DIF
DEBRECEN

NEW EXHIBITION BUILDING OF THE HUNGARIAN NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM IN DEBRECEN, ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN COMPETITION

FINAL CLOSING REPORT

CONTENTS

1 / BASIC DATA

Pursuant to Section 25 (3), point d), of Government Decree 310/2015 (X. 28.)

Date: 19 March 2025

Location: Registered seat of Debreceni Infrastruktúra Fejlesztő Kft. (4025 Debrecen, Széchenyi u. 31)

Annex: Written record on the details of the authors of the winning entries

CALL FOR DESIGN COMPETITION (EXCERPT)

THE CONTRACTING AUTHORITY:

Name: Debreceni Infrastruktúra Fejlesztő Kft.

Address: 4025 Debrecen, Széchenyi u. 31.

E-mail address: info@dif.debrecen.hu

The subject and purpose of the Design Competition

The subject of the Design Competition

New exhibition building of the Hungarian Museum of Natural History in Debrecen

An invitational international Design Competition reaching the EU threshold value, for the preparation of the architectural design documentation of the new exhibition building of the Hungarian Museum of Natural History in Debrecen.

The subject of the Design Competition is the design of the new Exhibition Building of the Hungarian Museum of Natural History and its immediate surroundings, as well as its integration into the Nagyerdő (Great Forest) of Debrecen and the creation of connections with the Culture Park. In the course of the Design Competition, the Contracting Authority is looking for a design concept that implements the design objectives and design programme set out in the call for the Design Competition to a high architectural standard and that, in the course of the design and implementation, results in a high-quality built and natural environment, in the spirit of sustainability.

With a gross floor space of approximately 22,900 m^2, the main function of the Exhibition Building will be to house approximately 7,200 m^2 of exhibition space, 5,800 m^2 of public circulation space, reception and circulation areas, 2,800 m^2 of office space for museum management and researchers, 2,500 m^2 of technical, operational and mechanical space, 4,600 m^2 of parking and 14,000 m^2 of internal garden and outdoor space.

During the preparation of the project, the potential need emerged for temporary accommodation for visiting researchers and/or students. As the precise requirements for the implementation of this function have not yet been finalised, tenderers will need to design a flexible space of 700 m^2 for this purpose. A possible solution could be a building part attached to the main building, which the Contracting Authority

may decide at a later stage to either implement or abandon. Alternatively, the accommodation function could be located within the main building in such a way that it can be easily modified or abandoned at a later stage. The final decision on the implementation the accommodation shall be at the discretion of the Contracting Authority.

The aim of the Design Competition

The aim of the Design Competition is to select the most suitable architectural firm or consortium of architectural firms to implement the design programme as published in the Documentation of the Design Competition (hereinafter: the "Documentation"). The design of the new building should be innovative, of high architectural quality and a high level of functionality, serving the present and future functional needs. The Contracting Authority invites architectural proposals and designs that are compatible with the existing urban and natural environment, infrastructure and community spaces.

As a result of the Design Competition, the Contracting Authority wishes to conclude a design contract with the designer awarded the first prize, as a result of a negotiated procedure without prior publication of a contract notice, in accordance with Section 98 (5) of the Public Procurement Act, for the preparation of design documentation for the design of the new exhibition building of the Hungarian Museum of Natural History in Debrecen.

The nature of the Design Competition

An invitation-based international Design Competition reaching the EU threshold value.

In the first phase of the procedure, the Contracting Authority will decide on the suitability of the applicants to perform the contract, and will select the suitable Applicants, up to the specified number of Applicants to be invited, to submit entries to the Design Competition. During this first phase of the procedure, the Contracting Authority may not request Applicants to submit entries, nor may Applicants submit entries to the Design Competition.

The nature of the Design Competition: open during the pre-qualification phase and restricted during the invitational phase for the submission of entries. In accordance with the relevant legislation in force, the Contracting Authority may also directly invite applications for the present Design Competition. Apart from the directly invited tenderers, all interested parties may submit a pre-qualification application (application to participate) in the first phase of the Design Competition. Directly invited tenderers must also demonstrate their eligibility in the same way as other tenderers. In the pre-qualification round, in addition to directly invited and qualifying tenderers, those applicants will be invited for the design phase who meet the eligibility criteria, have submitted a valid pre-qualification application, and are ranked appropriately in the order of the tenderers, as based on the number of available slots. The number of tenderers in the second phase of the present Design Competition is 14, of which 10 are directly invited. If the directly invited tenderers submit an invalid pre-qualification application or fail to submit a pre-qualification application, additional eligible applicants will be invited up to the predetermined limit number of slots.

SHORT DESCRIPTION OF THE PROCEDURE, NUMBER AND STATUS OF ENTRIES SUBMITTED

- The Design Competition was announced by Debreceni Infrastruktúra Fejlesztő Kft. (4025 Debrecen, Széchenyi u. 31.) (hereinafter: the "Contracting Authority").

- The call for participation in the design competition titled "**New exhibition building of the Hungarian Museum of Natural History in Debrecen**" was published on 16 September 2024 under no. 552765-2024 in the *Official Journal of the European Union* (TED) and in issue 179 of *Közbeszerzési Értesítő* (Hungarian Public Procurement Bulletin) under no. KÉ16819/2024.

