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PROCEDINGS

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Okay, we’re going to get the last people in. Okay. So everyone, welcome to the U.S. Department of State for the Overseas Buildings Operations Industry Advisory Group. I am very, very happy that all of you could attend today. We have 280 people attending, along with our immediate Industry Advisory Group. And I’m looking forward to a productive session this afternoon.

My name is Will Moser. I am currently the Acting Director of OBO. And it is my pleasure, as I said already, to welcome all of you here today. And with that, I will ask the members of the OBO management team to introduce themselves. So first, Marjorie?

MS. PHILLIPS: Marjorie Phillips, I am the
Acting Principal Deputy Director and normally the Managing Director for Operations.

MS. HARTKE: Good afternoon. Victoria Hartke, the Managing Director for Planning and Real Estate.

MR. HOCHULI: Good afternoon. Jürg Hochuli, Deputy Director of Resource Management.

MR. DIZON: Angel Dizon, Managing Director for Project Development.

MR. KANGA: Adi Kanga, Acting Deputy Director and also the Managing Director for Construction, Facility, and Security Management.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: And one thing that you will all see in all of our presentations today, OBO is really a part of the security posture of the Department of State and so we’re very happy to have with us today the Security Officer with whom OBO works the most, Wayne Ashbery. And Wayne?

MR. ASHERBY: Wayne Ashbery, Deputy
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Assistant Secretary for Countermeasures with Diplomatic Security. Thank you.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Okay. Okay, with that done I’d like to go around the table and have the members of the Industry Advisory Group introduce themselves. And Craig, why don’t we start with you?

MR. SCHWITTER: Hi. I’m Craig Schwitter from BuroHappold, Managing Principal, and Associate Professor at Columbia University.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Tom?

MR. MITCHELL: Good afternoon. My name is Tom Mitchell. I’m Senior Vice President and Chief Operating Officer for FM3IS. It’s a facility management, management consulting, and advisory support firm.

MR. SESIL: And I’m Dan Sesil. I’m a partner at LERA Structural Engineers in New York.

MR. TIGHE: Good afternoon. Rich Tighe,
Principal Vice President of Bechtel.

MS. BEHA: Good afternoon. I'm Ann Beha, architect from Boston.

MS. WHITING: Hi. I'm Sarah Whiting. I'm the Dean of the School of Architecture at Rice and a partner in WW Architecture in Houston.

MR. BLACKWELL: Hi. I'm Marlon Blackwell, the principal at Marlon Blackwell Architects in Fayetteville, Arkansas, as well as the E. Fay Jones Distinguished Professor at the University of Arkansas.

MR. BRANGMAN: Alan Brangman, Executive Vice President, University Treasurer at University of Delaware.

MS. BANKS: Chris Banks, Interior Design at Gensler.

MS. NITSCH: Judy Nitsch. I'm a civil engineer with Nitsch Engineering in Boston.

MR. OPPENHEIMER: Nat Oppenheimer with Silman Structural Engineers in New York City.
MR. DANKS: Richard Danks, Consulting Engineer.

MR. BURNETT: Jim Burnett, the Office of James Burnett, Boston, Houston, and San Diego.

MR. SINGH: Tej Singh, Vice President, Gilbane.

MS. SNOW: Julie Snow, Snow Kreilich Architects, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

MR. BURNEY: I'm David Burney from Pratt Institute in Brooklyn, New York where I direct the Urban Placemaking and Management Program.


MR. WOOD: Richard Wood, Chairman, Plaza Construction Corporation.

MR. SCIAME: Frank Sciame, Chairman, Founder, Sciame Construction and Development.

MR. GILMORE: Tom Gilmore, real estate developer, Los Angeles, California. Did you say New York?

(Laughter.)

MS. MCCONAHEY: Erin McConahey, Principal, Arup.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Yeah, you don’t have to get so close to these microphones. They actually work pretty well. So now if we could have our housekeeping moment?

VOICE: At this moment, if you haven’t already done so already, please disable your wifi from your electronic devices. Also the emergency exits will be to the front and to the rear of the auditorium. And lastly, if you need to use the restrooms or anything, contact a DOS escort and they will escort you to and from your destination. All right, thank you.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Okay. So okay. The
Industry Advisory Group has played a significant role in our design and construction over many years. Since we met last fall the group has participated in six embassy, consulate, and annex projects and we'll be hearing from those design reviews and the reports of those in a few minutes. And we are really looking forward to those particulars because I think it is actually valuable not only for us in Overseas Buildings Operations but also for our broader audience here today.

I want to thank you all for the expertise and the thoughtful conversations that you do engage with us about our projects. You know we do not in any way want to operate in isolation because we need to hear from private industry about how to improve our operations and really craft the right way forward where we can be more effective. Because we realize as government employees and public servants that we are actually here on a service mission, to provide not
only safe and secure facilities for our employees but to do that in the most cost effective, productive way possible with the long term view that our facilities have to be around for at least 50 years, maybe even longer.

Now I for one, having had a 33-year career in the Department of State, and having never been in a new facility, would just love to be in one once. Because the last one I was where I was Ambassador in Moldova, my building was 115 years when I arrived there and is now over 120. So I think it's due one of these fabulous new facilities that you are helping us construct now.

And one thing I would be remiss that if I did not mention is the work that the Advisory Group does and helps to make a better building. Part of the reason why this is important is to also make sure that we keep in mind that this is representing an image of the United States. You know, one of the things I was...
thinking about recently was that if you ever get a
nasty news story in any of the countries where I was
assigned to, the picture that they would always show
of the United States was what the local embassy looked
like. Now whether that was just because that local
embassy had an iconic place in the imagination of the
public, or they were trying to give directions to the
protesters to try to stage themselves in front of
that, I wasn’t ever sure. But it is true that during
that period of time when I was Ambassador in Moldova
the clip you would see on the news if they didn’t have
any other clip to show was actually a picture of the
embassy and usually of the employees going in and out
of it. So they’re going to have that image loaded in
their minds. So we want to make sure that those
really represent and put our best foot forward.

Now I think we’re ready to go on and do our
project reviews. So Amanda? If I can get you -- are
we ready? Okay. We’re going to talk about
construction awards first. And Angel is going to be helping me a little bit on this. Whew --

MR. DIZON: Oh.

VOICES: (Indiscernible).

(Laughter.)

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Okay. Construction awards this year. The Ankara new embassy project.

MR. DIZON: This project was designed by Ennead and awarded to B.L. Harbert International.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: You know, and Ankara is one of these projects that is, I must impress on everyone that our relationship with Turkey right now is extremely important and extremely complex. And if there is a place where we desperately need to have a new embassy for the most important of policy reasons, Ankara is really one of those primary examples.

The next one is Asunción, Paraguay.

MR. DIZON: This project was designed by ZGF and awarded to Caddell Construction. And interesting
to note about this particular project is it's a new embassy on an existing compound. So there was a need to maintain the level of functionality and security on the compound while the project is being constructed.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: And this will be a challenge throughout the construction term, for sure. Okay, next? This is the Beirut, Lebanon embassy. And this is one that has a special place in my heart. I have been a foreign service officer, as I said, since 1984. I visited the Beirut Compound in 1994, the year just after the 17-year Lebanese Civil War had ended. And we are still occupying a miserable set of temporary buildings this 20-some years later. So this is one that I want to see completed just to say that we have finally provided the kind of facility overseas in Lebanon that our employees deserve.

MR. DIZON: This project was designed by Morphosis and awarded to B.L. Harbert International.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Okay. And the next one
is the Manila major rehabilitation.

MR. DIZON: This project was designed by ZGF and awarded to Framaco. And if anybody is interested, my father got his visa to come here through that embassy.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: And we have --

MR. DIZON: And I am the result of that, yeah.

(Laughter.)

AMBASSADOR MOSER: We have Angel here with us today. That’s a very good story. Yeah, that’s a good one to answer. Okay. Then the anticipated construction awards. And I think anticipated may not, or you know we are going to award these as long as everything, as long as the creek don’t rise, I think is probably the better way to say it.

Okay. This is one that is for us a very much a premier project. And this is the new consulate compound in Erbil, Iraq. We have spent a great deal
of discussion with diplomatic security about how to have the best security conditions in order to undertake this project because the fight against ISIS is essentially 22 miles from the compound, where we're building the compound. So this is literally one of those occasions, not the first, but it is one of the occasions where we are actually building adjacent to an active war front. And so this will be extremely difficult, really a challenge, but we are confident that it can be done.

MR. DIZON: So this project was designed by EYP. And similar to Beirut, it has a very, very significant residential component to it and so there is a lot of thoughtfulness that has to go into being able to design a place for working and living in these kinds of environments.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: We are also expecting to award before the end of September the Mexico City, Mexico. And Marjorie, our Principal Deputy, was most
recently the management counselor in Mexico City. So Marjorie, any words?

