

COUNCIL OF EUROPE CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Strasbourg, 26 January 1973

SG/GT/Bât. (72) PV 17

Or. Fr.



COE078587

MINUTES

of the 17th meeting of the Working Party to study the problem of
Council of Europe buildings (1) held in Paris
on 12 December 1972

The Chairman opened the meeting at 10.30 a.m. and stated that Mr. Amatucci and Mr. Peyrot were unable to attend because of other professional commitments.

I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

[SG/GT/Bât. (72) OJ 17]

The agenda was adopted as appended (Appendix II).

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 16th MEETING

[SG/GT/Bât. (72) PV 16]

Mr. Hilpert pointed out that, at the 16th meeting, he had asked the Secretariat whether the expenditure on renovation of the Oblate Fathers' building remained within the limit of the funds allocated by the Committee of Ministers. He had been told that this was so. Both his question and the reply should be recorded in the minutes.

This was agreed.

The minutes of the 16th meeting were approved without further amendment.

./.

(1) See list of participants at Appendix I.

III. EXAMINATION OF THE ARCHITECT'S FINANCIAL REPORT (1)

The Chairman pointed out, firstly, that in March 1971, when the general design on which the building plans had been based had been submitted to the Working Party, he had voiced his scepticism as to whether it was possible to erect the building within the limit of 70 million FF (October 1970 prices) laid down by the Committee of Ministers. The conclusions of the architect's financial report now before them confirmed his view. This was regrettable.

Mr. Bernard acknowledged the truth of the Chairman's comments but pointed out that the floorspace provided for in the plans, which were based on the operational requirements stated by the Secretariat, was greater than that estimated in the programme drawn up by the Working Party in 1967. This partially explained why it had not been possible to contain the cost of the project within the limit of 70 million FF.

There were two basic reasons for the increase in floorspace:

- (a) the Committee of Ministers' decisions to authorise, on the one hand, construction of an extra floor of offices and, on the other hand, the provision of additional interpretation booths in the Assembly Chamber and 11 of the 14 committee rooms, so as to enable the European Parliament to use 7 working languages.

These two decisions entailed an increase of 6,800 m² in gross floorspace;

- (b) the fact that, in the absence of any plans, the 1967 floorspace programme had been based on average space norms. Indeed, the Working Party had taken the precaution of pointing out that the floorspace estimate, particularly with regard to the ratio between net space and gross space, was only approximate and should not be binding on the architect.

On the basis of the functional programme supplied by the Secretariat, he had had to increase the floorspace provision in the parliamentary and public areas. The space norms for the offices and committee rooms, on the other hand, had proved adequate. Lastly, because of the addition of an extra storey, the floorspace provided for technical plant and car parks had had to be increased. As a result, the floorspace requirements had increased by about 10,000 m² (3,500 m² for the superstructure and 6,500 m² for the substructure).

For these two reasons, the present plans comprised 16,800 m² more floorspace than the programme on which the figure of 70 million FF had been based.

This being so, it was not surprising that the estimated cost of construction was higher than the ceiling laid down by the Committee of Ministers.

./.

(1) See Appendix III.

Lastly, it must be repeated that insufficient allowance had been made in the amount of 70 million FF for price increases between May 1967 and October 1970. As he had stated in his report of 2 June 1971, the allowance made had been about 18% too low.

If all these factors were taken into account, the cost of construction was not very different from the estimates made by the Working Party in 1967. Furthermore, because of the representative character of the building, interior decorating and finishing were more expensive than for an ordinary building. For this reason, he had estimated this expenditure separately in order to draw special attention to it.

In conclusion, the planned building was very compact in terms of the floorspace, which was very close to the figures given in the theoretical programme drawn up by the Working Party; the estimated cost of construction proper was not much more than the Working Party's estimate. This was particularly true if it was borne in mind that the amount of 70 million FF laid down by the Committee of Ministers at October 1970 prices had been insufficiently updated in relation to 1967, the date when the Working Party had drawn up its theoretical cost estimate.

The Director General pointed out that the main purpose of this meeting was to consider financial aspects of the project in order to prepare a report for submission to the Committee of Ministers. The conclusions arrived at must be clear and unequivocal. The architect's financial report had been studied by the Secretariat and called for several comments.

A statement by the Director General analysing the problem in detail, is set out in Appendix IV.

The Chairman thanked Mr. BERNARD and Mr. DAUSSIN. Before inviting discussion, he wished to single out a number of principles suggested by the foregoing statements.

He did not agree with the architect's assertion that prices were determined by contractors and not by the architect. The cost of a building was determined by:

- its volume;
- its floorspace;
- the surface area of the outer walls;
- the materials used.

These four elements were determined by the architect and his choice accordingly affected the cost of construction.

In March 1971 he had expressed grave doubts whether costs could be kept within the ceiling laid down. He had also pointed out to the architect that the shape of the Assembly Chamber would involve expensive acoustic treatment. However, he agreed with the Director General that it was possible to reduce the expenditure envisaged by the architect without impairing the soundness and quality of the building.

Considering the architect's proposals lot by lot it was found that in some cases the variants suggested would permit substantial savings, though without bringing the cost within the prescribed ceiling.

To sum up, the Working Party was faced with the following alternative:

As it was not possible to contain costs within the limit laid down because of the basic design of the building, either the plans must be altered, or, as the architect had unfortunately clung to his optimistic vision, the plans must be executed economically.

He himself thought that it was not possible to alter the plans at this stage and that the project must go ahead with a new, realistic financial limit which the architect must respect.

Mr. VIVIEN acknowledged that the Chairman had expressed reservations as to whether it was possible to execute the project within the limit of 70 million FF (October 1970 prices). Although he had not expressed a view on this point at the time, as he had been attending a meeting of the Working Party for the first time and all the architectural decisions had already been taken, he had been inclined to agree with the Chairman. However, the design of the building completely satisfied the requirements of the Council of Europe and the European Parliament and its quality was worthy of the two institutions. This being so, there could be no question of altering the plans. The project must go ahead but savings must be made. However, the architect must not be restricted to a fixed amount, as he (Mr. Vivien) was convinced that savings could be made by adopting the variants proposed by the architect. Lastly, there were disadvantages in systematically choosing economic alternatives. Very often what was gained in investment was lost in running costs. With regard to the proposed savings on decoration, caution was to be recommended as, in his view, it was a combination of decoration and architectural design which created the atmosphere of a building. At all costs one must avoid creating a mediocre building.

Mr. HILPERT said that building costs depended on two factors:

- (a) the price of building materials and components;
- (b) the discounts obtained from firms.

With regard to discounts, he recalled his previous proposal that provision be made not only for the variants laid down by the architect but also for variants suggested by firms, which might prove even less expensive.

He fully agreed with Mr. VIVIEN that savings could be made on the basis of the various alternatives and that the effect of the choice of alternatives on running costs must not be overlooked.