- In the first phase of the procedure, the Contracting Authority decided on the suitability of the applicants to perform the contract and selected the suitable applicants, up to the predetermined number, who were invited to submit an entry to the Design Competition (a total of 14 tenderers, of which 10 were directly invited, i.e. a further 4 were invited on the basis of their ranking). Therefore, the nature of the Design Competition was open during the pre-qualification phase and restricted during the invitational phase for the submission of entries.

- The rules of procedure for the Design Competition and the conditions for participation in the same were set out in the Documentation, which was made available, from the publication of the Design Competition call to applicants, on the electronic system designated for the implementation of the Design Competition procedure (mtm.debrecen.hu).

- Applicants who downloaded the Documentation were invited to submit questions on the call and the tender process during the participation phase until 23 September 2024. The Jury, acting on behalf of the Contracting Authority, answered the questions submitted within the time limit set.

- The deadline for the submission of applications was 2 pm on 2 October 2024.

- The announcement of the results of the participation phase took place on 29 October 2024.

- Based on the decision of the Jury, the Contracting Authority invited the following qualified applicants to submit their entries in the design phase, up to the pre-determined number of tenderers:

Directly invited tenderers

1. **Lina Ghotmeh Architecture** (France, 75 rue de da Fontaine Au Roi – 75011)

2. **Mecanoo International B.V.** (the Netherlands, Oude Delft 203, 2611 HD Delft) és **AVESTA GROUP** (France, 20 rue de la Condamine, 75017 Paris), joint tenderers

3. **Sauerbruch Hutton GvA** (Germany, Lehrter Strasse 57, 10557 Berlin), **Gustafson Porter + Bowman** (United Kingdom, 1 Cobham Mews, Agar Grove, London, NW1 9Sb) and **Fernezelyi Kft.** (1112 Budapest, Érdi út 10. 2. épület), joint tenderers

4. **3XN A/S** (Denmark, 1437 Copenhagen K, Kanonbådsvej 8.) and **NAUTES Építészműterem Kft.** (1025 Budapest, Pentelei Molnár utca 12., 1. em. 5), joint tenderers

5. **Bjarke Ingels Group A/S** (Denmark, Sundkaj 165, 2150 Copenhagen) and **Vikár és Lukács Építész Stúdió Kft.** (1052 Budapest, Szervita tér 5), joint tenderers

6. **3h építészíroda Kft.** (1094 Budapest, Krisztina krt. 37)

7. **BORD Építész Stúdió Kft.** (1068 Budapest Felső erdősor 3. III/22)

8. **Építész Stúdió Kft.** (1016 Budapest, Krisztina krt. 71. 5. em.)

9. **M-Teampannon Építészmérnöki Kft.** (1053 Budapest, Veres Pálné utca 7)

10. **BÁNÁTI + HARTVIG Építész Iroda Korlátolt Felelősségű Társaság** (1117 Budapest, Fehérvári út 38)

Tenderers invited based on the result of the ranking

1. **ZAHA HADID ARCHITECTS** (United Kingdom 101 Goswell Road London EC1V 7EZ) and **Robert Gutowski Architects Kft.** (2071 Páty, Kossuth Lajos u. 113), joint tenderers

2. **TSPC Technical Supervision and Planning Consulting Hungary Kft.** (9022 Győr, Dunakapu tér 7) and **TSPC Mérnökiroda Korlátolt Felelősségű Társaság** (9022 Győr, Dunakapu tér 7), as well as **China Architecture Design & Research Group** (China, No.19, Chegongzhuang Street, Xicheng District, Beijing), joint tenderers

3. **Napur Architect Kft.** (1033 Budapest, Laktanya utca 33/a.) and **GINA Barcelona International Architects Group A.I.E.** (Spain, Gran Via Carlos III 84, 9-3, 08028 Barcelona), joint tenderers

4. **Középülettervező Zártkörűen működő Részvénytársaság** (1023 Budapest, Lublói u. 2)

- The Contracting Authority organised a site visit to the development site on 14 November 2024, from 10:00 a.m., where the Tenderers received information about the site.

- Applicants invited to submit an entry could submit questions about the call and the tendering process until 19 November 2024. The Jury, acting on behalf of the Contracting Authority, answered the questions submitted within the time limit set.

- With a view to the questions received, the documentation and the dates of the tender phase were modified once.

- The opening of the entries received took place on 10 February 2025 at 2 pm, via the electronic system available for the management of the Design Competition procedure (mtm.debrecen.hu) from the publication of the call for the Design Competition.

Participation

- **14 entries were submitted by the deadline.**

- No entries were submitted after the deadline (late).

The evaluation of the entries

- The evaluation of the entries was carried out, at the request of the Contracting Authority, by the **Jury**, with the assistance of experts from a wide range of disciplines (architecture, museology, tourism and visitor experience consultant, museum operation, sustainability, exhibition, economic, legal and public procurement, technical, public utilities, investment, price and cost experts).