MS. PHILLIPS: No, I’m very excited, having worked in that facility. It’s needed.

MR. DIZON: The project was designed by Tod Williams Billie Tsien Architects/Davis Brody Bond, joint venture.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Okay. The next one is Nairobi, Kenya, where we will be building a new embassy annex.

MR. DIZON: This project is currently being designed by Krueck & Sexton.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: And we really couldn’t build anything in Nairobi unless we also built something in Kampala.

MR. DIZON: And this project is currently under design by BNIM.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Then one of our major projects in Europe that is going to be awarded soon is
the Athens Embassy major rehabilitation, including the renovation of the chancery building by Walter Gropius.

MR. DIZON: And this project is designed by Ann Beha Architects.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: And then in Montevideo, Uruguay we have the U.S. Embassy major rehabilitation of a building that I believe was originally designed by I.M. Pei, is that correct? Yes. So this is also another one of our undertakings on one of our major architectural treasures.

MR. DIZON: And this project is designed by Smith Group.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Okay. Then on the design side of the house, in Brasilia we have the new embassy project that will be designed by Studio Gang.

In Seoul, your turn.

MR. DIZON: In Seoul the new embassy project is currently being designed by SHoP Architects.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Guadalajara?
MR. DIZON: Is being designed by Miller Hull.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: And Hermosillo

MR. DIZON: And Hermosillo is with Richard Bauer.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Okay. And next, site acquisitions. And Victoria, we have now closed on Rio, is that right?

MS. HARTKE: We have.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Yeah, I have to tell a little story though. We always said that when people were, the real estate team were working on Rio, we said, yes, but what about Lahore? We can’t go back to Rio until we’ve got something in Lahore. Well we still don’t have anything in Lahore.

(Laughter.)

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Okay. So many of the design and selections and awards that I just went through were done through our indefinite delivery
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indefinite quantity contracts for new constructions and major rehabilitations. And both of these contracts are up for renewal. And I know you want, that many of you are interested in this renewal process and -- and I used to be the head of, the Deputy Assistant Secretary in charge of Logistics Management. And one of my most trusted contracting officers during that period of time was David Vivian. So he’s going to talk a little bit about these contracts.

MR. VIVIAN: Hello and good afternoon, everyone. I’m Dave Vivian, as Will Moser said, Contracting Officer providing direct support to Overseas Buildings Operations. We did issue this morning the announcement to reacquire the IDIQ contracts for design construction. We issued only one announcement, though. I understand some of you may have been expecting two. But it was one announcement and that announcement allows us to award contracts for
both new designs as well as renovation designs. And then if we see that one of the offerors has an outstanding portfolio in either new construction or renovation then we can also go ahead and award contracts for either/or, for those designs as well.

And be very sure that you follow the instructions provided in the announcement. It has been issued. You can go ahead and read it and see what needs to be done. And I think proposals are due in about May 10th or so. And it does allow for small business set asides, so we are allowing for that. We plan to award a minimum of probably about eight contracts. We can award more if we so choose to meet the mission of OBO. And we set some of those aside for small business depending on their qualifications. Any questions concerning the announcement that was issued?

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Yeah, we have time to take a couple of questions, if someone in the group --
MR. VIVIAN: No? Great.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: I can’t believe it.

MR. VIVIAN: All right. We finally issued a perfect --

(Laughter.)

MR. VIVIAN: But as you are going through it, if you do see you have some questions just go ahead and send an email to Brian Mulcahy. He’s the contracting officer for this particular action.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Okay. Great.

MR. VIVIAN: Okay. And there were some announcements issued yesterday for construction, too, so be sure and look at those as well. Thank you.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Okay. I’d just like to -- thank you, David, for your presentation. And I think it’s very important. I really do think it’s important that any time that we have, that OBO is with you, we always make sure that we always have a contracting officer in the room with us. Because it’s
better to have our contracting officer than have our attorney. And we found out that the contracting officers kind of take care of us in getting in trouble with the attorneys later.

So then I’d like to just add that we do have major compound security upgrades going on and we’re doing those in the following locations: in Adana, in Turkey; in Brussels; in Dhaka, Bangladesh; Nicosia, Cyprus; Stockholm; and Vancouver. And those will be awarded this fiscal year.

Then one of the initiatives that we don’t talk about a lot in our normal building operations is OBO’s need for better data. When I came to OBO two years ago, one of the things I started with our staff was what we call affectionately the Ideal Operating State. And this is essentially for OBO to move to where it has enterprise wide data collection and data manipulation. Because we know that in order to be truly a 21st Century operation, we are going to have
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to collect and really use the data that we have on all of our projects and all of our activities worldwide. This is going to be something that will be done in conjunction with BIM. And we look upon it as really the sort of like the building of the East-West Railroad. And BIM and then the Ideal Operating State actually join together in one kind of unified software package where we’ll be able to better manager our program in the future.

So those of you that do have active interests in the systems side of things, we will probably be talking to you or you will see solicitations for information and for actual work in this activity over this year and next. Because this is one of our active and highest priority activities. Because as I said, we cannot be a modern organization unless we have the modern information infrastructure to accompany it.

Then just one thing I wanted to thank all of
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my immediate staff for all of the work that they do
everyday. And before I forget about it, I do want to
thank Christine Foushee and her very capable staff for
organizing today’s event and for all the work that
they’ve done. And Christine, do you have any more
housekeeping? And if not, I would like to introduce
Ann Beha. And Ann, you are going to talk to us about
your activities on the IAG and we’re looking forward
to it.

MS. BEHA: Well thank you, Ambassador Moser,
and all of you. One of the most I think substantive
parts of participating in the IAG is the opportunity
to review projects as they are developed. OBO has
over the years assembled panels of peer reviewers and
experts to join with its own staff and the design
architect and their team in checking in, reviewing,
and discussing the projects progress, once, twice,
perhaps more, during its evolution.

There are four projects that I can speak
briefly to today and with the assistance of some of those who very kindly offered to participate in these industry advisory group reviews over the past year. We’ll touch on Nairobi; Kampala; Seoul, Korea; and Tegucigalpa. Let’s start with Nairobi.

The Nairobi new office annex project includes redevelopment of the existing compound to include a new office annex, support annex facility, expanded Marine security guard residence, and parking. Krueck and Sexton is the architect and this project has had two advisory reviews. The first focus is principally on the presentation of three alternative concepts for these programmatic elements on the site, and that occurred in December. And then the second advisory review was the development of the selected scheme, the scheme that is preferred and most discussed after the first advisory review group.

The participants from the IAG and other resources included Julie Snow from Snow Kreilich; Nat
Oppenheimer from Silman; Debra Lehman Smith from
Lehman Smith McLeish; and Kirk Mettam from Silman.

Let me just say in terms of the concept,
Krueck and Sexton presented three schemes focusing on
the west end of the compound, behind the existing
chancery and the USAID annex, taking into
consideration the ongoing mission operations. The IAG
recommended maximizing the NOX, new office annex,
footprint and locating the parking to the north via
the blue scheme. Most critically K&S adopted IAG’s
recommendation of tying the east and west sides of the
compound together through landscape and pedestrian
experience. I think in summary this project touched a
lot of different elements on this compound, the idea
of using landscape and pedestrian life contributing to
the community connections with these resources. And
let me turn to Julie and Nat now for just a summary of
their participation.

MR. OPPENHEIMER: I’ll speak on behalf of
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Julie this morning, I've been asked to. Thank you, Ann -- or this afternoon. It was a very lively and from what we understand from Krueck and Sexton very productive discussion and really played to the strengths of this type of review.

The first review that I did participate in in December, as Ann mentioned, really focused on the organization of the site. Krueck and Sexton came with three very compelling concepts and there was a lot of different ways to look at the site. So the opportunity over the course of the day to play out a number of scenarios and validate some thinking and affirm or discard other thinking and help Krueck and Sexton from a higher level to sort of organize the site in a way that they I believe from the feedback we got felt very good about at the end of the day.

The second review, which my partner Kirk Mettam filled in for me for a couple of weeks ago but Julie and Debra were involved with as well, as it
should focused more on the building that came out of that first session. The fenestration of the building and the development further of both the primary structure on the site but also the relationship of the ancillary buildings and whether they played to the strengths of the main building or opposed them, and so on. The again from what we understand the review and the advice given by the group led to what was seen as a very good and rigorous design in the end that felt like the right design for the site. Thank you, Ann. I don’t know, Julie, if you want to add anything?

MS. SNOW: I’m good.

(Laughter.)