Lastly, he considered that the Working Party was not responsible for the increase in floorspace and that the Committee of Ministers' attention should be drawn to this point so that their authorisation for the increase might be obtained.

The Director General stated that Mr. HILPERT'S proposal concerning variants proposed by firms had been adopted by the Secretariat and the tender documents had been drawn up accordingly.

Mr. VIVIEN said that Mr. HILPERT's proposal had certain disadvantages, particularly with regard to the comparison of tenders. It was not always clear what firms' proposals covered and it could emerge that certain work was not covered when it was already in progress. This carried a risk of interruption in construction.

Mr. WILBY could not conceal his disappointment at the statements made by the Director General and the Chairman. The architect's estimate for construction work proper was not very different from the estimates made by the Working Party on the basis of January 1967 prices. If price rises between then and January 1973 were taken into account, the comparison to be made was between the figure of 125 million FF (January 1973 prices) estimated by the architect and the estimate of 114 million FF (January 1973 prices) drawn up by the Working Party.

In his view, the difference between the architect's overall estimate and that of the Working Party was due to the items which the Working Party had not taken into account. The two types of expenditure should not, therefore, be confused. The Committee of Ministers should be informed of, firstly, the cost of construction proper and, secondly, the cost of the entire project.

Lastly, this was one of the most important architectural projects in the history of modern Europe and the building constructed must be worthy of the institutions it was to accommodate. In his view, the present political climate was favourable. Any impairment of the quality and visual character of the building must be avoided.

The Chairman observed that each member of the Working Party had a different view:

- (a) Mr. VIVIEN thought it necessary to be reasonable and make savings, but without restricting the architect's freedom too much;
- (b) Mr. HILPERT thought that savings could be made by means of alternatives suggested by the architect or by firms. He had not given an opinion on the fixing of a new ceiling;

- (c) Mr. WILBY thought that the comparison between the theoretical cost and the actual cost, as estimated by the architect, was satisfactory and that no decision could be taken until tenders had been examined;
- (d) he himself thought that the Committee of Ministers should be told that the Working Party had been faced with the alternative of altering the plans or of proceeding with the project as planned, but subject to stringent economies, and had decided in favour of the second course, with a new ceiling.

The Director General urged the Working Party to take a decision which would not cause work to be interrupted and which would enable the Committee of Ministers to fix a new ceiling authorising the Secretariat to sign contracts for an amount above 70 million FF.

The Chairman suggested fixing a new ceiling, the increase in which in relation to the figure of 70 million FF would be justified by the three following factors:

- (a) the increase in floor space due to decisions taken by the Committee of Ministers since December 1970 (additional office floor - additional interpretation booths) and to the functional programme;
- (b) price increases since October 1970. At the same time, attention should be drawn to the 18% deficiency in the updating of the estimate at 1 October 1970;
- (c) the representative character of the building which justified the use in the more imposing parts of more expensive building components than those used elsewhere.

In the light of these three factors the new ceiling might be fixed at 130 million FF (1 January 1973 prices, including fees). To this should be added a further amount of 16 million FF (1 January 1973 prices) for work not included in the ceiling referred to above.

Mr. VIVIEN suggested that the Working Party's report to the Committee of Ministers should state that some of the 1967 floorspace estimates were inadequate, particularly those for the public and parliamentary areas.

Mr. WILBY, although he did not agree with restricting the architect financially, would go along with the majority so that the report to the Committee of Ministers might be unanimous.

Mr. BERNARD thanked the Working Party and agreed to the new ceiling, while pointing out that this made his task even more difficult.

The Chairman's proposal was approved unanimously.

IV. EXAMINATION OF THE ARCHITECT'S PROPOSALS FOR INTERIOR DECORATION OF THE ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, COMMITTEE ROOMS AND RESTAURANTS

Mr. BERNARD presented a series of models and drawings for the Assembly Chamber, the Committee of Ministers' meeting room, the committee rooms, restaurants and public lobbies, together with a written description. Members of the Working Party were asked for their comments.

The Director General expressed some doubts regarding the architect's proposal for seating in the Assembly Chamber. He thought that the idea of rotating seat-desk units might be attractive from the aesthetic point of view, but seats of this type were not used in any parliament. He feared that the rotating mechanism might prove fragile. In the opinion of the Assembly authorities, conventional seats would be preferable.

Mr. HILPERT thought that the idea of rotating seats was interesting not only from the aesthetic point of view but also for practical reasons, as it would enable the number of seats to be increased without major alterations. Lastly, he did not think that the novelty of the idea was sufficient reason to dismiss it out of hand.

Mr. WILBY agreed that the proposal had the advantage of flexibility and would avoid giving an impression of emptiness when seats were unoccupied. Two or three seats could be made and tried out by parliamentarians for themselves in Strasbourg.

Mr. BERNARD fully appreciated the Director General's reluctance but would like to explain the idea to parliamentarians himself.

Mr. CLAMER pointed out that the sound technicians' booths in the committee rooms needed to be raised slightly above floor level so as to give the technicians a clearer view of speakers. This might raise problems with regard to the height of the ceiling. He asked the architect to look into this matter.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

During his earlier statement (see Appendix IV) the Director General had also given information on the following two points:

- (a) tendering schedule
- (b) progress of foundation work.

A. Tendering schedule

The Working Party had been kept informed of the difficulties encountered by the architect in supplying specifications for the ten main lots.

The Chairman regretted that it was necessary to amend the schedule once again because the architect had failed to meet the deadlines. However, he suggested that the Working Party approve the proposed new schedule as it would not entail interrupting work on the site, owing to the extension of the contractual time allowed for the foundation work (see B. below).

This was agreed.

The new timetable would be as follows:

- 13 January 1973 : final date for submission of tenders
- 15 January 1973 : opening of tenders
- 19 February 1973 : submission to the Working Party of the architect's interim report on tenders
- 15 March 1973 : award of contracts for the main fabric and the remainder of the ten lots put out to tender
- end March 1973 : submission by the architect of the tender specifications for the remaining lots
- end April 1973 : submission of tenders for remaining lots
- June 1973 : award of remaining contracts.

B. Progress of foundation work

The Director General gave a progress report on the foundation work (see Appendix IV).

Mr. BERNARD explained that, as a result of additional test probes on the site, the inspecting engineers had decided to increase the number and length of piles and to alter their diameters. They had also required 147 additional piles for the restaurant. As a result, the total number of piles had been increased from 773 to 975. This had increased the volume of work by 40%, which justified extension of the time allowed by 107 calendar days beyond the original date of 15 December 1972.

The Chairman said that the Working Party was faced with two separate problems:

- (i) the time allowed for the contract needed to be extended owing to the increase in the amount of the work;
- (ii) work was behind schedule by comparison with the original rate.

On the first point, the contractor was not responsible. On the second, however, the contractor was entirely responsible as he had not deployed the resources necessary to complete the work on time.