- All members of the Jury and all experts have signed confidentiality agreements to protect the interests of the Applicants and the Contracting Authority.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE JURY

Persons with voting rights:

Nr.	Name	Role	Position	Delegating organisation
1	Zsolt Bernert	Chairperson	Director-general	Hungarian Natural History Museum
2	Lóránt Perényi	Co-Chairperson	Deputy State Secretary for Architectural Strategy	Ministry of Construction and Transport
3	László Papp	Member	Mayor	Municipality of Debrecen
4	Maria Buhigas	Member	Chief architect	Barcelona City Council
5	István Gábor	Member	Chief architect	Municipality of Debrecen
6	Stefano Casciani	Member	Architect	Contracting Authority
7	Mirko Zardini	Member	Architect	Contracting Authority
8	Pauline Asingh	Member	Exhibition Director	Moesgard Museum (Denmark)
9	Béla Pecsenye	Member	Architect	Hungarian Chamber of Architects
10	Zoltán Győrffy	Alternate member:	Architect	Hungarian Chamber of Architects

Persons without voting rights:

Nr.	Name	Role	Position	Delegating organisation
1	Dr. Bernadett Paróczai	Compliance with public procurement rules	Legal expert	Contracting Authority
2	Dr. László Puczkó	Visitor experience expert	Tourism and visitor advisor	Liget Budapest Project
3	Sára Schilling	Museology expert	Museum programme director	Liget Budapest Project
4	Anna Bencze	Sustainability expert	Head of sustainability	Contracting Authority
5	Dóra Gáva	Transport expert	Senior expert	Contracting Authority
6	Attila Nagyhaju	Architectural expert	Head of urban planning	Municipality of Debrecen
7	Ágoston Szabó	Cost expert	Managing director	BON CONTROL Kft.
8	Szilvia Papp	Landscape architectural expert	Landscape architecture	Contracting Authority
9	Dr. László Szende	Museology expert	Head of Division	Ministry of Culture and Innovation Division of Museums
10	Balázs Jelinek	Investment expert	Deputy gereral director of operations	Liget Budapest Project
11	Ágota Buzár	Museology expert	Deputy director for general affairs and public education	Hungarian Natural History Museum
12	Ferenc Kun	Expert in compliance, architecture, and massing	Managing director	Contracting Authority
13	László Krajczár	Public procurement expert	Deputy head of department	Municipality of Debrecen
14	Martha Thorne	Architect	Consultant	Contracting Authority

COMPLIANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS SET OUT IN THE DESIGN COMPETITION CALL

- The requirements of the Design Competition call have been complied with.

THE EVALUATION CRITERIA OF THE ENTRIES

The Jury has evaluated each application **according to the same criteria.**

The evaluation criteria, as set out in the Design Competition call and in Documentation,

are as follows:

Environmental integrationConnection to the urban landscape

- Dialogue with surrounding buildings
- Dialogue with the Great Forest
- Access to the building
- Orientation
- Mobility system: for all types of vehicles and pedestrians

Architecture and massing

- The overall architectural effect of the building, the proportion of its masses
- Unique, innovative external and internal appearance and character of the building
- Spatial relationships of the building
- Architectural quality of the building spaces

Technology and function

- Visitor experience
- Museum technology solutions
- Functional links
- Accessibility of the site by different means of transport and accessibility of the building and its interior

Sustainability

- Energy efficiency
- Water efficiency
- Indoor comfort and accessibility
- Sustainable transportation solutions
- Material use
- Waste management
- Plot use and ecology
- Prevention of pollution

Costs

- Expected building construction cost
- Expected building maintenance cost

2 / SUMMARY EVALUATION

Pursuant to Section 25 (3), point e), of Government Decree 310/2015 (X. 28.)

The aim of design competitions is to call for such unique, normative architectural solutions that will encourage higher performance and at the same time freer architectural thought, and help to find the solution that best expresses the intentions of the Contracting Authority.

Also in the case of the present competition, the Contracting Authority is looking for the best design to implement the design programme set out in the competition documents and, on this basis, for the most suitable designer to design the new exhibition building of the Hungarian Museum of Natural History in Debrecen, in order to achieve a high architectural and functional solution that best meets the requirements set out in the Documentation.

The Jury (hereinafter: the "Jury") carried out its evaluation work taking into account the assessment of the panel of experts (hereinafter the "Experts"). The Experts analysed the entries in working groups according to their areas of expertise and the evaluation criteria. The Experts' textual and scored evaluations were available for the Jury to study in the days preceding the plenary sessions, as well as in the form of summary presentations on the first day of the plenary session.

The Jury analysed the 14 entries one by one with the help of the Experts in order to get an overall picture, and selected the entries it considered worthy of further analysis and possible future awards or purchase. The selected entries were discussed in more detail by the Jury, taking into account the evaluation criteria, and then the Jury made its proposals for the awards and purchases.

The aim of the Contracting Authority was to select an entry which would create a competitive facility in Hungary and Europe, using unique architectural solutions and presenting the content of natural sciences in a forward-looking form. When realised, the Exhibition Building of the Hungarian Natural History Museum will be a new location for the leading cultural and scientific institution in Central Europe, and one of the most modern and largest natural science exhibition spaces in Europe.