MS. BEHA: Okay. Thank you. Thank you both. Well played. I’d like to talk about Kampala for a minute, the office annex project there. The Kampala new office annex project includes the redevelopment of the existing compound and includes a new office annex, support annex, compound access.
control facilities, utilities, and parking. Again, a varied and inclusive kind of program that reminds us that these compounds are truly campuses that must be both working, secure, and integrated in terms of their functionality. The architect for this project is BNIM, B-N-I-M, from Kansas City. And they've also had two industry advisory reviews, one in December and one quickly afterwards in February of this year.

The participants in those reviews included Sheila Kennedy from Kennedy and Violich; Frank Sciame from F.J. Sciame Construction Company; Greg Otto from Walter P. Moore; and Matthew Kreilich from Snow Kreilich Architects. And Frank, would you comment on -- let me give just a little more and then I'd ask you to comment.

For this project, BNIM presented the overall site strategies, building concept design, and interior space planning. The IAG recommended relocating key program elements to improve site organization,
construction phasing, and building massing. For the final concept the IAG recommended integrating more regional materials into the building envelope and refining the analysis regarding building performance. And Frank, I think that is a perfect segue into your expertise.

MR. SCIAME: Well thank you, Ann. And thank you everyone at OBO for really spending taxpayer dollars cost effectively on these great projects. As we said, the design team, BNIM, really did a good job at facing the challenges of this project. And this was a project where you were building an addition onto an existing facility which really does present certain challenges. After two sessions we did find ways to improve the site organization, which would better respond to the user needs. We also looked at the building massing, in terms of how we could situate the different buildings in a different location, have the massing be more consistent with what the final design
intent was.

And at the end of the day it really was a good exercise because by doing this we found out a way to really help the phasing and the site mobilization, which was able to save about six months from the original schedule. And that obviously will end up in a more cost effective project. So at the end of the day I was very happy to participate, as were the other advisors. And we think at the end you’re going to have a terrific building and it’s going to be built cost effectively.

MS. BEHA: I think it is a mark of the quality of these reviews that such a broad and diverse review group is included, including engineers, architects, facility managers, and inevitably the discussion is enriched by these different points of view.

So let’s go now to Seoul, Korea, to the new U.S. Embassy project. The new Seoul Embassy is
located on a ten-acre site with an adjacent housing site. The embassy scope includes a new chancery office building, Marine security guard residence, as well as parking and other support facilities. This project is being designed by SHoP Architects. It has had its first industry advisory review in January of this year. And as I mentioned, that focuses on three concepts to be evaluated and debated, discussed, etcetera, by the reviewers and the OBO participants. Thom Mayne from Morphosis, Nat Oppenheimer from Silman, and Shane Coen from Coen & Partners were advisors in this case.

The three concept schemes were named, easily, Cascade, Courtyard, and Porch. And the site strategy was a key difference in each scheme. The IAG recommended the site strategy of the Porch concept, which placed the staff parking garage on the east side of the site, paired with the chancery office building shown in the Cascade scheme. So mix and match in that
case often happens in design as we all know. This strategy allows the northwest corner of the site, the one most visible to people approaching, to be best developed as open representational space. And with that, Thom, could I ask for your comments on the review panel?

MR. MAYNE: Yeah, let me take a little bit different tack. I’m not going to continue to explain the project because you need the drawings and it’s very kind of specific and I think less important. For me what was so important about this whole process, IAG, was we’d been through it in terms of our project. And actually Nat, who was in our group this time, was part of the review for my project along with Craig Hartman, etcetera. And I have to say we came through that.

Well as an architect, having other architects, etcetera, look at your work, always kind of dicey as everybody knows here. And I didn’t know
what to expect. And I remember when we left that meeting, it was a long session with our project, I was just, it was amazingly useful and that the group was collegial, etcetera, and it was a very, very positive thing.

So when I came into this group we’re starting with something and first of all you realize how unique how each group is and that they came in with three projects, as mentioned. And they had three different teams working on it and there were three very different projects. And Nat, you remember I’m sure like it was yesterday, they were literally asking our advice and our conversation of the issues that came up with these three projects. And it was, I remember leaving that day, writing notes, etcetera, finding it immensely useful. And I don’t know if any of the SHoP people are here? They could, they could - - ah. I think they said the same. And that it’s an extremely useful process in these complex projects and
especially when we feel very comfortable that we knew the issues, we could kind of locate a lot of the problems, etcetera, right? And we could have a very, very constructive conversation on multiple levels. Because this one was, the first meeting, which had to do with the site, as mentioned, etcetera. But it was incredibly constructive and I would have said was, I left incredibly supportive of the whole process and its usefulness.

MS. BEHA: Well I personally couldn’t agree with you more. And I just think this is a mark of the quality of thinking that OBO is bringing to its projects. And one other comment is simply that we’ve been talking about the special features of these projects. And I think underlying all of them is this commitment to security, commitment to functionality, and also the commitment to the image that the U.S. presents in its host countries being all tied together. Not individual efforts, but integrated
efforts.

MR. MAYNE: Can I make one more comment? It just has occurred to me that when we left it became evident that we were actually part of the design team, it was that collegial, that, the conversation was that connected. And I think if you asked the SHoP people, they would say the same thing. That you’re literally participating in the solving of a complex problem.

MS. BEHA: Well the next project at Tegucigalpa new U.S. Embassy project is also a SHoP project. And before you google, that’s in Honduras. It’s a new embassy project that includes a new chancery office building, Marine security guard residence, as well as the parking and other support facilities that are part and parcel of developing a compound.

SHoP on this one has had their second industry advisory review. Dan Sesil from Les Robertson Associates; Chris Reed from Stoss, Landscape
Urbanism; and Mack Scogin from Mac Scogin Merrill Elam Architects were on that review.

And just as a quick summary, following the recommendations of IAG, because there had been a prior review, the final concept for the new embassy project blends the site planning, garage location, and access points of the Valley concept with features proposed in the Mountain concept. So I think what we’re really saying is it’s come together one way or the other into something that the IAG review panel was very enthusiastic about. So Dan, can you just wrap this up by commenting on that project?

MR. SESIL: Yes, sure. Thanks, Ann. We’ve gone through two -- and I’d like to second what Thom said. And that is that we had a wonderful experience with the architects at SHoP. It was a very collaborative process. There was a really healthy give and take back and forth.

This particular site is interesting because
it's pretty tight. There's a couple of tight side roads on it, one of which actually currently bisects the site. So there's a move to reposition that. And from a design aspiration standpoint, the relationship to the building and the mountains in the distance was important as well as providing important gathering spaces for the people who are going to work in this building. And you can sort of see it. You can start to see that very literally happening on this building. And so a lot of our effort, a lot of our time spent discussion the project focused on questions of access, movement through the building both through the site and through the building, and as well as actually finding places on the site for everything to go.

MS. BEHA: Thank you very much. Ambassador Moser, back to you. Thank you.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Are you willing to take any questions?

MS. BEHA: I'd be delighted to, or anyone
who participated --

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Okay. Any questions from the table or from the broader audience?

MS. BEHA: David, please.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Yeah, please. David?

MR. BURNEY: I just had one question going back to the procurement process. And I'm assuming that these design services are procured using a quality-based selection process. But I was wondering what the evaluation criteria were when these selections were made?

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Yes. I told you, we never go anywhere without a contracting officer.

MR. VIVIAN: Yes, the source selection process for AE construction requires that we don't consider price but we look at quality and capability of the contractor. But I couldn't exactly, if you want, you can send me an email and I can tell you what the specific selection criteria was.
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MR. BURNEY: Okay.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Any other questions? Now I'd like to turn to one of our other information sessions for this afternoon. You know, we have a very, very firm belief in design excellence in OBO. But to us design excellence means how functional our buildings are and how well they serve our customers. One of our most important customers and one of the essential parts of the foreign service and a part that has been with us since really the founding of the State Department is our consular affairs section. And they are the ones that give our visas, take care of citizens overseas, and really do an important part and are an important part of our diplomatic profile overseas.

I'm very fortunate to have with us this afternoon John Brennan. John, would you go ahead and stand, please? Who is a senior foreign service officer who is currently a Deputy Assistant Secretary.
in Consular Affairs. And Scott Feeken, from the Consular Affairs Executive Office. And they are going to talk to you about how OBO has worked in their careers and how we are interacting today in order to serve their very, very important business.

MR. BRENNAN: It’s on.

(Laughter.)