In conclusion, it was reasonable to extend the time allowed for the contract, but the contractor must be warned that he would have to pay the fines specified in the contract if he did not meet the new deadline.

Mr. VIVIEN agreed with the Chairman and proposed that monthly progress reports should be made in addition to the weekly site meeting reports.

The Chairman also considered that this firm should not be allowed to tender for the other lots.

o

o

o

On conclusion of their discussion the Working Party agreed to the Secretariat's proposals for the extension of the time allowed under the contract for foundation work.

VI. TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING

The Working Party decided to meet in Paris on 19 and 20 February 1973 at the office of Mr. Henry BERNARD, to examine his interim report on the tenders received.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.

A N N E X E I

A P P E N D I X I

LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS (1)

BELGIQUE
BELGIUM

M. A. de GRAVE, Président
Directeur Général des Bâtiments
de l'Etat
Ministère des Travaux Publics
Résidence Palace
155 rue de la Loi
BRUXELLES 4

REP. FED. D'ALLEMAGNE
FED. REP. OF GERMANY

M. Knud HILPERT
Ministerialrat, Dipl. Ing.
Bundesministerium für Raumordnung
Bauwesen und Städtebau
53 BONN-BAD GODESBERG
Martin-Luther-Kingstrasse Nr. 8

FRANCE

M. Pierre VIVIEN
Architecte en Chef des Bâtiments
Civils et des Palais Nationaux
Grand Palais - Porte C
Avenue Franklin Roosevelt
75008 - PARIS

ROYAUME-UNI
UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. G.T. WILBY
Senior Estate Surveyor
Ministry of Public Buildings and Works
Directorate of Estate Management Overseas
Whitgift Centre
Wellesley Road
CROYDON
Surrey CR9 3LY

Architecte
Architect

M. H. BERNARD
Inspecteur Général des Bâtiments Civils
et des Palais Nationaux
44 Avenue d'Iéna
75 - PARIS 16e

./.

- (1) MM. Amatuucci (Italie) et Peyrot (Suisse) se sont excusés.
MM. Amatuucci (Italy) and Peyrot (Switzerland) apologised for absence.

SG/GT/Bât. (72) PV 17

Appendix I

Annexe I

Conseil de l'Europe
Council of Europe

Secrétariat

Etaient également présents
Also present

- ii -

M. A. DAUSSIN
Directeur Général
Chargé de l'Administration et des Finances

M. R. CLAMER
Chef de la Division des Services
Techniques et des Conférences

M. J.A. TSIMARATOS

M. OVTCHNIKOV
Ingénieur en Chef du Bureau
d'Etudes CECOB

M. P. d'HAUTHUILLE
Collaborateur de l'architecte

A P P E N D I X I I

WORKING PARTY TO STUDY
THE PROBLEM OF COUNCIL OF EUROPE BUILDINGS

AGENDA

of the 17th meeting held
at Mr. Bernard's office in Paris,
46 Avenue d'Iéna, at 10.30 a.m.

1. Adoption of the agenda /SG/GT/Bât. (72) OJ 17 /
2. Approval of the minutes of the 16th meeting /SG/GT/Bât. (72) PV 16/
3. Examination of the architect's financial report
dated 22 November 1972
4. Examination of the architect's proposals for interior
decoration of the Assembly Chamber, committee rooms and
restaurants
5. Any other business
6. Time and place of next meeting

A P P E N D I X I I I

COUNCIL OF EUROPE BUILDINGS

ARCHITECT'S REPORT

I. INTRODUCTION

As the Architect appointed by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe in June 1970 for the new buildings to be erected in Strasbourg, I consider it necessary at this stage to submit the following general report comparing the plans with the programme and setting out the cost of the project.

- o -

Work on the Strasbourg site, which began with the ceremonial laying of the foundation stone on 15 May 1972, has now been in progress for six months and most of the work has been put out to qualified firms in the member States for tender.

We are now approaching the moment of truth when the contract prices will be known.

Before the contracts are negotiated and signed, however, top-level decisions must be taken, in full knowledge of the facts, regarding the standard of interior design, fitting out and decoration required for an international building which must exemplify and symbolise intergovernmental co-operation - though this does not mean it must be ostentatious. These decisions are necessary in order to guide architects and designers in their planning and choice of materials and in order that the responsibilities of each in this project, by which they will all be judged, may be clearly defined in advance.

Although there will always be differing, not to say conflicting, opinions as to the choice of architecture or design, clarity as to the general approach is essential in order that all the problems can be brought out into the open and dealt with as a whole.

- o -

./.

Obviously, whatever decision is taken will have economic and financial consequences. However, it is the Architect's duty to put questions for the policy-makers to answer and to suggest solutions accordingly, even if some of the work has to be staggered over a period for financial reasons. It must be realised that such an arrangement is not without its drawbacks; although some types of external work can be readily deferred, it is much more difficult to postpone interior work which, if it is not done in the proper sequence and before the building is occupied, entails numerous piecemeal jobs resulting in constant disorder.

- o -

To begin with, I cannot forget that before being designated as Architect I had the honour to be Chairman of the Working Party set up under Committee of Ministers Resolution (66) 21 to study the problem of Council of Europe buildings and I well remember the study made by that international group of experts and the conclusions they arrived at in their report of 3 May 1967, especially with regard to the requirements to be met in the years ahead, the space norms for the various types of office and the estimated cost of the project.

In commenting on the project, therefore, it is necessary to go back to the beginning in order to single out the crucial factors.

- o -

II. METHOD

The method adopted has been:

- to take the net space laid down in the official programme of September 1971, together with the extra storey of offices and the revised provision for interpretation booths;
- to multiply these net space figures by the co-efficient proposed in the 1967 Working Party's report (≈ 1.8) for converting net space into gross space;
- to compare the resulting figure with the total gross space provided for in the plans now in course of execution;
- to multiply the figures specified in the programme and those incorporated in the plans by the m² prices given in the 1967 report (separate prices for substructure, superstructure and laying-out of approaches);

- to update these prices by means of the official weighted indices for the period from 1 January 1967 (cf. 1967 report) to 1 January 1973, the approximate date on which tenders will be opened;
- to compare these figures with those of the appended cost estimates, of which 67% are based on quantity surveys (10 trades) and the remaining 33% approximate figures;
- to compare these figures with the funds allocated;
- to infer comments and draw conclusions;
- to estimate further expenditure to be incurred in order to complete the project and make the premises ready for use.

- o -

III. COMPARISON OF FLOORSPACE

A. PROGRAMME

(1) <u>Substructure</u>	<u>Net</u>	<u>Gross</u>
car parks	8,400 m2	9,600 m2
stores - machine rooms and fitted-out premises	7,000 m2	12,600 m2
Total		22,200 m2
(2) <u>Superstructure</u>		
original programme	24,277 m2	43,698 m2
additional office storey	3,700 m2	6,300 m2
additional space for interpretation booths (1)	276 m2	496 m2
		50,495 m2

./.