In the course of the evaluation of the entries, the Jury paid particular attention to the possibility of meeting the following criteria:

- a facility presenting natural science content in a forward-looking form, independently capable of attracting visitors from Hungary and abroad to Debrecen, with links to the Culture Park (zoo and amusement park) and to other functions already located in the Nagyerdő (Nagyerdei Stadium, Sziget-kék Thematic Park, Sports Centre, Békás Pond, Aquaticum);

- functioning as a community space where families and people who want to learn and have fun, as well as representatives of the scientific and museum professions can meet, and connecting to its surroundings and serving as an open space on an everyday basis for those living in the area;

- applying unique, revolutionary architectural solutions, serving as a defining cultural and scientific community institution in Central Europe, being one the most modern, innovative and environmentally aware buildings in Europe, providing a venue for world-class exhibitions, a place satisfying the requirements of the present and the future and a venue setting museum-going trends.

The Jury took a holistic approach to the architectural answers to the questions set out in the design programme and to the urban design solutions. From an urbanistic perspective, the Jury identified the integration into the urban fabric and the harmonious incorporation of the proposal into the natural environment of the Great Forest as important criteria. The Jury welcomed solutions where the proposal contributes to the development of Debrecen by creating new urban community spaces.

In terms of the building, the Jury gave preference to entries that could convey the messages of the Hungarian Museum of Natural History, reflecting the identity of the institution. The Jury evaluated the emblematic architectural formulations, designs that encourage exploration, the coherence of the interior and exterior spaces, functional appropriateness, but also sustainability and budgetary aspects.

The 14 entries received can be divided into three main categories in terms of their basic concept and massing:

1. Camouflaged, hiding, blending into the landscape (entries 02, 03, 06)
2. Modular, massive, expansive (entries 01, 04, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 14)
3. Isolated, compact (entries 05, 10, 12, 13)

Overall, the Jury appreciated the energy and creativity invested by the design architects, which resulted in exciting and valuable entries. In assessing the buildings, the Jury took into account whether any shortcomings in the entries could be corrected during the subsequent design phases without altering the basic concept and character of the buildings.

Taking into account all the criteria, the Jury considered the competition to be successful and recommended entry no. 2 for implementation, which was awarded the 1st prize. The Jury also proposed to award 2nd and 3rd prizes in recognition of the architectural quality of these entries. Two further entries were proposed to be purchased in recognition of their outstanding detail solutions.

3 / EVALUATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL ENTRIES
(DETAILED PROFESSIONAL EVALUATINOS)

Pursuant to Section 25 (3), point f), of Government Decree 310/2015 (X. 28.)

ENTRY 1

The architectural program of the entry is based on the synthesis of "soft cells"; in addition, its concept seeks to emphasise the city's historical character. However, the message derived from the mathematical model is difficult for visitors to decode and is unduly complex in its concept and architectural design. While its striking appearance may be described as an interesting experiment, the building overstretches its function and is not in harmony with its surroundings. The design is underdeveloped from the point of view of urban planning; it does not integrate the northern boulevard, turns away from the city, and functions as an isolated object independent of its surroundings. The raster-like spatial organisation, divided into six blocks, results in a large-scale, hall-like building, as well as spaces fragmented by a modular system of structured, repetitive elements, along which the individual functions can be strung, but their transparency is significantly reduced. The vast expanses of glass in the spatial system of the EXPO-style building also define the character of the individual exhibition spaces, creating spaces that raise concerns from an artefact conservation point of view. Shading the large glass surfaces in exhibition spaces is essential for artefact protection, yet this directly contradicts the membrane-like aesthetic of the soft cell elements that define the building's core concept.

The design contains some forward-looking solutions in terms of functional details (well-conceived artefacts logistics, exhibition spaces of appropriate geometry and ceiling heights, services with good external connections), at the same it does not pay enough attention to the integration with the surrounding natural environment.

ENTRY 2

The integration of the building into its surroundings and its character are fully in line with the mission of the institution. Its massing, scale, and shape integrate smoothly into the Great Forest's landscape, exerting minimal visual impact on the surrounding area. A building that is both hidden and discreet yet has a striking optical character from a horizontal viewpoint.

The formation of the artificial hill evokes associations with "kurgans", burial mounds characteristic of the Great Plains region. As a result, beyond the associations with science, the design also conveys cultural and identity-strengthening messages through the cross-shaped floor plan and the kurgan reference.

The building, with its spectacular and attractive appearance from almost all perspectives, slowly reveals itself, inviting exploration and evoking emotions. The green roof garden of intersecting strips of land offers a wealth of educational opportunities, and the fusion of interior and exterior spaces makes it a truly open community building, which could be envisaged as a prominent recreational space for families and a wide range of social groups. At the same time, the main entrance, positioned at the intersection of the southern ribbons, is under-represented, and the expected open community space and museum function both require more pronounced exploration.

The clean design principle of maintaining proportion and scale in the basic concept results in a clear allocation of functions, but at the same time it also implies constraints. The functions of the building wings around the central core are clear and well-defined, and the radial arrangement of the exhibitions allows for a well-coordinated flow of visitors; however, it also means that the central circulation core occupies one of the most valuable areas of the building.

In the case of less favourable solutions due to the building geometry, it is recommended to reconsider certain parts of the design, in particular the glass surfaces and shading of the exhibition spaces, as well as the layout and accessibility of the offices. The existing functional anomalies can be addressed in the design without compromising the basic concept.

