



ATATÜRK CULTURAL CENTER SCULPTURE CONTEST

Evaluation Meeting Report of the Jury

Atatürk Cultural Center Sculpture Contest Evaluation Meeting of the Jury started on 28.07.2022 at 10:00 in Atatürk Cultural Center Multi-Purpose Hall under the chairmanship of Hüsametin KOÇAN.

- Consultant Jury Süleyman Saim TEKCAN could not attend the meeting due to health problems.
- The members of the jury participating in the evaluation work made a declaration of honesty that they had not seen the projects participating in the competition before and that they did not know the identities of the competitors.
- A total of 81 projects were received.
- All files were checked by the Rapporteur's Office, and pseudonyms were covered and confidentiality was ensured.
- The compliance of 81 projects with the competition specifications was examined. The deficiencies identified were brought to the attention of the Jury. The particulars determined by the Contest Reporting Office are shown below.

Project Registry Numbers	Remarks
01	It was determined by the Rapporteur's Office that the model came in a damaged bag. There is no scale information on the model. In the description of the work, it was seen that the scale of the model was 1/20.
02	It was determined that the design technical report, application deadline plan and cost reports were not delivered. There is no scale information on the model. In the description of the work, it was seen that the scale of the model was 1/20.
03	The scale is not specified on the model. In the description of the work, the scale of the model is specified as 1/10. Electronic parts in the model do not work. It was determined that the cost report and the implementation deadline plan were not delivered.
04	There is no scale information on the model. In the description of the work, it was seen that the scale of the model was 1/20.
05	There is no scale information on the model. In the description of the work, it was seen that the scale of the model was 1/20.
08	There is no scale information on the model. In the description of the work, it was seen that the scale of the model was 1/20.
09	There is no scale information on the model. In the description of the work, it was seen that the scale of the model was 1/20.
10	It has been determined that there is no sheet work in A1 size, there are only photographs of the work in the USB, and the drawings and reports of the visuals are in DWG format. There is no scale information on the model.



12	There is no scale information on the model. In its description, it was seen that the scale of the model was 1/10.
13	There is no scale information on the model. In the description of the work, it was seen that the scale of the model was 1/20.
17	There is no scale information on the model. In its description, it was seen that the scale of the model was 1/10.
18	There is no scale information on the model. In the description of the work, it was seen that the scale of the model was 1/20. It has been determined that there is no implementation deadline plan.
19	It was determined that the identity envelope was open, and it was closed by the Rapporteur's Office. There is no scale information on the model. In the description of the work, it was seen that the scale of the model was 1/20.
20	It was determined that the identity envelope was open, and it was closed by the Rapporteur's Office. There is no scale information on the model. In its description, it was seen that the scale of the model was 1/5.
21	There is no scale information on the model. In the description, the contestant declared that the scale of the model was 1/5.
22	It has been determined that there is no implementation deadline plan.
23	There is no scale information on the model. In the description, the contestant declared that the scale of the model was 1/5.
24	There is no scale information on the model. In the description, the contestant declared that the scale of the model was 1/20. It was determined from the photomontage visuals that the work was positioned in the wrong place by the contestant.
25	There is no scale information on the model. In the description, the contestant declared that the scale of the model was 1/10.
26	There is no scale information on the model. In the description, the contestant declared that the scale of the model was 1/20.
27	There is no scale information or pseudonym information on the model. In the description, the contestant declared that the scale of the model was 1/5. It has been determined that the sheet is not prepared in A1 size, and artwork images and video documents are presented on the USB.
28	It has been determined that there is no photomontage work on the sheet.
29	There is no scale information on the model. In its description, it was declared that the scale of the model was 1/20.
30	There is no scale information on the model. In its description, it was declared that the scale of the model was 1/10.
31	There is no scale information on the model. In its description, it was declared that the scale of the model was 1/5.
33	It has been determined that there are no visual and technical narrative sheets in A1 paper size with the pseudonym in the upper right corner. There are print works in A3 size with the visuals of the work. It has been determined that no photomontage work has been done. The scale is not specified on the work documents or the model.
35	There is no scale information on the model. In its description, it was declared that the scale of the model was 1/20.
36	It has been determined that there is no technical narrative sheet or photomontage work. There is no scale information on the model. In its description, it was declared that the scale of the model was 1/10.