- (1) Booth space in the September 1971 programme is based on obsolete standards; the programme allows 360 m2 net for 106 booths, i.e. 3.40 m2 per booth. The official standard is ≥ 6 m2, i.e. 636 m2 instead of 360, a difference of 276 m2 net.

TOTAL ACCORDING TO THE PROGRAMME = 72,695 m2 gross

(3) Laying-out of approaches = 3,000 m2

B. PLANS

The floorspace figures according to the plans are as follows:

(1) Substructure	22,080 m2 gross
(2) Superstructure	52,318 m2 gross

TOTAL ACCORDING TO THE PLANS = 74,398 m2 gross

(3) Laying-out of approaches = 7,000 m2

C. COMPARISON

A comparison of the two figures of 74,398 m2 and 72,695 m2 shows that the estimate has been exceeded by 2.3%, which may be explained as follows:

- The 1967 Working Party's report spoke clearly of an "estimate", which could be no more than an indication of the cost, as no plans had been drawn up for a specific building - and such plans must be seen as a whole.
- There are virtually only three items where the space requirements have been exceeded:

(a) the common areas (entrance hall and public sector).

These areas, specified as 245 m2 net (i.e. 440 m2 gross) in the programme, have been expanded to 2,550 m2 gross in the plans.

One has only to look at the density of the buildings, the way the various parts interlock and the large number of users of the premises, to realise that this amount of space - resulting from actual plans - is by no means excessive, but is indeed necessary, not to say cramped, like the site itself.

The areas set aside for the public represent about 1,300 m2 gross of this total, as against the 180 m2 provided for in the programme.

Who could possibly say that this amount of space, where contact will be made between the organisation and members of the European public thanks to lectures, exhibitions, textual and audio-visual displays, is too much? A mere glance at the plans shows that it is not. Apart from the common entrance hall, the public will occupy only a minute part of a lower ground floor.

- (b) Because of the imperative need for a built-in car park at the two basement levels and the presence of groundwater at a depth of 1 m, the main entrance to the common hall had to be placed at 6 m above natural ground level. For this reason, access to the building had to be via a raised forecourt. It is accordingly essential to build the first part of this forecourt immediately. It will later be extended to the West to join up with the gardens after demolition of the present 'A' Building.

This first part will be 11.50 m wide and 78 m long and will be on two levels, each with an area of 900 m². This will increase the capacity of the car park by 50 cars, i.e. from the original 300 unanimously regarded as inadequate, particularly since the addition of an extra storey of offices, to 350 places.

- (c) Lastly, mention should be made of the provision, for reasons of climate, of a low-cost, semi-sunken covered walk between the main building and the restaurant block.

The approach area to be laid out will depend on the general plan adopted.

- o -

Apart from these differences, the approved plans follow the programme in almost every detail and hence completely satisfy the quantitative requirements.

- o -

IV. COMPARISON OF COSTS

A. THEORETICAL COST OF THE PROGRAMME

If we apply to the programme floorspace the gross m² prices specified by the 1967 Working Party at early 1967 values, viz. 600 F per m² gross for the substructure, 1,400 F per m² for

the superstructure and 500 F per m² for the laying-out of approaches, but subtract fees (6.50%) and taxes (12%) for the sake of uniformity with the basis for the present estimates, we arrive at the following figures:

(1) Substructure:	22,200 m ² x 494 F	=	10,966,800 F	
(2) Superstructure:	50,495 m ² x 1,152 F	=	58,170,240 F	
(3) Laying-out of approaches:	3,000 m ² x 417 F	=	1,251,000 F	
	(1.1.1967 prices)		70,388,040 F	excl. fees and taxes

If this "programme cost" is multiplied for purposes of comparison by the proportional rise in the official weighted indices between 1.1.1967 and 1.1.1973 (i.e. official indices up to June 1972, the most recently published index, and extrapolated figures for the next six months) (1) we arrive at the following result:

70,388,040 F x 1.6 = 112,620,864 F excl. fees and taxes (1.1.1973 prices)

B. THEORETICAL COST ACCORDING TO THE PLANS

If the same unit prices at the same date are applied to the plans, the result is as follows:

22,080 m ² gross x 494 F	=	10,907,520 F	
52,318 m ² gross x 1,152 F	=	60,270,336 F	
7,000 m ² (laying-out of approaches)		2,919,000 F	
Total cost according to plans		74,096,856 F	excl. fees and taxes (1.1.1967 prices)

If this "theoretical cost according to plans" is revised in the same way by means of the official weighted indices between 1.1.67 and 1.1.1973, the result is as follows:

74,096,856 F x 1.6 = 118,554,970 F excl. fees and taxes (1.1.1973 prices)

./.

- (1) The rise in the Bas-Rhin index would give a figure of 1.56, the rise in the Seine index 1.63. We have taken an average.

C. PRACTICAL COST ACCORDING TO THE PLANS

Now that agreement between the plans and the programme has been established beyond dispute, making allowance for the differences in floorspace explained above, it is interesting to compare these figures with the current estimate of costs according to the priced bills of quantities based on preliminary quantity surveys for 2/3 of the work and on statistical estimates for the remaining lots, for which the papers are in preparation.

These estimates total:

125,630,000 F excl. fees and taxes (1.1.73 prices)

Allowance has been made in this amount for contractors' discounts averaging about 7%.

A further estimated amount of 1,400,000 F must be added for the necessary simply laid out approaches and mains connections, giving a total of:

127,030,000 F. excl. fees and taxes (1.1.73 prices)

D. ACTUAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION

The actual cost will be known in a few months' time when tenders have been received.

V. EVALUATION OF ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURE

It should be noted that the amount of 127,030,000 F excl. fees and taxes (1.1.73 prices), does not include the following items:

- Demolition of 'A' Building
- Refurbishing of 'B' Building
- Extension of the car park for 350 cars
- Laying-out of gardens in their final form.

Estimates for these items are appended.

Nor does the amount include the cost of purchasing and converting certain furnishings and equipment, such as:

- Light fittings
- Extension of automatic telephone exchange
- Additional telephones
- Simultaneous interpretation equipment
- Kitchens and restaurants
- Documents conveyor

The cost of these items is estimated by the Council of Europe Secretariat at 16,000,000 F, excluding taxes (1.1.73 prices).

VI. FINANCE - FUNDS ALLOCATED

In October 1970 the Committee of Ministers, on receipt of the French Government's offer of a loan of the same amount, decided to fix the cost of the work at 70 million francs, excluding taxes, based on the 1967 Working Party's estimate. However, in order to allow for rises in costs, the new amount was made exclusive of tax, which had been included in the 1967 figure.