Despite the tactful, naturalistic concept, the positioning of the design in the urban structure and the landscape architectural solutions proposed are still undeveloped and will need to be improved during the design process. In addition to identifying itself as an institution with a natural history character already through its appearance, the entry offers outstanding solutions in terms of visitor experience and its additional potential could place the new exhibition building on the cultural map of Hungary and the region as an iconic and worthy home of the Hungarian Museum of Natural History in Debrecen.

ENTRY 3

Inspired by the forces of nature, the entry attempts to integrate the building and its surroundings with an attitude of blending into the environment. However, the solution, which evokes glaciers, crystals and mountain peaks, is completely alien to the lowland environment. The most striking feature of the building is the steel-framed glass roof, inspired by crystal-like forms in nature. The entire design is subordinated to this roof, resulting in an overly dynamic architectural statements in terms of the floor plan. The undeniably unique and striking character of the building often leads to self-serving design solutions, even though the concept could allow for a lighter approach. Although the core concept suggests organic integration into the surroundings, its landscape and urban integration are less resolved, making the building feel arbitrarily placed on the site. The boundaries between exterior and interior spaces are ambiguous, visitor flow is poorly managed, and the organisation of entrances and exits lacks clear logic. In the interior, the use of indoor water features is problematic, both in terms of operation and in protecting artefacts.

Overall, the entry presents an interesting and markedly articulated vision, but it is completely lacking in harmony with both the landscape and its function.

ENTRY 4

The design is inspired in its basic concept from integration with nature and from ancient Hungarian legends, which it attempts to bring to life through organic forms. The conceptual ideas are remotely relevant to the purpose of the competition. The entry sends a misguided architectural message, altough itis making striking and powerful architectural statements. The design is not in harmony with its the natural surrounding.

It proposes a highly fragmented and articulated system, which is unified and connected into a complex through the consistent use of stone cladding. The concept contains valuable elements in its detail solutions, and it successfully addresses the possibilities for off-site (outdoor) events, with a forward-thinking placement of permanent and temporary exhibitions, as well as the linking of event and lecture halls. However, there are serious issues with the narrow design of key indoor routes, the separation of museum pedagogy spaces, the lack of dedicated artefact transport routes, the cluttered staff entrance, and the open office solution.

Apart from a strong emphasis on biodiversity, the proposal does little to reflect the identity of the museum, and its striking proposals do smoothly not blend in the Great Forest.

ENTRY 5

The massing of the proposed building is clearly defined and not intrusive. Thanks to its orientation suggests harmonious relationship to its natural environment. The design separates and connects at the same time: it communicates well with its immediate surroundings, while at the same time interrupting the ecological permeability of the green space units. The graceful mass of the building bounces off its surroundings and bisects the forest environment along a linear axis.

The long, curved massing of the building makes it easy to organise the various functions. The geometry of the permanent and temporary exhibition spaces has been carefully designed, offering an excellent solution for the layout of the workrooms/offices and the museum pedagogical spaces. Service elements that are not directly related to the museum's function can also be made available independently and operated outside of museum opening hours. However, the absence of a representative foyer does not fully meet the expectations of the community function.

The sculpture-like building structure, the sensitive massing and the subtle solutions that characterise the building are certainly noteworthy, while the pavilion-like arrangement of the various functions is logical and transparent.

ENTRY 6

Despite the grandiosity of the design, it attempts to respect the landscape; the building and its surroundings strive to be visually and physically unified.This ambition, however, is compromised by the prominent framing of the paved promenade strips that continue from the façade, which – despite the green roof design – disconnect the building from its surroundings. The design places a strong emphasis on exterior mapping with many forward-looking proposals, but offers an oversized solution in terms of paved areas. By looking at the entire Great Forest area in a complex way, the entry proposes a number of urban improvements, creating a new urban space whereby the building and its surroundings can become a greatnew community space for Debrecen.

The building's striking appearance, with its pronounced inclined façade wall and the new wide promenade in front, creates a spacious arrival area and further highlights the main entrance. The tilted façade is impressive but less unique; the design of the building does not clearly correspond with its initial purpose, as it could potentiallyhouse many rather different functionsindependently from its location. The simple internal cubature of the building provides a good framework for the functional design. It offers an appropriate response to the problems of artefact management and the parameters of the permanent exhibition spaces are well-conceived. The ramped design of the multi-level biodiversity unit allows for multi-perspective access to the exhibition. Innovative solutions are sometimes also coupled with problematic ideas: the interactive forest section is an excellent idea, but its placement within a museum building is unrealistic due to conservation concerns.

The holistic, urbanistically focused approach and the strong basic concept of the proposal are certainly noteworthy. Still the needed refinements and changes could fundamentally modify the scale and functional concepts of the proposed design.

ENTRY 7

The concept aimed for an architectural form integrated into the landscape, but the large roof elements encroach on the surroundings. From an urbanistic point of view, the design considers the wider context, proposing a fine urban design gesture for the organisation of transport, exploring transport links from both the south and the north. The organisation of the space is subtle with its level dips, but at the same time its articulation results in an EXPO-like complex, dry and devoid of any local character. The flow of visitors between the separate building blocks is difficult, and accessibility is often hard to ensure.