37	There is no scale information on the model. In the statement, the contestant declared that the scale of the model was 1/16. It has been determined that the scale of the model is out of the 1/5, 1/10, 1/20 scale standards requested in the competition specifications. The contestant did not submit a report with the title of the implementation deadline plan.
38	There is no scale information on the model. In the statement, the contestant declared that the scale of the model is 1/10.
39	It was determined from the photomontage visuals that the work was positioned in the wrong place by the contestant.
41	The implementation deadline plan and design technical report have not been prepared. The model scale is not specified.
42	There is no scale information on the model.
43	There is no scale information on the model. In its description, it was declared that the scale of the model was 1/20. It has been determined that the subject of the work and the artist's review of the subject are shown on the sheet.
44	There is no scale information on the model. In its description, it was declared that the scale of the model was 1/5.
45	There is no scale information on the model. In its description, it was declared that the scale of the model was 1/5.
46	It has been determined that the contestant has explained his background in the project reports without including his identity information; these documents were extracted from the project reports by the rapporteur. It has been determined that the design technical report and photomontage work are not included. There is no scale information on the model. In its description, it was declared that the scale of the model is 1/5.
47	There is no scale information on the model. In its explanation, it was declared that the scale of the model was 1/10. It was determined that 2 sheets were received, and it was determined that the sheet on which the photomontage image was placed was not in A1 paper size as specified in the competition specifications.
48	It was determined that he did not submit the project reports under the title of implementation deadline plan and design technical report. There is no scale information on the model. It has been determined that the scale of the model was stated in the project report as 1/20.
49	There is no scale information on the model. It has been determined that there is no implementation deadline plan.
50	There is no scale information on the model. In its description, it was declared that the scale of the model was 1/20.
54	There was no written expression other than a pseudonym on the identity envelope. It was determined by the Rapporteur's Office that it was an identity envelope, the phrase 'ID ENVELOPE' was written on it, and the open envelope was closed.
55	There is no scale information on the model. In its description, it was declared that the scale of the model was 1/20.
57	It was determined from the photomontage visuals that the work was positioned in the wrong place by the contestant.



58	It was determined that the identity envelope was open, and it was closed by the rapporteur. There is no scale information on the model.
59	There is no scale information on the model.
60	There is no scale information on the model. In its description, it was declared that the scale of the model was 1/20.
61	There is no scale information on the model. In its description, it was declared that the scale of the model was 1/10.
62	There is no cost report. It has been determined that the contestant delivered 1/15 partial models.
65	There is no scale information on the model. In its description, it was declared that the scale of the model was 1/5. Photomontage description is not included.
66	There is no scale information on the model. In its description, it was declared that the scale of the model was 1/50. Does not comply with the scale rules specified in the competition specifications
67	There is no scale information on the model. It was stated in the reports that the scale of the model was 1/20..
68	There is no scale information on the model. In its description, it was declared that the scale of the model was 1/10.
69	There is no scale information on the model. In its description, it was declared that the scale of the model was 1/20.
70	There is no scale information on the model. In its description, it was declared that the scale of the model was 1/20.
72	There is no scale information on the model. It has been determined that the implementation deadline plan has not been prepared as a report.
73	The implementation deadline plan has not been prepared as a report.
75	There is no scale information on the model. It has been determined that a sheet in A1 paper size was not prepared as stated in the competition specifications.
76	There is no scale information on the model. In its description, it was declared that the scale of the model was 1/20. It has been determined that a sheet in A1 paper size was not prepared as stated in the competition specifications.
77	There is no scale information on the model. In its description, it was declared that the scale of the model was 1/20.
78	It was determined that the project reports were not delivered. There is no scale information on the model. In its description, it was declared that the scale of the model was 1/20.
80	There is no scale information on the model.
81	There is no scale information on the model. In its description, it was declared that the scale of the model was 1/10.