It must be pointed out that officially costs rose by 30% between 1967 and 1973, while the amount of tax payable in 1967 was only 12%. In plain language, this means that the amount specified by the Committee of Ministers was 18% lower than the original estimate (cf. 1967 Working Party's report).

This serious difficulty was indeed stressed in the Architect's report presenting the preliminary plans to the Working Party in 1971. In the appendix dealing with the financial estimate, I expressed the strongest reservations regarding the amount fixed at 70 million francs excluding taxes but including fees. In its report of 21 July 1971 (CM (71) 110) to the Committee of Ministers, the Working Party acknowledged the truth of my remarks regarding the inadequate allowance made for rising prices.

When an international working party of six experts has spent two years working out technical and financial solutions to a building problem, there is obviously no chance of achieving the same objectives with 18% less money.

The amount will in any case need to be reconsidered.

VII. IMPROVEMENT OF INTERIOR FINISHING AND ACOUSTICS

For the last two years, the architects and engineers have been vainly trying to square the circle in their efforts to reconcile draconian financial requirements with the quality expected of such a building. They have been reduced to preparing design after design, specification after specification, and to drawing up a large number of variants, between which a definite choice can be made when they have been priced by the prospective contractors.

Accordingly, two kinds of estimate are given below:

- first, estimates based on a proper treatment of the exterior of a building with adequate air-conditioning, but finished very simply as regards interior decoration;
- secondly, estimates based on the same facade treatment and air-conditioning, but incorporating the interior finishing which would seem suitable for this type of building.

Hence, Appendix B refers to "extra cost" for completing the interior finishing; however, one must not be misled by the word "extra" - the additional cost is necessary if the building is to be suitably finished.

Moreover, we did not think it wise to leave the outside walls bare, as this would allow a process to begin from the outset which it would be impossible for technical reasons to reverse later.

The extra cost referred to, for interior finishing and soundproofing, totals 20,716,600 F (1.1.73 prices) (cf. Appendix B) and increases the total from 127,030,000 F to:

147,746,600 F excluding fees and taxes

It should be remembered in this connection that the 1967 Working Party described their estimate as approximate, since they had no plans to go on, and, although it seemed sufficient for adequate premises, the international nature of the building demanded additional decoration by the member States (cf. 1967 Working Party report).

- o -

Lastly, in order to give an idea of the total cost of developing the Council of Europe site, we thought it desirable to estimate the cost of improving 'B' Building, of possibly extending the underground car park for 350 cars, of laying out the gardens and constructing the forecourt and the two footbridges. These estimates are set out in Appendices C and D.

This work could be done at a later stage.

- o -

VIII. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I should like to draw attention to the acuteness of the problems raised in this report; they require a single solution and must not be tackled piecemeal, since architecture is a whole. The solution ultimately adopted will inevitably be translated into reality, as the building cannot but be the reflection of the decisions taken.

APPENDICES

/ A / (1) QUALITY OF MATERIALS FOR MAIN TYPES OF WORK

/ A / (2) ESTIMATED COST (ALL TRADES)

/ B / - IMPROVEMENT OF INTERIOR FINISHING AND
SOUNDPROOFING

/ C / - WORK TO BE DONE ON EXISTING BUILDINGS

(1) DEMOLITION OF 'A' BUILDING

(2) REFURBISHING OF 'B' BUILDING

/ D / - EXTERIOR WORK

/ E / - ESTIMATE FOR COMMITTEE ROOM AND LOBBY
FURNITURE

QUALITY OF MATERIALS FOR MAIN TYPES OF WORK

(Basic specifications and proposed variants)

The attached cost estimates for each type of work (Appendix A-2) are based on the following general specifications (further details may be found in the detailed specifications and bills of quantities).

Lot 1 - PILES

as per contract

Lot 2 - MAIN FABRIC - MASONRY - REINFORCED CONCRETE

- Basic specification: Substructure and outer walls in granite.

- Variants:

- (1) LABRADOR granite
- (2) "Alta-Quarzite"
- (3) Prefabricated architectural concrete elements (lower cost)
 - (a) White cement with mineral pigments
 - (b) Grey "CPA" (1) cement with "Vitrato" paint
 - (c) Walls as (a), substructure in prefabricated panels
- (4) Cladding with sandstone relief panels (lower cost)
- (5) Cladding with stoneware mosaic tiles (lower cost)
 - (a) 2cm x 2cm or 2.5 x 2.5 multi-colour majolica tiles
 - (b) 2cm x 2cm tiles with slight relief
- (6) Resin sealing and marble aggregate coating

Lot 3 - LAMINATED WOOD STRUCTURES

- Basic specification: Wood: Grand Bassam

- Variant: Sipo (lower cost)

./.

-
- (1) Ciment Portland artificiel

Lot 4 - STRUCTURAL STEELWORK, METALWORK, IRONWORK

- Estimate based on 25 F per m2 (1.58%)

Lot 5 - WATERPROOFING

- Basic specification: Multi-layer waterproofing on glass foam insulation
- Higher cost variant: "Roofmat" insulation (polystyrene)
- Lower-cost variant: Heavy protection of waterproofing with cement slabs instead of coated gravel

Lot 6 - ROOFING

- Basic specification: Hypalon with neoprene under-layer
- Lower-cost variant: "Gertoit" (butyl neoprene)

Lot 7 - EXTERIOR METAL JOINERY AND DOORS, WINDOWS, SHUTTERS, ETC...

- Basic specification: 30.50/10 anodised aluminium sheet facing on proposed framework
- Lower-cost variants:
 - Cast aluminium; lacquered aluminium for joinery
 - Asbestos cement cladding of facades ("Glasal" type)

Lot 8 - INTERIOR JOINERY AND FITTINGS

- Estimate based on 50 F per m2 (3.17%)

Lot 9 - MOVABLE PARTITIONS

- Estimate based on 250 F per m2 for visible parts and 160 F per m2 for parts hidden by false ceilings

Lot 10 - GLUED FLOOR COVERINGS

- Estimate based on 50,000 m2 of tufted carpet and corresponding screed

Lot 11 - STONE SLABBING AND PAVING

- Estimates based on 5,000 m2 of slabbing at 160 F per m2

Lot 12 - CEMENT-BEDDED FLOOR COVERINGS - TILING

- Estimate based on 10,000 m2 (floors and walls)

Lot 13 - FALSE CEILINGS AND STAFF

- Estimates based on 60,000 m2 of false ceilings of Hunter-Douglas type (70 F per m2) or equivalent

Lot 14 - PAINTING - WALL COVERINGS

- Estimate based on 75,000 m2 of painting and 75,000 m2 of wall coverings (plastic)

Lot 15 - GLAZING

- Reflective double-glazing in committee rooms
- Reflective glazing in exposed offices
- Plain glass for the remainder

Lot 16 - SANITARY PLUMBING

- Sanitary fittings as per specifications. Conventional plumbing.

