**High Court of Australia**

**Request for Quotation (RFQ)**

1. **INTRODUCTION**

The purpose of this RFQ is for the High Court of Australia (the Court) to obtain quotations from Service Providers for the creation of an oral history project to celebrate the 40th anniversary of opening of the building of the High Court in Canberra. The High Court is a unique and architecturally significant building. Its design was the culmination of a national competition and its construction took place between 1976 and 1980. Its interior design, artworks and furnishings were also integral to the project to construct a building for the nation which reflected the significance of the High Court at the apex of the judicial branch of government.

The Court seeks expressions of interests and quotations from historians, particularly historians with experience and skills in oral history and with an interest in design and architecture. The Court will select one Service Provider and enter into an Official Order for Services.

The building’s design features and genesis are well documented. What is less known is the construction phase of the building, its fit-out with artworks and furnishings, and the experiences of and challenges faced by those involved in that phase of the building’s history. It is these which that the oral history project will seek to capture. Given the passage of time, it is considered that there will be fewer opportunities to record the experiences of those involved in the design and construction of the building and that it is timely to record such things where possible.

1. **RFQ PROCESS**
   1. Responses to this RFQ must be sent to the following e-mail address [bwickham@hcourt.gov.au](mailto:bwickham@hcourt.gov.au)
   2. In providing a response to this RFQ, Service Providers should address the Selection Criteria detailed in section 9 of this RFQ.
   3. The RFQ timetable is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Activity** |
| Friday 13 September 2019 | RFQ Release |
| Friday 11 October 2019 | RFQ Closure |
| Friday 18 October 2019 | RFQ Evaluation Completed; commencement |

1. **THIS RFQ IS ISSUED BY:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Agency:** | High Court of Australia |
| **Branch** | Chief Executive & Principal Registrar |
| **Contact Officer Name** | Ben Wickham |
| **Contact Officer Details** | Senior Executive Deputy Registrar  Phone: (02) 6270 6893  Mobile: 0432 626 171  Email: bwickham@hcourt.gov.au  Address: PO Box 6309  Kingston ACT 2604 |

1. **HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA BUILDING**

The High Court building is an outstanding example of late modern Brutalist architecture. It has light-filled, bold geometric shapes and spaces, raw massed concrete, dynamic internal movement, and strong links with neighbouring buildings and landscape. It is monumental and asymmetrical, but also functional.

The building’s design was the culmination of a nationwide competition. The original architectural competition conditions for the High Court building stated the following:

*"The national functions of both the High Court and the Parliament are strongly related. In simple terms, the former interprets Federal law established by the latter.*

*The locating of both the High Court and the Parliament in proximity to one another in the Federal Capital has strong symbolic significance. Together they represent the basis of government and justice at the national level.*

*The High Court building, in one sense, is visually related to the Parliament but at the same time must be seen to stand separate from, and independent of, the Parliament. In its constitutional independence, its objectivity of deliberation and freedom from political influence, the High Court can be seen as a powerful influence within this relationship. An expression of both the unity of purpose and the independence of status is the essence of the physical symbolism that has been achieved.*

*In its siting and in its form, the High Court building imparts a sense of strength and security. The visitor is made to feel aware of the rights, privileges and responsibilities of the Australian judicial system."*

The national design competition for the building announced in May 1972 was won by the architectural firm of Edwards Madigan Torzillo and Briggs (EMTB). EMTB was also responsible for the adjacent Australian National Gallery (as it was then) and links. EMTB Director and architect Christopher Kringas led the design of the High Court, working closely with Feiko Bouman and Rod Lawrence. Kringas died in 1975, just prior to construction. Colin Madigan, who was the team leader for the National Gallery, and Hans Marelli, oversaw the construction phase of the High Court building.

The assessment panel for the design competition entries comprised Chief Justice Sir Garfield Barwick GCMG, the Commissioner of the National Capital Development Commission Sir John Overall, the chair of the Australian Universities Commission, Peter Karmel, New South Wales Government Architect, EH Farmer, and Melbourne architect Daryl Jackson. More than 150 designs were entered in the competition.

Thus the overall concept for the building was framed. At the time Edwards Madigan Torzillo and Briggs (EMTB) were chosen as the winners of the design competition, the firm was already involved in the design and construction of the National Gallery building next door. The design process for both buildings was carried out using a "collaborative design method", which involved a team of architects establishing a "design law" to guide the evolution of the buildings.

The design of the High Court building was continually refined during the documentation phase. The EMTB design was aimed at emphasising a feeling of spaciousness within the building. The primary materials used (ie. the concrete, glass and wood) are exposed in order to enhance the nobility of the building and to "include" visitors in the way the building works.

The form of the building expresses both its symbolic nature and its working functions. The public areas within and around the High Court, for instance, give a distinct sense of it being a National Place, but transitional areas within the building allow the visitor a smooth perceptual change from the exterior towards the judicial character of the courtrooms within.

