteria that would push the participants to explore unique and creative solutions.

The competition Administrators checked and edited the brief to ensure clarity of what was required for their submission. Included were strict guidelines as to what the participant was to submit. This submission amongst others was for a maximum of 6 off A1 pages in a fixed format and a 1:500 scale model.

Stage 2 Brief: see Annexures **KIM\_S2\_1 & MP\_S2\_1**

The stage 2 submissions were made at the NIHE offices in Kimberley and Nelspruit. Attached are the two Stage 2 reports which detail the process of submission and adjudication. See Annexures **KIM\_S2\_5 & MP\_S2\_5**

The following annexures are referred to in the stage 2 administrators report:

Jurors declarations: **KIM\_S2\_7 & MP\_S2\_7**

Individual juror's score sheets: **KIM2\_2 & MP2\_2**

The score spreadsheet confirming the juror's final scores prior to their discussions as to whether a submission is to be selected or not. **KIM\_S2\_10 & MP\_S2\_10**

The ranking information sheeting guiding the jurors as to the outcome of their scoring process: **KIM\_S2\_9 & MP\_S2\_9**

All participants were requested to fill in declarations confirming that the work was their own and complied with clause 7.2 of the standard Conditions for a design competition. See Annexures **KIM\_S2\_6 & MP\_S2\_6** These declarations were used to confirm the email addresses of the participants who were selected to Stage 2. The declarations were kept in separate envelopes and only opened after the adjudication process.

All stage 2 submissions are found in Annexures **KIM4 & MP4**

The jury were requested to prepare a report for each of the competitions: Annexures: **KIM\_S2\_12 & MP\_S2\_12**

### **Tender Evaluation:**

The tender documents were kept by Dr Ron Watermeyer, who assessed each application with regards to Preference and Financial Offer. The clarifications that were issued to the respective competitors are located in Addenda **T2 & T3**

Once the results of the adjudication were finalised the ranking of the submissions was sent to the tender evaluation panel based in Johannesburg. The final Stage 2 declarations were opened by the competition administrators (For Kimberley they were opened by Mark Schaefer and for Nelspruit they were opened by Michael Rayne) These declarations linked the jurors results which related to the anonymity number to the tender documentation which included names of participants. The winners of the competition were not placed in any order and are to be given equal sized framework contracts.

Once the scores had been calculated according to the weighting of 70% design to 30%. The final winners were then confirmed. The tender evaluation reports prepared by Ron Watermeyer are located.

## Winners:

The winners were announced at two separate events:

### Sol Plaatje University

The announcement of the winners was made at the William Humphries Art Gallery in Kimberley on the 18<sup>th</sup> September 2013. The winners in no particular order were as follows:

- Activate Architecture - represented by Michael Magner
- Wilkinson Architects in Joint Venture with Mashilo Lampbrechts Architects and GXY Architects - represented by Chris Wilkinson
- Savage and Dodd Architects - represented by Heather Dodd
- Design workshop: SA - represented by Paul Wygers
- Comrie Wilkinson Cape and Urban Studio JV - represented by Henri Pierre Comrie

See attached the Media Statement issued on the 18<sup>th</sup> September 2013 by the Department of Higher Education Annexure **KIM\_S2\_14**

### University of Mpumalanga

The announcement of the winners for the Architectural design competition for the new university of Mpumalanga was made on the 30<sup>th</sup> October 2013 at the Lowveld Agricultural College in Nelspruit.

The winners in no particular order were as follows:

- Cohen and Garson – represented by Fiona Garson
- Conco Bryan Architects – represented by Llewellyn Bryan
- TC Design Group (Pty) Ltd – represented by Mark Pencharz
- Gapp Architects and Urban Designers (Pty) Ltd – represented by Caron Schnaid

See attached the Media Statement issued on the 31 October 2013 by the Department of Higher Education Annexure **MP\_S2\_14**

### Notification of Participants:

A final email was sent out from the competition website on the 11<sup>th</sup> November 2013 to all persons who had registered for Stage 1 of both competitions. This emailed referred them to the New Universities website where the press release and jury reports were located. All names of the website registered Stage 1 Participants were emailed:

*Dear colleagues,*

*The Final results for the two Architectural Competitions for the Sol Plaatje University in Kimberley and the University of Mpumalanga in Nelspruit have been uploaded onto the New Universities website: [www.newuniversities.ac.za](http://www.newuniversities.ac.za). The Jury reports for both competitions can also be downloaded. Thank you for your participation.*