Lot 17 - HEATING - VENTILATION - AIR-CONDITIONING

- Basic specification: Fully electric heating
 - Variants:
 - Conventional heating (gas plant)
 - Replacement of double shaft system by single-shaft system
- (some twenty further lower-cost variants are also described in the specifications)

Lot 18 - ELECTRICITY

- Basic specification: as per specification documents
- Variants:
 - Omission of generator
 - Lower-cost variant depending on choice of heating

Appendix III

A-1

Lot 19 - LOW-VOLTAGE CURRENT

- Estimate based on 30 F per m2 in superstructure

Lot 20 - LIFTS

- Automatic lifts
- Variant: 1.5 m/sec instead of 3m/sec

Lot 21 - FIRE-FIGHTING EQUIPMENT

- Estimate based on 5 F per m2

Lot 22 - AUTOMATIC DOORS

- Estimate based on 22 Securit glass doors, operated by compressed air

Lot 23 - ENCLOSED GARDENS

- Estimate based on 300 F per m2

Lot 24 - FIXED FURNITURE

- (Includes only furniture for the Assembly Chamber and galleries, and the meeting room of the Committee of Ministers)

=====

ESTIMATED COST (ALL TRADES)

(EVA - estimate for lots for which specifications are in preparation)

(AVM - estimate based on preliminary quantity survey)

LOT No.	Type of work		Estimate	Estimate with 7% discount
1	Demolition, earthworks, foundations	AVM	2,675,000	2,500,000
2	Additional earthworks, reinforced concrete, masonry	AVM	35,524,000	33,200,000
3	Laminated wood structures	AVM	3,531,000	3,300,000
4	Structural steelwork, metalwork, ironwork	EVA	2,086,500	1,950,000
5	Waterproofing	AVM	963,000	900,000
6	Roofing	AVM	535,000	500,000
7	(a) Metal joinery) Exterior (b) Exterior doors,) wall windows,) coverings shutters, etc.)	AVM	1,819,000 14,445,000	1,700,000 13,500,000
8	Interior joinery and fittings	EVA	4,173,000	3,900,000
9	Movable partitions	EVA	4,066,000	3,800,000
10	(a) Glued floor-coverings (b) Special screeds	EVA	2,675,000 2,675,000	2,500,000 2,500,000
11	Stone slabbing and paving	EVA	856,000	800,000
12	Cement-bedded floor-coverings - tilings	EVA	1,284,000	1,200,000
13	False ceilings and staff	EVA	5,029,000	4,700,000
14	Painting - wall-coverings (papering)	EVA	4,173,000	3,900,000
15	Glazing	AVM	7,308,100	6,830,000
16	Sanitary plumbing	AVM	2,086,500	1,950,000
17	Heating, ventilation, air-conditioning	AVM	18,190,000	17,000,000
18	(a) Electricity, excluding decorative light fittings (b) Emergency supply (generator)	AVM	5,885,000 1,926,000	5,500,000 1,800,000
19	Low-voltage current (1)	EVA	1,926,000	1,800,000
20	Lifts and escalators	AVM	4,601,000	4,300,000
21	Fire-fighting equipment	EVA	428,000	400,000
22	Automatic doors	EVA	428,000	400,000
23	Enclosed gardens	EVA	428,000	400,000
24	Fixed furniture (Assembly Chamber, Committee of Ministers)	AVM	2,568,000	2,400,000
	Electric circuit control system (dispatching)	EVA	2,140,000	2,000,000
			134,424,100	125,630,000

(1) It is pointed out here that the choice of telephone equipment laid down is irrational. In a field of constantly advancing technology, it is unwise to equip a building of such size with obsolete telephone apparatus in order to make use of existing installations.

1.1.1973 prices exclusive fees and taxes

IMPROVEMENT OF INTERIOR FINISHING AND ACOUSTICS

Estimated extra cost in excess of the estimates given
in Appendix A-2
(excluding furniture)

Governmental area

Assembly Chamber and lobbies

14 committee rooms

Libraries

Press facilities (including
recording and television)

Public area (including lecture/
projection room)

Total estimate

20,716,600 FF
0000000000
0000000000

excluding fees and taxes
at 1.1.73 prices

The stringent economies imposed are reflected in the estimates given in Appendix A-2, which cover only the strict minimum required to construct a sound building, to heat it and to provide protection against the elements.

The purpose for which the building is intended requires, at least for the parts mentioned above, less spartan, more elaborate treatment of spaces and surfaces (floors, walls, ceilings) as well as of lighting, and adequate acoustics.

WORK TO BE DONE ON EXISTING BUILDINGS

- (1) DEMOLITION OF 'A' BUILDING (cf. our estimate of October 1970)

300,000 FF October 1970 excluding tax

x 1.21 (index variation) -

447,700 FF

(excluding fees and
taxes at 1.1.73
prices)

- (2) REFURBISHING OF 'B' BUILDING (cf. our estimate of October 1970)

2,077,918 x 1.21 (ditto) -

2,514,280 FF

(excluding fees and
taxes at 1.1.73
prices)

This figure, which was arrived at by comparison with an office building, comprised:

- rearrangement of offices by replacing false ceilings and partitions;
- replacement of floor- and wall-coverings;
- interior joinery and paintwork (4,200 m2 net)
- replacement of 2 lifts - addition of a further outside staircase on one end-wall;
- aluminium cladding of outside walls;

(leaving the windows untouched and keeping all the technical installations).

(The details of this work need to be reviewed.)

EXTERIOR WORK

- (1) Extension of car park (350 places)

(increasing the total to 700)

8,500 m² x 494 FF - 4,200,000 FF excluding
fees and taxes (1.1.67)

updated 1967-73

4,200,000 FF x 1.6 -

6,720,000 FF

- (2) Simple gardens (in-fill, embankments, lawns,
paths, flower-beds and shrubberies, watering,
lighting, pools, conduits, fencing)

(according to estimate based on sketch)

4,000,000 FF

- (3) Forecourt - paving - flag-poles

960,000 FF

- (4) Two footbridges linking 'B' and 'C' buildings
to the main building

600,000 FF

TOTAL excluding fees and taxes at 1.1.73 prices

12,280,000 FF

ESTIMATE FOR COMMITTEE ROOM AND LOBBY FURNITURE

N.B. This estimate does not include tables and chairs for the Assembly Chamber and its galleries and the Committee of Ministers table, which form part of the building and are hence included in Appendix A-2.