The artefact logistics inside the building, using steep ramps, and also mixing with goods delivery and visitor routes, is particularly disadvantageous and dangerous. There are good solutions for the building's relationship with the park/garden and catering units, creating opportunities for outdoor events. The permanent exhibition spaces are well separated, their functional parameters are appropriate, and the artefact spaces are thoughtfully arranged.

Despite the excessive mass of the building, the entry contains a number of valuable architectural ideas and high-quality solutions, but overall it has a commercial feel with little conviction. It does little to communicate the mission of the institution.

ENTRY 8

Inspired by the Hortobágy National Park, the form and monumental size of the building symbolise the power of nature. Despite its grandiosity, it has a human scale, invitingly elegant, but at the same time somewhat disproportionate. The contradictions are evident in almost every element: beautifully drawn in its mass but unpolished in other ways, explosive but subtly poetic, introspective yet haughty. The work subordinates everything to the roof structure that is spectacular from a bird's-eye view, but then the uniqueness and character of the building is less asserted from the visitor's street-level perspective. One of the most exciting elements of the entry is the partially walkable roof garden, but the realistic feasibility of this is highly questionable without compromising the visual concept. The roof element draws the garden into the building through the three opening points, bringing nature closer to the visitor.

Despite the large floor area, the architectural concept leads to compromises in the floor plan, which results in functional challenges. The possibility of external access to services independent of the museum function is advantageous, and the positioning of the individual functions is mostly well resolved, but the superficiality of the design means that many solutions cannot be evaluated in any meaningful way. Nevertheless, the potential of the design is evident.

ENTRY 9

The applicant has developed its architectural programme around the "core of life" motif. The interlocking cylindrical building blocks stand apart from their surroundings, appearing as alien in the landscape of the Great Forest. The entry does not put make forward-thinking urban or landscape architectural proposals; instead, it focuses on clichéd design solutions for the building mass and suggests unfavourable approaches in terms of opening up the space. The stairs and bleachers leading to the green roof may mislead visitors, as their distinctive appearance creates the impression of a main entrance, causing confusion in visitor orientation.

The strict structural principle of circles and hexagons, which form the basic concept, on the one hand, delineates the different functions, but on the other hand, sometimes creates constraints. Because of this consistent structural principle, the main compromise is the unusual geometry of the temporary exhibition space. In case of most functions, the hexagonal-grid division provides a workable layout, although it subordinates function to architectural gesture for the sake of consistency.

ENTRY 10

The architectural concept of the entry was inspired by the intertwining with the landscape, but also by the different periods of the Earth's history. Services and functions not directly related to the museum are located in separate buildings, Which have different character and thus cause an overall heterogeneous picture. By outsourcing them, a new urban space is created and external access to services is ensured, independent of the museum's opening hours.

The design of the main building lacks emblematic and unique character; it is compact, but appears randomly placed in its surroundings.

The spacious foyer of the main building, both on the ground floor and on the exhibition level, makes excellent use of the impressive effect of the display storage as an interior design element. The geometry, positioning and accessibility of the exhibition spaces are well thought out, and their separation is a key feature of the interior design. The visitor's routes leading to them are also clear. The central space of the ground floor lobby houses a number of functions (museum pedagogy, science playroom, escape rooms) that require a more separated layout, while the shop and café are only indicative, located in the open space. The exhibition storage opposite the main entrance does not make sense as the central element of the lobby.

Despite the value of its detailed solutions, the entry as a whole presents a haphazard image without identity.

ENTRY 11

The design is inspired by the organic-crystalline structure of the mineral rhodocrosite, which intends to blur the boundaries between the natural landscape and the built environment through its structural mapping. The organic connections in the mineral's cross-section are reflected in the building's layout and spatial organisation. The spatial units thus created provide an excellent way of grouping the building's individual functions into separate, occasionally confusing, yet organically interwoven blocks. The garden connections and the sporadic presence of internal gardens suggest the function of the building, but overall the entry does not sufficiently communicate the institution's identity. The design is a detailed vision with many creative ideas, but the creative energy invested is devalued by the somewhat cluttered and over-used spatial connections. Alongside the kinetic spatial organisation, the entry pays close attention to functional usability, the management and the transport routes of artefacts. The logistics of the exhibition spaces are well managed, but the amorphous geometry of the spaces is sometimes not advantageous. The sliding mobile wall solution for the external boundary walls of temporary exhibition spaces results in inadequate exhibition space. The proposals for the design of the workrooms are outstanding, but the opening of the immersive space, the conference area and the permanent exhibition into a narrow common anteroom makes them difficult to use.

The internal green bays also enhance the visitor's sense of comfort in the spaces within the building, and the exciting internal and external connections are reinforced by the organic massing. The longitudinal mass of the building, oriented north-south, is horizontally expansive, but also has the value of creating a new urban space with a water feature and inviting visitors to visit through a new community function.