MR. BRENNAN: Okay. I just didn’t see a red light, so thank you very much. Thank you very much, Ambassador Moser. And yes, I’ve been with the Department of State since 1985, and most recently served abroad as the Minister Counselor for Consular Affairs in Mexico, where we have more consulates than in any other country and are involved rather strenuously in an aggressive program to renew our facilities. And I’m going to ask for your indulgence for a little bit because I’m going to indulge in some reminiscences and some history here because I’ve been around a while.
For those of you who haven’t been around a while, you may find some historical perspective in this. For those of you who have been around a while, you may find some new information that could be useful and inform your decisions about how you engage with us.

So when I started with the foreign service, and I am a career foreign service officer, in 1985 I came in with Chinese and Japanese language, which was not a widely available skill at that point in time given our history of relationships with China. My Chinese language classes in Columbia University had about ten or 12 people in them until Nixon went to China and then suddenly they had 100. But I graduated the year that Nixon went to China. So I never saw more than a dozen people studying Chinese during my academic career.

So I was sent to China. My initial job was in Beijing. Initially I did some economic work, just...
kind of as a stop gap, and then was sent to do what was then considered the standard 18-month consular tour.

Later on you’re going to see some views of our facilities in China, particularly Guangzhou, its massive reception halls, its dozens and dozens of windows. I was the sole non-immigrant visa officer in Beijing in 1985. It was me. That was it. And we had one less consulate. We had no consulate in Chengdu. That was within our district. And no one at that point in time could have envisioned what we have become, nor anticipated the problems that we are having now with respect to resourcing our operations in China.

You guys have a big and a daunting task. These things that we’re building are multigenerational operations that require, you know, a significant amount of thought about how they remain functional through their life spans. There is a lot of
volatility in our work. There's a lot of unknowns. But we have become a better and more mature organization. And I think that one of the points that Ambassador Moser made about data, we've grown a lot stronger in our ability to supply the type of data that can give people a better grounding in at least what we can anticipate for our own future.

And concerning what I do now, I'm in a new position in the Bureau of Consular Affairs, which has grown into a significantly different organization over the past 20 years. We do in excess of 15 million non-immigrant visa applications worldwide at the moment. The majority of those are handled in embassies and consulates through in person interviews. Again, scaling that, rolling all that back 20 or 30 years, no one could have anticipated these types of volumes. But in some ways we're like those long term graphs of the stock market that you get from financial advisors. It's always eventually going up, especially when you
compress the timelines.

But we don’t anticipate that our business is going to be anything other than a growth business over the long term. And it has become an extremely large business. It has also taken on new dimensions, far more complexity than most people would envision, especially if they have dealt with the visa processes of other countries. So our demands with respect to what is a functional environment have grown appreciably.

Our partnership with OBO has also grown significantly and much stronger. There’s a lot better communication. There’s a lot more, let’s say coordination in advance in terms of what our needs are going to be and how we will realize them. And there’s also, I think, a demonstrable record of successful execution so that all of our goals are properly met. I saw this firsthand in China as new facilities were both opened and designed. I mean in Mexico, rather.
China we have some problems with opening and designing new facilities, though we have made some progress.

But in Mexico we have moved forward rather aggressively, as I’ve said, in terms of rebuilding what we have there. A lot of the infrastructure, a lot of the buildings that we’re replacing, were done in the sixties, long have outlived their usefulness, and are trying to serve a mission in Mexico that has changed dramatically in character since the time in which they were designed.

You know, I also need to mention our security posture has changed dramatically within that same period of time. So our collective needs, because we are part of the State Department. I don’t want to seem like the tail is wagging the dog here. But how we interact with the public is one of our major concerns. And we are not the only part of the State Department that has that concern. There are other public facing aspects of our embassy. But we are by
far the largest. We are the face of America for the foreign visitor, in their millions, as they come here. We are also the lifeline for Americans abroad, when they lose their passports or for those who are residing abroad who register their children, and for a variety of other tasks that are still necessary to see the U.S. government about even though you are no longer in the United States.

So with that in mind, we have coped a lot with shoeorning new missions into old facilities. And we are extremely grateful when we can work with our colleagues in OBO and DS, and you as well, to come up with newer facilities that meet our needs and meet the needs of the public.

Our mission is basically twofold. We are basically the frontline for border security screening for the United States abroad. We are a huge information collection organization. We are a huge identity management organization. We collect
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biometrics on all visa applicants. We basically lock in their identities with host country documents. And therefore set a string of identity and data management in place that lasts over the life of those people basically traveling to and from the United States. Most people would be aghast at the complexity of the back end that runs this anymore. The depth of the interagency connections and dependencies. The amount of IT that’s necessary to keep this up and running 24/7 globally in 300 locations. This is big and important stuff. All housed in these facilities, right, that are under construction. And in the old facilities that still have to serve our needs.

So I would first of all like to thank Ambassador Moser, and the rest of his staff, for what I think is the excellent working relationship that we have with them at this moment. And hope that we will continue to move forward together in partnership to see that the platforms that support our mission are
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the best that we can design and build.

So one of the things that has emerged that has changed over the course of my career is, I mean, we’re a sole source provider. You can’t go anywhere else for U.S. visas. So let’s just say a commitment to customer service was not one of the things that was beaten into my head 30 years ago as I stepped out into my task. But that has changed. We’ve changed in innumerable ways, in size and scale, and in the understanding of what our mission is. And customer service is certainly part of it.

We do look for people to be served in an appropriate and dignified environment, to give them the facilities that they need while they are waiting for our services and allow us to dispense the services in an appropriately efficient manner so that they are not waiting too long for them. So these have not always been needs that have been at the forefront when people have designed facilities in the past. But I’ve
seen that people have understood these concepts and worked at them from the basic level in which they are coming up with concepts to build a new embassy or consulate.

While I was in Mexico I was fortunate enough to have a good mix of new and old. We were dealing with a very large new facility in Ciudad Juárez, which handles more immigrant visas than any other facility in the world. We were dealing with a relatively recently constructed facility in Tijuana, both of which had been built to accommodate the types of public facing activities that were required for scale operations.

I saw completed and put into service our new consulate in Monterrey, which I thought brought the concepts that had been proven to work in those facilities up to another level. And that new level was a general understanding of our commitment to the public. And I’m going to go a bit off my brief here,
which those of you who were at my table at lunch understand is one of my faults.

But in a sense that our general understanding of that commitment I think has undergone a little bit of a shift. We have gone through some very significant organizational changes. We have grown very large. Our border security mission has grown very big. And but during that we have had to struggle and we’ve had to come up with, well, how do we meet our public facing service commitments? And make sure that all of that is taken care of? It’s not an easy thing to put in a single package. There are some tensions there. But I believe that we together collectively have found a path towards achieving all of those multiple goals.

But some awareness of what’s required and the scale of the activity that goes on in some of these places is one of the basic pieces of knowledge that’s necessary to come up with a desirable result.
We had several sessions in Mexico when we were going over the design of the new embassy compound in Mexico City. I found those in addition to seeing the design in Monterrey evolve so that it could accommodate the hundreds of thousands of people who apply for visas there, including more than half of all the temporary seasonal and agricultural work that comes legitimately into the United States in one facility and watching it be put into service and seeing it work. This was as heartening a moment as any I have had in my 30-year career. It was wonderful. And it did take close to a decade worth of effort, collaborative thinking, and a successful and timely execution of difficult projects. That was I think really rewarding for everyone who saw it. And you know the icing on the cake? It is a beautiful building. It is really a beautiful building in a spectacular setting. Right against the Huasteca, these huge lofty limestone cliffs, with wonderful
outdoor spaces that the public can access to view this setting as well as more glass than I had ever seen in a U.S. government facility up to that time in my life, allowing for spaces inside whereby people could look at this environment. It was really heartening to see all of that done.

And then as we were going towards the new embassy compound, looking at people, telling them this is what we like, this is where we should go, understanding was not very hard to achieve. But people actually went further. Right? We had architects who then asked us, well, what is the customer journey here? Looking at our customers. A very good and a very sensible question. Right? And not one that has always been addressed with a great deal of rigor in the past. And they, the lead architects, the guys whose names you saw on that compound, spent an entire day at one of our facilities going through what a member of the public goes through
to come and see us and be served. And I think that
that was extremely informative in the way that they
put their design together. Which again, I found
extremely heartening.

As well as the fact all of the work that
they did to look at cultural norms in Mexico, how
fences didn’t work, how walls did, how patios worked,
you know, how we worked in terms of the neighborhood
and the spaces that were sort of in this gray area
between public space and our security barriers. I
found this all gratifying. I found that my journey
from Beijing where we were in basically a facility
that had been discarded by an Eastern European country
and was up for grabs and we sort of retrofitted,
right, to where we are now, to be almost unbelievable
in its breadth.