A - Committee rooms and lobbies

900 delegates' chairs
150 guests' seats
+ tables + 11 refreshment trolleys . = 2,242,000

A1 Committee of Ministers room

Chairs = 246,500

B - Lobby - Ministers' lounge = 103,200

C - Parliamentarians' bar and reading room = 378,300

D - Working papers distribution area = 78,100

E - Public lobby = 228,300

F - Landings - waiting and reception lobbies (39) = 354,900

G - Assembly Chamber lobby (benches) = 51,700

H - Restaurants: tables, chairs, counters = 314,000

I - Projection room (to seat 150) = 60,000

J - Covered way to restaurant block = 75,000

K - Press zone = 50,000

L - Reading rooms and libraries = 80,000

TOTAL excluding fees and taxes at 1.1.73 prices = 4,262,000 FF

A P P E N D I X I V

STATEMENT BY THE DIRECTOR GENERAL
AT THE MEETING OF THE WORKING PARTY SET UP TO STUDY
THE PROBLEM OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE BUILDINGS
ON 12 DECEMBER 1972

I should like to comment on the three problems which have been referred to the Working Party, namely:

- (1) the financial aspects of the project;
- (2) the work schedule;
- (3) the progress with the foundations.

FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF THE PROJECT

1. As you are aware, we started with a sum of 70 million francs (at October 1970 prices), excluding taxes but including fees. Three new elements have entered into the reckoning since that time:

- (1) the decision of the Ministers to authorise the building of an additional storey;
- (2) the increase in the number of interpretation booths;
- (3) the changes in the index of building prices in the Bas-Rhin since 1970.

2. The extra cost of building an additional storey and increasing the number of interpretation booths amounts to approximately 7,645,000 FF excluding taxes but including fees, at October 1970 prices, if the storey is unfinished and 9,800,000 FF excluding taxes but including fees, at October 1970 prices, if the storey is finished.

As for the index, it moved from 2,416 in October 1970 to 2,814 in August 1972 - a rise of 16%. In view of present price trends it is not unreasonable to expect the increase to have reached 22% by January 1973.

./.

Thus, starting with the figure of 70 million mentioned in Resolution (70) 53 of 11 December 1970 and applying to it the financial repercussions of the three factors I have just mentioned, we arrive at an overall cost estimate, at January 1973 prices, of approximately:

94,700,000 FF excluding taxes, including fees, with the additional storey unfinished;

or

97,300,000 FF excluding taxes, including fees with the additional storey fully finished.

For the sake of convenience I shall take here the figure of 97,300,000 FF. I should also add that the figures we are talking about are amounts exclusive of taxes, since the latter are to be refunded to the Organisation. It must be borne in mind, however, that if the top storey is not finished, about 2½ million FF (January 1973 prices) must be subtracted from the figures arrived at.

3. This figure of 97,300,000 FF has to be compared with that quoted by the architect in his report as being necessary for the completion of the project, and which takes account of probable price levels on the same date.

Adding up the various items he mentions, we arrive at a figure of 167,250,000 FF, which does not include fees but does take account of an expected discount of 7% on the estimates for the various lots after the tenders have been analysed.

To this figure of 167,250,000 FF must be added the architect's fees (6.5% of the total amount for the work including taxes). This brings us to 180 million FF.

4. If we set this figure of 180 million (including fees) against the figure of 97,300,000 FF, which represents the present-day equivalent of the initial ceiling, we find that the difference is a substantial one. I am sure the members of the Working Party will agree that the new estimate needs to be looked at very carefully. The aim should be to arrive at a considerably lower figure, without of course endangering the functional character of the building or the dignity it is required to have.

5. For my part, I have endeavoured to discover what might be the origin of the difference between the two figures I have just mentioned, and I have looked for ways of eliminating it either in part or in full, while at the same time respecting the objective I have just defined. I find in the architect's report three factors which might lie at the root of this sizeable increase. They are as follows:

- (a) A certain increase in floorspace, both in the substructure and in the superstructure, as compared with the original project;
- (b) a choice of particularly expensive architectural, decorative and technical solutions;
- (c) the inclusion in the cost of the operation of work not covered by the ceiling of 70 million and which can probably be delayed until after the building is occupied.

(a) Floorspace

The original programme envisaged a total floorspace of 15,400 m² for the substructure. The architect now envisages 22,000 m² which represents an increase of 6,600 m². Of this figure, 3,000 m² are justified by the additional requirements in respect of technical rooms (heating, air-conditioning, electricity, etc.) and 2,000 m² by the use of areas set aside for the forecourts. This leaves an area of 1,600 m² which the architect will need to explain.

As regards the superstructure, the gross figure of 42,000 m² in the original project is to be increased by 6,800 m² to allow for the additional storey (6,300 m² gross) and for the increase in the number of interpretation booths (500 m²), making the gross floor-space according to the programmes 48,800 m².

In fact, however, we find that the architect's plans now relate to a floor-space of 52,318 m², which represents an increase of 3,518 m².

The architect justifies this increase by the extension of the common area (2,110 m²) and of the public area (1,120).

(b) Choice of expensive solutions for the architecture, decoration and technical plant.

In Appendix A to his report, the architect costs the various lots (all trades), and in Appendix B he lists the additional expenditure he considers necessary for the interior finishing and acoustics.

The cost of the items in Appendix A, having regard to an expected discount of 7% on the tenders, amounts to 125,630 FF to which must be added (according to page 8 of the architect's report) 1,400,000 FF for the approaches and mains connections; Lastly, the sum of 20,716,000 FF must be added for interior finishing (Appendix B to the report). These figures are still exclusive of the fees.

I assume that for the purposes of this estimate, the architect considered the most expensive solutions and that consequently, the variants for which firms have been asked to tender may well afford a substantial reduction in the amount quoted in Appendix A.

As regards Appendix B, however, I note the presence of an item to cover "acoustics". I consider that good acoustics were intended to be an integral feature of the Assembly Chamber and meeting rooms and are covered by the work and expenditure listed in Appendix A. Appendix B is probably intended to cover a combination of decoration and acoustic treatment. It is of course understood that good acoustics are of fundamental importance.

(c) Work not included in the initial ceiling of 70 million FF

The work concerned is essentially that listed in Appendices C and D of the architect's report for: the demolition of A building, the refurbishing of B building, the extension of the car park under the gardens (350 cars), the laying-out of the gardens in their final form, the paving and decoration of the forecourt and the construction of foot-bridges linking the new building to the existing B and C buildings.

The architect's estimate for this work now amounts to 15 million FF. However, in his report of 2 June 1971 (Appendix II) the estimate for this work was no more than 5,525,000 FF at October 1970 prices. There is therefore a very substantial difference, the main explanation for which seems to be the building of an additional car park for 350 cars (under the gardens) and the final laying-out of the gardens.

6. Having reached this point in my analysis, I wondered what might be done to bring the figure of 180 million down to a more acceptable level.

The total cost represented by Appendix A (all trades plus approaches and mains connections) and Appendix B (interior finishing) amounts to 147,700,000 FF, excluding fees, at January 1973 prices.

An effort should be made in the first place to reduce this figure to approximately 113 million FF, that is by some 34 million.

How can this be done without detracting from the functionality and dignity of the building?