ENTRY 12

The concept of the entry uses strong abstraction to evoke the kurgans, or burial mounds typical in the region, continuing the tradition and highlighting its values. The design places the building sculpturally atop the pedestal-like hill, but instead of integrating it into the landscape, it elevates it above the surroundings, making it the dominant focal point. This approach is not at all in keeping with the museum's mission, nor does the character of the building reflect anything that would make it identifiable as a natural history museum. The same clean but rather neutral, generic character is reflected in the interior design. From

the point of view of the visitor experience, it is extremely disadvantageous both inside and out. The block-like geometry promises a functionally more manageable spatial organisation, in which the whole range of museum functions and services are organised around the central atrium. The functional parameters of the exhibition spaces are well thought out, the artefact handling flow is ensured, and the workrooms, although cellular in design, have the disadvantage of being windowless, facing internal areas.

The entry honestly embraces the building's architectural nature, aiming to remain concrete through a compact design and simple massing while proposing functionally sound solutions. However, this approach is not in line either with the need to integrate the building into the Great Forest nor with the message of the institution's mission.

ENTRY 13

The design principle of the entry is based on centrality, following a spatial design inspired by the rings of a tree. The circular plan gives an equal appearance from all directions, but the internal garden created by the opening to the north-east integrates into the natural fabric of the Great Forest and allows access to spaces with different functions. However, exploration at one point does not sufficiently open up the building, which thus encloses its own inner world and science in an introverted manner. Its appearance suggests a kind of archetypal approach, compact, exciting but introspective. This kind of architectural attitude implies that the building lives its life as an entity in its own right and is not in sufficient dialogue with its surroundings. The simple, enclosed, ring-shaped massing lends itself to a variety of false associations of function (commercial building, stadium, municipal library, etc.) and the building is therefore less able to successfully represent an institution open to all social layers and age groups. At the same time, the central arrangement provides a practical internal organisation of the space, the exhibitions can be walked around, and the continuous row of spaces allows for a variety of layout principles. However, the narrow internal corridor makes it difficult to manage larger groups, and the restroom blocks integrated into the exhibition spaces pose a risk to the artefacts. Also, logistical routes for handling artefacts are not ideal due to the mixing with visitor traffic. The same problem also applies to the delivery of goods. In addition to the above functional anomalies, the central layout offers a number of excellent solutions, and in many respects offers positive opportunities.

The entry, with its intimacy and internal mapping, is a fundamentally likeable, elegant and compact architectural response to the programme of the Hungarian Museum of Natural History.

ENTRY 14

The dominant element of the design concept is the geometrically fragmented terraced structure, which creates a number of uncontrolled terrace connections in the building without forming a green surface. The building is overdimensioned, its sprawling mass has limited appeal, and it does not encourage to visit. The building elements, fragmented along a rigid structural concept, give the impression of a disorderly city in the natural environment. The provocative, large-scale building is an alien body in the institutional and green fabric of the Great Forest. The exterior and interior of the work are coherent, their design characterised by geometric fragmentation. The design of the central lobby offers a good point of orientation, the access to the permanent exhibition spaces attached to it is clean and practical, and the internal circulation of the works of art is well-conceived. The temporary exhibition spaces, on the other hand, are fragmented, hard to use and unclear, as is the overall organisation of the ground floor space. The design with multiple points of entry is associated with difficulties in terms of visitor flow and operation.

The entry is an interesting experiment, but its concept and its self-serving, wasteful solutions do not provide an adequate response to the question of environmental integration, nor do they convey the mission of the institution.

4 / THE RANKING OF THE ENTRIES
(AWARDED AND PURCHASED ENTRIES)

Pursuant to Section 25 (3), point g)-h), of Government Decree 310/2015 (X. 28.)

Based on the unanimous decision of the Jury:

THE FIRST PRIZE IS AWARDED TO

- ***Entry 2***

  The amount of the 1st prize award: ***EUR 60,000***

Based on the unanimous decision of the Jury:

THE SECOND PRIZE IS AWARDED TO

- ***Entry 13***

  The amount of the 2nd prize award: ***EUR 40,000***

Based on the decision of the Jury:

THE THIRD PRIZE IS AWARDED TO

- ***Entry 5***

  The amount of the 3rd prize award: ***EUR 10,000***

Based on the unanimous decision of the Jury:

The FOLLOWING ENTRIES ARE PURCHASED:

- ***Entry 6***

The amount of the purchase prize ***5,000 EUR***

- ***Entry 11***

  The amount of the purchase prize: ***5,000 EUR***

Reasons:

Several of the entries submitted contained ideas that could be of use to the Contracting Authority and designs that met the criteria of the call for entries to such an extent that the possibility of realisation could realistically be envisaged on the basis of the documented design.

For these reasons, the Jury decided to award prizes to three entries and to purchase two.

The architectural solution of **the entry awarded the first prize** with its concept of green ribbons of land integrated into the landscape is fully in line with the mission of the institution. It is perfectly suited to the role of a new urban community space, and it represents the idea of an open institution, inviting discovery and open to all social strata. The interior design of the building and the use of materials are coherent with the messages the museum wishes to convey. It reinforces the natural science aspects with creative solutions, while at the same time managing visitor flows and providing a well thought-out solution for artefacts logistics.

The design is outstanding in terms of visitor experience and can be further developed with modifications that do not affect the basic concept.