So I hope that I haven’t bored you with, you
know, sort of old man tales about the good old, the
bad old days and the good old days that have seemed to
have arrived. But I think it's worth thinking about. Especially sort of in the general level of what is it we want to achieve? And also with respect to how close we are, closer than every before, to getting the types of results that we need I think generally.

I deal with global operations. I understand the challenges. There's no one size fits all that happens here. There's also a lot of volatility and unpredictability that makes this as a business proposition challenging for those who undertake it to execute it. I get all that. But then again, I've seen how well people do facing these challenges and I have to say thank you, thank you, thank you for what I have seen recently. And I expect to see more before they boot me out the door. All right? And I'm going to hold it there.

I'm available for questions. All right?

And I believe we're going to have a session now with SOM?
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AMBASSADOR MOSER: Well John, if you're willing to take questions while you are up there I think we should give people a chance.

MR. BRENNAN: Absolutely.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: So questions?

MR. BRENNAN: Come on.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Yeah, come on Tom.

MR. MITCHELL: This is a softball question for you, John. Can you give us some feedback from the end users, the experience that they are having in these new facilities that are relatively new, unfortunately, and we should have done it maybe a little earlier?

MR. BRENNAN: Yeah. Well we do actually expend increasingly large amounts of time trying to find customer service feedback. And although, you know, sort of a little story, right, about how things don't always get thought through, power in our waiting rooms was in short supply. So as well as cabling. So
putting in things like go to a kiosk and ask, do a customer service survey, turned out to be a huge goat rope in Mexico. We eventually found our way through it. But this is the type of thing that actually people can incorporate into their thinking.

And of course, we have a captive audience. We’re a sole source provider. People we give visas to are happy. People we don’t give visas to are less happy. But in general they found that the experience that they were getting in the facilities was one of the better parts of the process.

It was interesting what they found less lovable about the process. Some of it was the complexity and the length of our forms online, right, they found that a bit daunting. So yes, we get good feedback. People are very happy. Right? When we have a good facility, we have lots of internal mechanisms that we use to monitor flow through and optimize what the customer experience might be. We
don't necessarily have a single model for this. But we do try to get people in and out quickly and served quickly and nothing makes them happier than that. And nothing allows that to be done better than right-sizing of the facility.

We wanted to absolutely end this era where we had people out waiting in areas outside the embassy under canopies that sometimes turned into mud in the rain and a variety of other things. We wanted to have the appropriate amenities, we want these things to be appropriately sized. We want the CACs that do all the screening right-sized for the volumes of the type of people who are going to have to walk through them. And I could lay out other aspirational things, too. Right? If you wanted to hear them, just off the top of my head.

We are not the only people who serve the public. And you have a problem, too, as what is the Department of State, what is the embassy, and who is
expressing the needs? And you get a whole laundry list of requirements. But sometimes a little step back and thinking about the public more collectively could result in a better answer than, well, my public needs to go here and their public needs to go there, and just saying, right.

But you, I’ve seen these sessions so I know how difficult they are for you as you sort through requirements, because we can be the death of a thousand cuts, right. And some vision about how it’s supposed to work is the only way that you kind of survive the death of a thousand cuts and come up with the best solution for everyone.

So yes, there’s good feedback. What else?

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Any other questions?

MR. KANGA: John, you mentioned I think it was Monterrey, where you said we had given you a beautiful facility. I’d love to hear your perspective on how you think good architecture, a beautiful
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facility, actually facilitates, you know, our department’s conduct of diplomacy? How, where is --

MR. BRENNAN: That’s an excellent question. And I do want to get into, this was a luncheon topic about the symbolic value of some of this. Right? Because it is really important. It was deeply significant in Mexico.

I was in Mexico from 2011 to 2014. And that was the end of the Calderón administration. We had seen basically the war against the cartels ramp up to the point where tens of thousands of casualties a year were being racked up in that effort. We had seen since 2007 a lot of the border towns basically turn into war zones -- and please don’t quote me on that. You know, people have gotten into trouble for that before. But the, they were difficult environments. Security challenges were real.

Our presence was important. Our presence was important as a sign of our commitment, as a sign
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that civic institutions work, right, that government business can be conducted in an open and reasonable manner. All of these things are important. Packaging that in a way that looks like we have a facility that works with the community as opposed to something that is completely separate from it is in my view an important part of that. And I think you can get it all done and get the setbacks we need, the screening we need, right, the security barriers that we need, all of that can be done. But having that sense that, yes, we're there and we're there because we're committed to that place and we show we're committed to that place because we interact with that place on multiple levels. Right? Including for instance the public that I serve, as well as the local governments, and any other constituencies that we have.

And an attractive building helps. It shows, it's a symbol that, yes, we care. Right? We're putting something nice in the middle of your town,
right? As opposed to something that looks sort of like a -- well, I won’t say that either. I’ll get in trouble for that, too. But you know what I mean. It does make a difference. And Monterrey is a wonderful example of that. Because Monterrey had its problems. Right? Monterrey had some security challenges. Monterrey had an extremely strong and I thought very good civic reaction on the part of their local leaders to their security problems. And the fact that we were in synch with that, right, that we were making a statement that Monterrey mattered, that mattered greatly across the board. So yes, it does make a difference. What else?

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Okay. I think we have time for one more question. Anyone from the crowd? If not, John, thank you very much. We appreciate it.

(Appause.)

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Okay. So Mr. Fleming, Mark, do you want to take the microphone now? I think
it's up to you. If you'll please introduce yourself and --

MR. FLEMMING: Yes, sir. Good afternoon.

My name is Mark Flemming. I'm the Acting Director of Design and Engineering for OBO. Normally I'm a design manager with Special Projects Coordination. And I've had the privilege of working with SOM to design and get these two buildings, these two projects constructed.

But what I thought I might do is maybe tee up the problem set here that David Dianond from SOM will be speaking to. As many of you know, embassy and consulate design is technically complex and requires an intimate understanding of the many processes and services rendered at these locations overseas. Consular services presents one of the more challenging set of requirements for the designer to master. Scheduling, security screening, document verification, biometric data collection, in person interviews, case
adjudication, and if all goes well an approved U.S. visa for the traveler. The process repeats thousands of times daily with the security of our borders and the integrity of U.S. immigration in the balance with each application.

Beyond meeting the uncompromising security standards and delivering spaces flexible enough for evolving requirements, the design must do something more. The U.S. mission and consular hall is usually the prospective traveler’s first contact with the United States and its government. The architecture should inspire and inform them of the country they wish to visit. In one way or another, the design communicates our values to these thousands of daily visitors for many years to come.

The consular process in a notional embassy incorporates security requirements such as, as I said, security screening. But there is a physical separation from the public for the foreign service
officers. The public applicants' side and the foreign officers' side are separated by a secure hardline mandated by our diplomatic security standards. Where applicants present their documents, provide fingerprints, and converse with officers, ballistic resistant interview windows intervene. Yet the environment must be engaging and welcoming. The acoustics and lighting design should work to create a degree of privacy and immediacy for observing visual cues and spoken responses.

In addition to this the consular service standards continue to be refined. Consular processes, from queuing management to visa printing, are undergoing changes in technology. Both the consular processes and supporting technologies have refresh rates that are months and years shorter than the usual time it takes for OBO to build these projects.

So how best to design the flexibility for this accelerating change? To introduce David Diamond
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with SOM, he will be presenting two -- Skidmore, Owings, & Merrill, San Francisco office -- will be presenting two recent examples, the Beijing new embassy and Guangzhou new consulate in the People's Republic of China, which illustrate possible solutions to these priorities for consular services in the architecture of diplomacy. David?

MR. DIAMOND: Okay, thank you, Mark. Thank you all for coming today and thanks also to OBO for inviting us to present some of the work that we've done with them over the last 15 years. And it has been a real privilege and honor for those of us who have been involved in these projects to have participated in this process.

So today we're going to look at three SOM projects in China for the State Department, beginning with the United States Embassy in Beijing on which the design began in 2001 and the project opened in August of 2008 in time for the Summer Olympics which were
then held in Beijing.

So embassies and consulates provide a unique opportunity for architects and design professionals to design buildings that not only serve a very important program specific function for the end users, but they also symbolically represent the culture and values of the American people and the countries abroad in which they are built. Beijing being the capital city of China required the program to include a very heavy concentration of diplomatic departments and functions, but today we’re going to focus more on the consular affairs sections.

The overall site plan is laid out in three main neighborhoods, which organize the plan from east to west beginning with the consular neighborhood at the east with a dedicated entrance for visa applicants; the professional neighborhood at the center of the site for embassy staff and office workers; and then a social neighborhood on the west
side of the site containing the Marines quarters, gymnasium, cafeteria, conference center, post office, and commissary.