There is no hope of cutting down on floorspace; the architect's explanations appear to justify the increase here. Furthermore, the tender specifications are now being scrutinised by the firms concerned and cannot be changed. I wonder nevertheless whether decisions might not be taken after the tenders have been analysed to reduce certain areas in the substructure (car park) and in the restaurants or to eliminate or postpone parts of the work.

In addition, it is clear that the architect should endeavour to find the least expensive solutions for the items in Appendix A, in particular by making use of the variants which will be proposed by the tenderers. I am thinking especially of floor coverings and external and internal walls, for which we may well receive interesting tenders from firms in member States. I am also thinking of the electrical equipment and the heating system.

It should probably be possible to cut about 22 million from the total reached in this Appendix without detracting from the functional character of the building.

As regards Appendix B, I should like to point out that the estimated extra cost for the interior finishing seems very high. Very high quality finishes can be confined to those areas that are regarded as most important. All that is needed in the other areas is a proper, presentable appearance without undue decoration. In my opinion, the architect could submit fresh proposals on this point.

The 20 million envisaged for the items listed in Appendix B could be cut by some 12 million and thus brought down to 8 million.

7. I now come to Appendices C and D of the report, which concern the work to be done on existing buildings and exterior work, respectively, and which together account for about 15 million FF.

I think that all these items could be postponed, with the exception of those which relate to the demolition of A building and the simple laying-out of the surrounds. The completion of this part of the work is bound up with the coming into service of the new building, whereas the rest of the work is not an immediate necessity and could be executed later, depending on the funds available to the Organisation. This would bring the cost down from 15 to 3 million.

8. If all the savings I have mentioned could in fact be made, they would represent a sum of 46 million, plus the corresponding fees.

9. This leaves us with Appendix E, which concerns the acquisition of the special furniture recommended by the architect for the committee rooms, lobbies and passages, at an estimated cost of 4,262,000 FF. This expenditure is covered in Appendix II to the report of 2 June 1971 which concerns the purchase of all the furniture and equipment needed for the operational services of the building. It is regarded as being separate from the total estimate for the building itself (see paragraph 11 below).

10. In conclusion, taking account of the recommended savings on the one hand and the sum mentioned in Appendix E on the other, the estimate could perhaps be brought down to somewhere in the region of 126 million.

o

o

o

./.

11. In my analysis of the figures I have so far deliberately passed over the expenditure not covered by the original ceiling, which was listed in an estimate set out as Appendix II to the report of June 1971. This related to the acquisition of furniture, equipment, lighting, simultaneous interpretation equipment, kitchen equipment, and the extension of the automatic telephone exchange. As I have already said, this list includes the furniture mentioned in Appendix E to the architect's report.

The report of the Working Party of June 1971 provided for expenditure on equipment of 11,500,000 FF (for seven languages October 1970 prices).

This figure must now be increased to cover:

- (a) the rise in prices between October 1970 and January 1973;
- (b) the cost of the additional extension to the telephone exchange entailed by the extra storey and of the latter's fitting out.

Prices in this field have risen by about 20%, i.e. 2,300,000 FF and the remainder can be estimated at 1,700,000 FF.

Consequently, the amount needed to cover these various purchases, according to my calculations, would be in the region of 15,500,000 FF, at January 1973 prices. We shall of course have to examine, in conjunction with the Working Party, the problems raised by this equipment.

Lastly, if we add this sum to the 126 million at which we are seeking to arrive for the whole of the project, we obtain a total cost for the building and its equipment of some 142 million, including fees, at January 1973 prices.

To this sum we shall of course have to add the price rises which will occur between now and the occupation of the building in 1976. As matters stand at present, any attempt to forecast the sum involved would appear to be extremely difficult.

WORK SCHEDULE

12. The Working Party had agreed that the sending of tender specifications for the ten main lots to interested firms would be spread over a period between 16 October and 10 November 1972. The architect and the consulting engineers had accepted these dates.

While this has been done for eight of the lots concerned, the specifications for the external metal joinery and glazing did not reach the Secretariat until 21 November; they were sent out to firms on 24 November.

In addition there has been the delay, which I fail to understand, in preparing the additional specifications for the restaurant building. They reached the Secretariat on 8 December. The Secretariat has studied these specifications as a matter of urgency and is sending them today to the firms concerned (i.e. practically all those interested in the ten main lots). Depending on the addressees, it seems certain that these files will not reach the firms concerned until some time between 14 and 18 December.

The date set for submission of tenders was 22 December. It would not be reasonable to require the firms to work out the additional specifications in so short a time, and if they were asked to do so the proposals submitted would undoubtedly suffer accordingly.

In my opinion, the time limit for submission of tenders should be put back to 12 January 1973.

The date for opening the tenders would then become 15 January, and the architect would present his interim report on the first ten lots on 15 February instead of 1 February.

His final report would then be submitted on 1 March instead of 15 February. The selection by the Tenders Board of the firm to be responsible for the main fabric would be postponed accordingly.

Finally, the other firms could be selected on 15 March.

No notification has been sent to firms for the time being, but as soon as the Working Party has reached its decision a circular will be sent to each firm giving the new date for submission of tenders.

THE PROBLEM OF FOUNDATIONS

13. At its meeting on 9 October the Working Party was informed of the difficulties encountered in the foundation work. This is proceeding at a rather slow pace; 340 piles have now been drilled and cast.

In addition, a rider is to be added to the contract of the firm concerned, by reason of the increase in the volume of the work.

It will be remembered that the Consulting Engineers had too little time to study the foundations specification because of the wish that everything should be done to enable the foundation stone ceremony to take place on 15 May 1972 and the work on the foundations to begin immediately thereafter.

The corrections made by the Consulting Engineers, which related mainly to the number, length and diameter of the piles, were not made until the contract had been signed.

From the initial figure of 773 piles, the Consulting Engineers' requirements have risen to 828, and they now envisage 147 extra piles for the construction of the restaurants. Thus there are now to be 975 in all. Furthermore, at the request of the Inspecting Engineers, the depth of the piles has been increased by ten to 20%; the average depth of 10 metres initially proposed has been increased to 11 metres for the 60 cm diameter piles and to 12 metres for those larger than 60 cm in diameter, the aim being to anchor the piles in the firmest phreatic alluvia.

Thus the volume of work has risen by some 40%, resulting in a significant addition to the total cost. Further, the time-limit specified in the contract for the completion of the work needs to be extended. In view of the additional work to be done, the date should now be set at 17 March 1973, to give an extension of 107 calendar days after the initial deadline of 15 December 1972.

o

o

o

14. In conclusion, I ask the Working Party:

- (1) to give the Secretariat the requisite instructions as to where to seek the means of bringing the cost of the work down below the architect's present estimate;
- (2) to extend the time-limit for the submission of tenders to 12 January 1973;
- (3) to postpone until 17 March 1973 the contractual deadline for the completion of the work on the foundations.