In the end, the design complements the vision expressed in the competition conditions, providing the High Court with a grand building, visibly and emphatically relating to the democratic base from which the Law emanates within the context of the surrounding spaces and adjacent buildings.

The builder, PDC Constructions (ACT) Pty Ltd, began construction of the building in 1975, and it was completed in 1980 at a total cost of $46.5 million. It was officially opened by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II on 26 May 1980.

The 40-metre tall building is essentially one of concrete and glass comprising a number of major functional elements, namely a large public hall, three courtrooms, an administrative wing, and Justices’ chambers.

The forecourt and main entrance of the building are approached via a long, paved ceremonial ramp underneath which is a car park, warehouse and machinery rooms. A waterfall, designed by Robert Woodward and constructed of South Australian speckled granite, runs the full length of one side of the ramp.

Most of the external and internal walls created by the 18,400 cubic metres of concrete used in the construction have been subjected to a process known as "bush hammering", carried out with a percussion instrument, which has flaked the surface and exposed the aggregate within the concrete.

The glazed areas total some 4,000 square metres and these are mainly on the northern and southern faces of the building. The use of steel frame supports for the glazed areas has meant that generous expansion allowances have had to be provided to cope with Canberra's relatively wide temperature range. A system was devised so that the glass in the walls can "creep" up or down according to the temperature changes and any movement in the concrete structure.

The internal floor area of the building is approximately 18,515 square metres. The building itself covers 0.32 hectares (0.8 acres) and is surrounded by nearly 1 hectare (2.5 acres) of quarry tiles.

The High Court–National Gallery Precinct was entered on the National Heritage List in 2007. The High Court building is also listed on the World Register of Significant 20th Century Architecture. In 2007 it received the Royal Australian Institute of Architects National ‘25 Year Award for Enduring Architecture’. It is situated on 3.4 hectares (8.4 acres) of land in the Parliamentary Triangle, on the shores of Lake Burley Griffin between the National Science and Technology Centre and the National Gallery of Australia.

Further detail on the High Court building can be found at: http://www.hcourt.gov.au/assets/corporate/heritage/HCA-CMP-May2011.pdf

1. **SCOPE OF THE REQUIREMENT**

The Court is seeking a Service Provider to compile an oral history, which can also be presented and developed into written and visual forms.

The Service Provider will be required to:

* With the assistance of High Court Staff, identify, locate and interview people (approx. 15) involved in the design, construction and fit-out of the High Court building;
* Understand the architectural, design and artistic qualities of the High Court building and its contents, and the political and cultural context in which this occurred;
* Integrate the existing archival footage, including drawings and photos into the finished product;
* Compile and curate an oral history which incorporates all of the above.

The oral history is to coincide with an official ceremony of the Court on its 40th anniversary on Tuesday 26 May 2020.

It is anticipated that the oral history will be presented in a short ‘pod-cast’ or ‘vod-cast’ type format of 10 to 15 minutes, and a longer format for those with a deeper interest in the subject. It is anticipated that this pod-cast will be made available on the High Court’s web-site and within the building itself.

1. **SELECTION CRITERIA**

When preparing their proposals Service Providers should address each of the selection criteria listed below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Demonstrated experience in completing an oral history project on a discrete topic from inception to presentation |
|  | It would be desirable to have a background or experience in architecture, art and design |
|  | Skills and experience in presenting oral history in different formats |
|  | Cost and value for money of the services (how will providers provide cost total, hourly rates, disbursements, travel?) |
|  | Referees  (as requested in section 11)) |

1. **TIME FRAMES**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Activity** |
| Friday 13 September 2019 | RFQ Release |
| Friday 11 October 2019 | RFQ Closure |
| Friday 18 October 2019 | RFQ Evaluation Completed; commencement |
| Monday 6 April 2020 | Final draft to be produced |
| Tuesday 26 May 2020 | Launch at High Court |

1. **CONTACT DETAILS**

Enquiries and requests for additional information or clarification relating to this RFQ should be made to the Contact Officer at section 3.

1. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

The Service Provider is required to notify the Courtof any actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest (a perceived conflict of interest is one in which a reasonable person would think that the person’s judgement is likely to be compromised).

1. **CONFIDENTIALITY AND PROTECTION OF PERSONAL INFORMATION**

If a Service Provider wishes for information contained in their RFQ response to be protected as Confidential Information, they should clearly identify the information they consider should be protected as confidential information. The Customer will only consider a request for confidentiality where:

* 1. the information is to be protected is identified in specific rather than global terms;
  2. the information is by its nature confidential; and
  3. disclosure would cause detriment to the parties concerned.

1. **REFEREES**

The Service Provider must provide the name and contact details of at least three referees who can be contacted by the Court if required, noting that the Court may, at its sole discretion, contact other referees who have not been nominated.