The consular building on the east side of the site is the primary face of the embassy for the public who access the compound via a consular compound access control facility on the east side of the perimeter wall. As the primary face of the embassy for visitors, the objective of the design for the consular building was to convey a sense of openness as an extension of American culture and values. This was the motivation behind utilizing as transparent a facade as possible within the limitations of blast and security requirements for the exterior wall of the consular hall.

Additionally, though, we wanted the main arrival sequence to the consular hall to convey an aura of welcome, which is personified by a large projecting roof element supported on four great
columns as a symbolic reference to the classic American front porch. The interior of the consular hall is a multistory open space with full natural daylighting on two sides and skylight registers in the ceiling. You may notice that the queuing and waiting area in front of the tailor windows is not as large as some other consulates and embassies. This is because at this post the embassy staff planned to conduct most of the queuing in the consular CAC at the perimeter wall so when the public area of the consular hall only had to accommodate visitors who had been designed a predetermined waiting time.

The public spaces in the consular hall also provided opportunities to display the artwork of notable artists commissioned by the State Department’s Art In Embassies program for specific locations throughout the complex. These are some of the pieces that were specifically commissioned for the consular hall.
Additionally, this image on the left shows the public stair up to the American citizen services section which was on the second floor of the consular building.

As this is a multiple building compound, the public functions of the consular building are separated from the more private functions of the embassy staff in the office buildings behind it. There are two office buildings which together anchor the center of the site, an eight-story mid-rise tower which is located to the south and an elongated three-story building which is split down the middle by a continuous atrium gallery.

The elongated lower building on the right is designed to promote professional and social exchange between the embassy staff and workers. Two thin horizontal bars of office space maximize the availability and penetration of natural light within the interior and the two bars are separated by a
daylit central atrium galleria space that runs the full length of the building. This serves as the community heart of the project for the embassy staff. This gallery space also provides an additional opportunity for the display of public artwork, which in this instance is Russell Crotty's *Landscapes of the Mind*.

Shortly after the completion of the Beijing embassy project, OBO came back to us to design a new office annex building due to the rapid growth of operations at this post. This new building was sited on the northeast corner of the site adjacent to the original consular building, which provided an opportunity to expand the size of consular operations within the new annex. So in this photo the new annex is the building on the far right.

The annex building occupies the northeast corner of what was formerly landscaped garden space with a large portion of the expanded consular section.
contained in a below grade level, below a newly configured outdoor courtyard. This allows the above grade footprint of the building to be relatively compact, thereby maximizing daylight and the space between the buildings and the perimeter wall.

The American citizens’ services section of consular affairs which had initially been located on the second floor of the consular building, but now the new annex afforded the opportunity to move ACS to a more spacious hall on the lower level of the new annex building. Visitors to the ACS consular hall arrive via a path across the courtyard between the two buildings and then they proceed through the building lobby down a monumental stair or elevator to the lower level.

The lower level of the consular hall includes ten teller window positions, including one privacy booth and a more gracious waiting area than what had been provided in the original building.
This section shows the sequence from the main level down the monumental stair to the consular hall on the lower level. Also worth noting is the solution for introducing daylight into the lower level via glass floor lights set in the courtyard plaza paving at the perimeter of the building. This natural daylight washes down the wall services opposite the consular hall waiting area.

And here are some photos of the annex building as it was nearing completion of construction.

The last project we will look at today is the U.S. Consulate General in Guangzhou, China. Guangzhou is a very large city of 13 million people in Southern China. It was formerly named Canton. And as such, it is a major visa processing center for Chinese nationals seeking non-immigrant and immigrant visas. With such a large volume of consular visitors, the largest building on the compound is the consular building of which the highest proportion of the
program is occupied by the consular affairs section.

The site plan is organized similarly to Beijing, with multiple buildings separated by landscaped courtyards within the compound perimeter wall. The main building, noted as Building B, is located near the eastern side of the site. This building is a long, low, four-story building where the public face of the consular affairs section is on the east side of the building. The primary public space for visa applicant visitors is a two-story high interior volume grade hall that runs along two-thirds the length of the east side of the building. The visa processing programming area for the consular staff is located to the west of the great hall behind the teller windows and the consular support program functions are located on the top floor of the building.

Due to the exceptionally high volume of visa processing, the non-immigrant visa and immigrant visa
applicants are split between the first and the third floors. The first floor accommodates the larger volume of non-immigrant visa applicants with 28 teller windows on the ground level of the great hall. Additionally there is a generous amount of public queuing space with movable chairs for applicants to wait in the sheltered and climate controlled environment of the great hall’s interior.

The second floor accommodates the American Citizen Services section at the north end of the building with ten teller windows and waiting room seating. Of interesting note, though, the ACS section at Guangzhou has the unique function of also processing all of the adoption and citizenship papers for American parents-to-be who have traveled to China to adopt Chinese children. As such, there are more ACS teller windows in this hall than at a typical consulate and there are also daily swearing in ceremonies for these new American citizens that take
place in the great hall in the late afternoon. On average, the consulate processes between 50 to 100 adoptions per day.

Lastly, the immigrant visa section is accommodated by 24 teller windows in a separate hall on the third floor of the building.

So this is a view of the non-immigrant visa great hall on the ground floor with the line of 28 teller windows looking north towards the glass enclosed elevator and stairs circulation tower to the upper floors. This grant interior open space serves as the central heart of the compound and the movable chairs can be stowed away so that the space can be configured for a variety of assembly functions which can also be open to the public, which is unlike Beijing where the central galleria is within a staff office building that is not accessible to the general public. The space was also configured in such a way that the wall at the south end can be used as a
projection screen for multimedia presentations, and there’s a drop down projector located in the ceiling.

While there are standard OBO templates for the design and equipment to be incorporated into the individual teller windows, we were able to integrate the interior finishes of the great hall into the public side of the windows by using stone cladding on the pylons between the windows and integrating the cumadic (phonetic) screens into the horizontal wood slats above.

But perhaps as important as the consular hall is in the main building, the user experience for the consular visitor begins at the compound access control CAC, in this case located at the eastern perimeter of the site. The consular CAC, the building located here in the foreground, not only formulates the first impressions that visitors will have of their experience at the consulate, but it also becomes the consulate’s physical connection to the public realm of
the host city beyond. As such, we really thought about ways of making this building as gracious and welcoming as possible and minimizing the visual impact of the required security measures.

This began with elevating the building up above the plane of the public sidewalk and accommodating the grade transition with long ramps bordered by low knee walls that serve as the anti-ram protection required at the compound perimeter wall. This eliminated the need for bollards or a heavy solid base where the building met the ground.

The next idea was to create view corridors through the CAC building that would allow people outside the compound to see through the perimeter wall and glimpse the presence of and the activity of the consulate within. This also created a visual connection between the consulate and the street beyond the compound.

Lastly, due to the high volume of visitors
who will require screening and the adverse
experiential impact for a visitor with a long waiting
time at a screening station, we separated the
screening facility into two separate areas based on
the visitor's final destination within the building.
One for NIV and IV applicants shown in yellow to the
south, and one for ACS visitors shown in blue to the
north.

To achieve the aforementioned objectives, we
split the programmatic functions into separate
pavilions that are all collected under a singular
roof. The resulting open spaces between these
separate pavilions not only provided additional public
queuing space that is sheltered from the elements by
the building's roof, but it also allowed for the
transverse view corridors that visually connect the
consular garden to the public street.

The screening station for NIV and IV
applications is the larger pavilion at the south end
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of the building, and the screening station for ACS
visitors is the smaller pavilion at the north end of
the building.

Once visitors have passed through the
screening facility the next part of the experience is
the journey across the consular gardens to the main
consular building. NIV and IV applicants traverse the
consular garden to the south under covered walkways
and they enter the consular building at the southern
end of the great hall. Click it again, please. Thank
you. And their outgoing path is the reverse direction
through the southern garden and then back through the
NIV and IV CAC.

ACS visitors traverse the consular garden to
the north under the covered walkways as they enter the
consular building at the northern end of the great
hall. And their outgoing path is the reverse
direction through the northern consular garden.

So the photo on the right shows the

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)
relationship between the main consular building in the background, the consular CAC in the foreground, and the consular garden in between with bands of striped paving that track through the CAC and carry out to the elevated streetside plaza. The photo on the left shows the interior side of the consular garden with the covered walkways for visitors approaching the southern entry to the great hall.