In case of the **entry awarded the second prize**, the Jury appreciated the tenderer's sophisticated architectural solutions and compact response to the programme of the Hungarian Museum of Natural History. The harmonious and exciting solution of the central spatial organisation makes it stand out from the rest of the entries, and its elegance and coherent interior design are of great value. However, the Jury considers that the enclosed massing of the building is less able to successfully represent an institution open to all social layers and age groups than the entry awarded the first prize.

The entry awarded the third prize was a sculptural architectural response with a curved massing. The design is of a high standard, with a coherent concept that makes the organisation of the various functions well-structured, offering a sensitive and valuable solution. The pavilion-like concept is elegantly restrained from an architectural perspective, while being functionally logical and transparent. It also has the added value of proposing a northern access option in addition to a southern orientation of its transport links. In addition to recognising the architectural merit of the design, the Jury ranked it behind the entries awarded the first and the second prizes due to its incomplete integration into the environment and the building's inability to convey a distinct identity.

The entries selected for purchase contain conceptual, architectural, or urbanistic elements in their formulation that include details which the Jury recognised for their value.

In case of **entry no. 6 proposed for purchase**, the Jury acknowledged the holistic approach to urban design that applies to the entire area of the site. The Jury considered the proposal for the complex development of the Great Forest and its surroundings, including the creation of a north-south promenade and the idea of establishing a new urban space, as worth considering, and therefore recommended the entry for purchase.

As regards **entry no. 11 proposed for purchase**, it stood out from the rest of the entries for its precise elaboration, its dynamic spatial organisation, as well as its outstanding detail solutions. In recognition of the valuable elements of the entry, the Jury recommended it for purchase.

5 / RECOMMENDATIONS

Pursuant to Section 25 (3), point i) and k), of Government Decree 310/2015 (X. 28.)

The Jury found that some of the submitted competition entries include conceptual, architectural, or urban design solutions that make them worthy of purchase. Entries deemed to have outstanding merit were awarded a prize. The ranking order of the entries, the amount of the prize awards, and the amount of the purchase prices are set out in point IV of the Final Report.

On the basis of the evaluation carried out and the detailed analysis of the entries, the Jury recommends that, following the Design Competition procedure, the Contracting Authority invite the first prize winner to submit an offer, in a negotiated procedure without prior publication of a contract notice, with a view to selecting the final designer and the final design suitable for implementation.

Pursuant to Article 98 (5) of the Public Procurement Act and Article 28 of Government Decree No. 310/2015 (X. 28.), in accordance with the above recommendation of the Jury to the Contracting Authority, the author of the entry awarded the first prize is invited to submit an offer, in a negotiated procedure without prior publication of a contract notice to take place after the Design Competition procedure, noting that in the further design process, it should:

- endeavour to examine the environmental integration of the building in a broader context, also from an urban structure point of view: with a landscape architectural proposal for the entire block, reorganising pedestrian and other traffic, developing urban design elements;
- seek a more representative design of the main entrance;
- propose a solution to the adverse consequences from a museology perspective of the glass walls of the exhibition spaces without changing the character of the building;
- seek to optimise the connectivity and functional design of the office spaces;
- seek to optimise certain functional connections.

MINUTES

of the final report of the design competition procedure for the
“New Exhibition Building of the Hungarian Natural History Museum in Debrecen”

Date: March 27, 2025, 9:00 a.m.

Venue: Debreceni Infrastruktúra Fejlesztő Kft. (4025 Debrecen, Széchenyi u. 31.)

Subject: Lifting the anonymity of the competition entries

Pursuant to Section 25 of Government Decree No. 310/2015. (X.28.), the contracting authority lifted the anonymity of the entries after accepting the documents recording the professional evaluations (final report/evaluation minutes), based on which the applicants' data are recorded as follows:

EVALUATION NUMBER	APPLICANTS' DATA
I. PRIZE – 02.	**BIG – BJARKE INGELS GROUP A/S // Vikár és Lukács Építész Stúdió Kft.**
II. PRIZE – 13.	**3XN A/S // NAUTES Építészműterem Kft.**
III. PRIZE – 05.	**Középülettervező Zártkörűen Működő Részvénytársaság**
AWARDED PURCHASE – 11.	**M-Teampannon Építészmérnöki Kft.**
AWARDED PURCHASE – 06.	**BORD Építész Stúdió Kft.**
01.	BÁNÁTI + HARTVIG Építész Iroda Korlátolt Felelősségű Társaság
03.	TSPC Technical Supervision and Planning Consulting Hungary Kft. // TSPC Mérnökiroda Korlátolt Felelősségű Társaság // Architecture Design & Research Group
04.	Lina Ghotmeh Architecture
07.	Napur Architect Kft. // GINA Barcelona International Architects Group A.I.E.
08.	ZAHA HADID ARCHITECTS // Robert Gutowski Architects Kft.
09.	3H ÉPÍTÉSZIRODA Kft.
10.	Sauerbruch Hutton GvA // Gustafson Porter + Bowman // Fernezelyi Kft.
12.	Építész Stúdió Kft.
14.	Mecanoo International B.V. // AVESTA GROUP

Prepared by: Dr. Bernadett Paróczai, Legal Expert

Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum
Közgyűjteményi Központ
Magyar Természettudományi Múzeum

Debrecen

DIF
DEBRECEN