- The jury excluded the applications numbered 24, 39, and 57 from the competition due to non-compliance with the conditions of the place where the work will be deployed in the contest specifications.
- Other applications were not excluded from the competition due to other issues reported to the Jury by the Rapporteur's Office.

A total of 78 projects were evaluated.



The jury started individual studies at 10.30.

- In the 1st round of elimination;
 - Applications numbered 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,10,11,12,13,14,16,17,19,20,21,23,25,26,27,28,30,31,32,33,35,36,37,38,40,41,45,46,47,49,50,51,52,53,54,56,58,59,63,64,65,68,69,71,72,73,74,78, and 80 have been unanimously disqualified.
- In the 2nd round of elimination;
 - Applications numbered 9,15,22,34,42,61,62,75,76,77,79, and 81 have been unanimously disqualified.
- In the 3rd round of elimination;
 - Applications numbered 29,43,48, and 55 have been unanimously disqualified.
- Applications numbered 18,44,60,66,67 and 70 were selected for the award group.
 - The application registered with the number 67 was unanimously awarded 1st Prize
 - The application registered with the number 66 was unanimously awarded 2nd Prize
 - The application registered with the number 60 was unanimously awarded 3rd Prize
 - The application registered with the number 18 was unanimously awarded Honorable Mention
 - The application registered with the number 44 was unanimously awarded Honorable Mention
 - The application registered with the number 70 was unanimously awarded Honorable Mention.

The reports of the awarded projects are listed below;

Application No 67 – 1st Prize

It was awarded the First Prize (1st) for its harmony with the environment, its innovative approach and its definitive dialogue with architecture, its original, innovative and courageous work, and the fact that it establishes a dialogue with the AKM building as requested in the specification; while at the same time being both oppositional and positive and productive.

However, the jury has some suggestions for the artist and the project in terms of static and life safety measures. These issues will be planned in the future.

Application No 66 – 2nd Prize



The work was evaluated by the jury, and the Second Prize (2nd) was given as a result of the energy created by the work in the space, participation of the audience in the work, and proposed material being environmentally friendly and sustainable, inspiring energy.

Application No 60 – 3rd Prize

It was found valuable in terms of adding the sound element and the air circulation therein to the design, adapting to the vertical rhythm of the building and the rise of the tree. In terms of the relationship between the work and the human (environment-square-AKM relationship), the third place (3rd) was deemed worthy.

Application No 18 – Honorable Mention

Its spatiality, the references it made to the spherical geometry of the main opera hall of AKM and the ceramic wall design by Sadi Diren, were found to be in positive dialogue with the presence of the tree in the area.

Application No 44 – Honorable Mention

It is a very well produced work from a technical point of view. And it has brought a new dimension to the art of sculpture with its light plays. For this reason, it was deemed worthy of honorable mention. It is a technically successful proposition.

Application No 70 – Honorable Mention

It is appreciated that the work establishes a bold relationship with the place and the building.

Regarding the eliminated works, the reasons why the language of the applications did not coincide with the theme and the concept-content relationship were unanimously agreed by the Jury.



T.C. KÜLTÜR VE TURİZM
BAKANLIĞI

AKM
Atatürk Kültür Merkezi

Principal Jury Members

Celeddin ÇELİK

Günseli KATO

Hüsamettin KOÇAN
(Jury Chairman)

Murat TABANLIOĞLU

Osman DİNÇ

Seçkin PİRİM

Şakir GÖKÇEBAĞ

Consultant Jury Members



T.C. KÜLTÜR VE TURİZM
BAKANLIĞI

AKM
Atatürk Kültür Merkezi

Alper ÖZKAN

Süleyman Saim TEKCAN

Reserve Jury Members

İsmail EĞLER

Mehmet Ali UYSAL

Rıfat ŞAHİNER

Tansel TÜRKDOĞAN

Rapporteurs

Başar ÇAVUŞOĞLU

Elanur EVCİ ERCAN

Elif BOZKURT