As stated earlier, the open spaces between the separate pavilions in the CAC create view corridors into the consular garden. This photo shows that view connection all the way from the public sidewalk, through the CAC and the consular garden, and back to the face of the main consular building. These view corridors were achieved with full height laminated security glazing to provide the necessary physical separation. But the great success here is that it provides a much more transparent visual connection than a wall or a fence would have.
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The view on the right shows the interior of the southern NIV and IV consular garden space with the overhanging roof of the CAC in the upper right corner of the photo. And the eastern facade of the consular building is punctuated on the ground floor by a series of cor-ten steel and wood lined lantern boxes that visually connect the outdoor garden to the interior of the great hall within. The view on the left also shows that visual connection all the way from the inside of the great hall back to the public sidewalk.

ACS visitors enter the great hall through the northern end of the building via another covered walkway.

In conclusion, we feel that this rethinking of the organization and presentation of the consular CAC has been really successful in terms of how the U.S. government’s presence is perceived by the host country, as evidenced by how the project is being received by the local residents.
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So we thank you for this opportunity to present our work in China. And we've just recently broken ground on our next consulate in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia. So we are looking forward to a continuing relationship with OBO and the Department of State. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MR. FLEMMING: Thank you, David. That was great. I appreciate it. Just to wrap up, again, thanks to David for his presentation and to SOM for their great work here. But this is, these are three examples of great work that many of you are doing. And I'd like to just emphasize the partnership that we have with our A&Es, and with industry, with the IAG, that really makes all this possible to advance the OBO program and to advance the American diplomacy overseas. So thank you.

(Applause.)

AMBASSADOR MOSER: So I want to thank my
consular colleagues, Scott and John and David. Thank you very much for your presentation from SOM, although we did let you get away without taking any questions, which we’ll try to correct that in a little bit. And Mark, thank you.

I want to give some time to Bob Castro. Bob? And if you want to take the microphone? And I’ll say this, Bob is a former OBO employee. So we always try to allocate time to our current and former.

MR. CASTRO: Thank you, Will. It’s great to see you and DAS Ashbery and DAS Brennan. Thanks for giving me a minute. It’s really more to make a little bit of an announcement and a plea to the folks here, because I’m one of you. I worked at OBO for four years helping to coordinate these panels. I met and married my wife while at OBO and married into the foreign service, so I have served now at three posts, including Mexico and two in the Middle East. I don’t know if it’s still true that an educated consumer is
your best customer now that Syms Suits has gone out of business. But I’ve occasionally also worked for some of the vendors in this room and it’s just great to be back and staying connected to OBO.

My current role in the Secretary’s transition team has placed me in the Secretary’s Office of Global Partnerships. And I’m not here to speak for the Secretary or for the White House. But I think you’ve all seen that there’s some serious thought being put into how to engage the private sector. And as I’ve sent advice up, and I have a colleague who is covering the M family who is here in the room but I won’t put the spotlight on him because I didn’t get a chance to ask his permission in advance, but I’d love to chat with you all and get your input and advice. Because I have pointed several times to this group, the Industry Advisory Group and OBO’s predecessor industry advisory panel as best practices, ones that should be adopted, expanded,
etcetera.

And as we think through both how the Secretary’s Office of Global Partnerships goes forward and the various other industry engagements that are going on, I really want your feedback. What has worked? What could be done better? What other parts of the department perhaps could enjoy engagement like this? And with that in mind, I wanted to point out that OBO has been engaged with the Office of Global Partnerships on a number of initiatives. And Beth Hilton, I don’t know if Beth actually made it? Oh, there you are, Beth. Thank you. She’s presenting on Friday at what’s called the Diplomacy Lab and Annual Wonk Tank competition. And my colleagues there pointed out that in addition to the typical political science engagement, many of you in this room would appreciate the fact, particularly those in academia, that it’s also scientific, technical, and engineering architecture research that we’re leveraging through
that effort. In the past year the University of Virginia has worked on a project called Diplomacy in Architecture: Designing and Planning Consular Landscape and Building Entry Sequence for U.S. Embassies and Consulates in Diverse Contexts for Global Diplomacy. And this coming Fall, Indiana University, no coincidence the Vice President’s home state, this decision was made before then, is working on a proposal, Three Vestibules, Three Entrances, looking at sacred religious, commercial industrial, and institutional embassy.

So if any of you are in town Friday and interested in coming, you can. Email us at diplomacylab@state.gov or go to the website diplomacylab.org, not.gov, but .org. See one of us during the time socially afterwards. And it’s just great to be engaged with all of you all. So thanks again for giving me a couple of minutes to say hello.

Thanks.
(Applause.)

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Okay. Bob, thank you very much. And now, I'd like to open up to questions on, any or all questions. While we still have all of our speakers here we'd like to give everyone in the audience a chance to really ask questions. So it's open. So please. Okay. Boy, I just be unpopular. Okay. There we go.

MR. BORDENARO: Hello, Mike Bordenaro. I'm with the Asset Leadership Network and I volunteer with the National Institute of Building Sciences, the Building Smart Alliance, which works on the programming code for BIM. So thank you for mentioning that.

And what we're trying to do is figure out how to bring pockets of excellence that we know of from different agencies and cross-pollinate. So is there any mechanism other than working through NIBS, we've got a small program, but is there a way that we
can step it up and bring more information and education for this?

MR. DIZON: Yeah, the step it up comment, we’re actually working with you guys on a couple of initiatives surrounding BIM in terms of getting together this foundation of families and templates. And then we’re also working with you on how it impacts the various directorates within OBO. I think we talked a little bit about it during lunch and we had sort of suggested that it was sort of easy to understand when you are talking about design. But when we look at how it translates into construction to maintenance, certainly all the portfolio management, that’s the evolution of how our thinking is. But we’re working directly with you guys now.

MR. BORDENARO: So thank you for saying BIM. You’re the highest official that has said that word.

(Laughter.)

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Okay.
MR. CALLAHAN: (Inaudible) the audiovisual.
Oh, goodness gracious, it works. The red light, the audiovisual works. My name is Joe Callahan with Innovative Collaboration. I found it interesting, I think John Brennan had mentioned it and also the other gentleman, Mark, about the technology. And I have noticed in the past, you know, that as I look and I research back and I'll see, you know, an architectural design award will happen in, you know, 2013 and the next thing you know it's 2016 before it's built. And the technology that is changing at a rapid pace, you know, between those few years, I particularly appreciated the multipurpose layout of the China facility there with the projector and the screen on the wall.

So the question that I have is, you know, that's a long period of time. We, where we work is we work with the primes on the back end and bid on the audiovisual. But from the design aspect of it, how
often are you taking a look at the technology, I mean, of three or four years ago and you want it really to deploy, at the time of deployment to be as modern as possible? How often during that cycle are you revisiting, you know, we said we were going to make this room this way two years ago and now we think it should look like this? I just wanted to understand that process a little better. Thank you.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Well in the general sense, I’m going to turn over this question also to Angel, but in the general sense one of the things that we’re trying to emphasize in programmatic structure is that designs are flexible in nature. And this is not something, a challenge that is necessarily unique to OBO. But our buildings do take a look time from the design phase to the construction phase because of the complexities of them. But what we’re really trying to do is to make sure that as we design that we anticipate the challenges that will arise in the
future and that we are flexible enough in what we design so that we can absorb those changes as they come alone.

You know, we really are looking for buildings to go 50 years. So we have to think about how flexible is that building not only going to be in the next five years, but how flexible is it going to be in year 15 and year 25. And so that is really one of our goals in our current design effort. Angel, do you want to add anything?

MR. DIZON: I think you pretty much said everything there. I was going to echo what he had said about, you know, these are 50-year buildings and we have to plan for those types of flexibilities and adaptabilities in the future. Those programs constantly change. Technology constantly changes. And so we have to be prepared for that kind of adjustment. So we are developing spaces that are able to be that kind of adaptable.
One of the things that we have to careful about with the new technology as it evolves is the sort of security concerns that might be associated with it. Unwittingly we are moving quickly into situations where that technology could be compromised in certain kinds of ways. So there’s a lot of stuff that we are doing with diplomatic security to certainly understand what those vulnerabilities may be and then incorporate them in our building. But we essentially do that every year. So through our Lessons Learned program we are adapting new technologies when it’s appropriate with diplomatic security.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: John, you had a comment?

MR. BRENNAN: (Inaudible).

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Okay. Other questions? This side of the room? It’s been quiet over there.

(Laughter.)

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Okay.
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MR. RIDGELL: I have a question. Right here. Excuse me. Vince Ridgell with Philips Lighting. The follow on the cyber discussion, I'm curious, where does State Department stand relative to cyber security requirements within the RMF and the FIPS? We're seeing the OSD, DHS, etcetera. I'm assuming that there's guidance within the OBO's instructions relative to the RMF process, whether it be IP addressable devices and things of that nature, particularly with IOT coming. I'm not talking back of house, but just in the space. Lighting, other things like that. Can anyone speak to that?

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Wayne, do you want to take that?

MR. ASHERBY: I can speak somewhat to it. Cybersecurity of course is a major concern at the department. We consider ourselves to be a primary target of a lot of the actors around the world that are interested in our information. And many of them
have extremely highly developed ability to manipulate technology and use it for their benefit versus our benefit.

We work very closely without the U.S. government community to make sure that we stay on top of emerging technologies, the vulnerabilities associated with them, and how that impacts the design and construction of our facilities overseas. It's increasingly challenging as technology moves faster and faster. It simply means we need to redouble our commitment in those areas. Part of that is, as discussed in the earlier session, is working with the industry to find out where the goals of the industry are in terms of which of these technologies are most important to implement that then develop the strategies on how to implement them.

In most cases our opinion is that many of these things can be implemented. It’s simply what measures need to be put in place along with them to
provide that level of security to those IT-based systems to prevent either manipulation of information or denial of service type scenarios.

MR. RIDGELL: Thanks.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Okay. Question? Yes, please?

MR. DANKS: Regarding the timing it takes from conception to ribbon cutting, I wonder if maybe you could explain a little bit about how appropriations work and if you still do the getting approval and then appropriations for design, and then separately having to go back and get appropriations for construction?

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Well actually the way the capital security cost sharing program works, is that we actually receive all the money up front for the whole thing. And we actually allocate the money in one time. Now one of our problems is that -- the design process is usually about two years, and then
depending on circumstances construction can be anywhere from three to five, depending on the complexity. But one of the problems that we have is that our appropriations, appropriators, with very good reason want to believe that that number that we give them in that period of time in year X is going to be the same number that it’s going to come out three, four, five, years later. And that is a problem, particularly in some of our high security environments, this is a really, really big problem. Because we have to incorporate those costs in the project as well. So we have to do, we are increasingly focused on doing a good job of trying to explain that sometimes our program costs really can’t be fixed at the time of when we actually go to ask for the project to be funded. And we’re now even having to give a cost estimate at the time we do site acquisition, and that’s actually a long time away many times from when we’ll actually construct a project.
And this is a problem for us. But it's something that I think that we just need to enhance our dialogue, and explaining why we have to be realistic about how the costs for projects can change.

Okay. Another question?

MS. BEHA: I have a question that may be completely off from everything else we've been talking about. But I've been sitting here and I've been a little bit fascinated by the fact that we had two porch metaphors in the presentation. So there was a -

AMBASSADOR MOSER: (Indiscernible).

MS. BEHA: -- and they weren't coming from you. So one was with the Seoul Embassy project. So SHoP, one of their schemes was porch. And then the other was the, it was the Guangzhou or the Beijing? The Beijing, right, actually we see it here. And I'm sort of fascinated, I guess, by this, the use of these metaphors of kind of let's say American types as opposed to sort of symbolizing American civic notions.
And it's a big shift, I would say, since say the fifties building project with the embassies. And I guess I wondered if either Thom and Nat in talking about the discussion with SHoP, or David, whether the use of these metaphors are a way of communicating with the broader public? Whether it's deliberately a kind of safer notion of an American symbolism? Or if it's a way of trying to find a common discussion among people with industry in these conversations?

MR. MAYNE: That's a completely loaded question, of course.

(Laughter.)

MR. MAYNE: You know, it's funny, I stayed away from the three names. I didn't even want to talk about it. Architects give names to things, as you well know, and they are not necessarily literal. They are just used as, to identify broad ideas. And I don't think, yeah, I don't think we even touched on that conversation. And it was much more realpolitik.
It was really having to do with the nature of the project and this huge amount of kind of forces that were taking place and in specificity to the site, to Seoul itself. I happen to know the site because we’re working in Seoul for the last ten years. And but it also begs a question I think that you’re asking. Is there any kind of singular symbol for the symbolic sense of an embassy of this country? And I think that’s a very complicated question.

MS. BEHA: I would never suggest that there’s a singular symbolism. But I am very intrigued, and maybe David you could speak to the Beijing project? Because this does hearken to some of the, it echoes actually the sort of fifties and sixties embassy building project and then introduces this idea of the porch to it. So it’s a different version of that. But no, I mean, I don’t want to suggest that I think we could all agree to a singular symbolism. But I am intrigued by the fact that the
symbolism has moved to sort of vernacular natural analogies, as opposed to broader ones.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: David, I think you have to answer.

MS. BEHA: It’s an interesting thing for us to think about, I think, that’s all.

MR. DIAMOND: Well I’ll do my best to answer. Maybe not as eloquently as Thom did. But yes, we did look at the referential embassies of the fifties and the sixties --

MS. BEHA: Right.

MR. DIAMOND: -- which you mentioned. And I think we felt that they had a much heavier, more institutional feel. And I like the fact that you mentioned that we have a similar sort of very civic presence to our embassies. But yet we introduced some elements that we think made it more of the people. Because at the end of the day we thought that the embassies were ultimately serving the people. Not
just the people who work there but also the people who are coming and what their impression is of America with their first experience visiting the embassy. So we wanted to introduce some of these notions of a little bit more of a sense of welcome and openness and we thought that the idea of a porch conveying a sense of shelter, the glass facades, was a way of maybe translating some of these ideals into built forms.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: And if I could just add one thing. I say this as the perspective of the non-architect in the room. You know, every time we talk about these projects and we get the first schematic review, we have a real long discussion about how they fit in with the local environment.

MS. BEHA: Right.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: So we are looking for iconic American elements and what’s going to represent, but we also know that we have to be a good citizen in the host country. And to me that is what
diplomacy is all about. Because even though you’re talking about who you are, at the same time it’s not that you’re shouting at somebody about who you are. You’re also saying, but we’re here to be a good representative of our government in your location. And I think that many of our projects have actually captured that very, very important spirit.

MR. OPPENHEIMER: I would just add --

AMBASSADOR MOSER: And I thank the IAG for that, too, I want to say that.

MR. OPPENHEIMER: I would just add to what Thom was saying, I mean, it’s interesting you caught that. And I think in having reviewed both the SHoP and looking at this presentation, it is the same use of the word porch but in very different ways. And I think in the SHoP project it was very inward looking. It was more of a sense of people who are on the campus and what they experience versus what’s projected to the public.
One of the interesting things I’ve found in the five reviews I’ve done over the last four or five years, and I don’t know if Angel or anyone who has been on for a long time who can speak to it, but I think with all the setback requirements and so on one of the more interesting discussions all the time comes up to what the presence is set back so far from the street of these buildings. And very often we get to it in an early concept where every, all the energy has rightfully been spent on figuring out the site and the building and the uses and security and everything else. And often one of the very first group of comments we end up making is about, well, what did that end up presenting? And I think, my understanding is historically it moved it further back so it becomes a whole new perspective on how do you make that statement so far away, you know, across a parking lot and across water and so on? It’s brought up some really fascinating solutions and discussions along the
way.

MS. BEHA:  Well and I think we saw that in the Guangzhou project, that the entry sequence I think is quite sophisticated in terms of what it presents to the public.

MR. MAYNE:  Can I say in responding to this that we stayed away from the more complex architectural, like cultural architecture problems in these review sessions. And I think you just about have to. Because David, you don’t even want to hear a critique from other architects, I don’t believe, the way I would start it. Because I wouldn’t call it a porch. I would call it part of a modernist device and we would get into a conversation that’s going to bore everybody. And we kept to a much more pragmatic kind of agenda, I believe, in terms of the working of these things and the architecture has been left as another subject.

By the way, in terms of context that’s also
an incredibly complicated, we’re building Shenzhen and Seoul. The context is us. We built it right next door. I mean, us, like as architects. And so today you’re talking about something cultural. I don’t know about you guys, SOM might have built a tower right next to this one as well as Guangzhou and --

(Laughter.)

MR. MAYNE: -- and I’m right next to that, and we could go around the table and --

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Yeah, but Thom you would be undercutting your project in Beirut if you didn’t say it was harmonious with its local circumstances.

MR. MAYNE: You could -- well, that’s another argument. But of course I’m going to make that argument.

(Laughter.)

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Okay. Okay, we have time for one more question. Judith, I think you’ve got the floor.
MS. NITSCH: (Inaudible.) Sorry about that. My question is about the location of the and the orientation of the water features on the sites of these two and proximity to the building. The main purpose for them is what? I mean, it could be storm water management, which of course would be close to my heart. But it could also be security. It could be little microclimates. It could be helping in way finding. What are the purposes of them? And could you explain that a little bit?

MR. DIAMOND: Well Guangzhou didn’t have any water features, so we’ll focus primarily on Beijing. The water features were basically site elements that I’m not going to say we’re performing a security function, because they were internal to the perimeter wall and so all the perimeter security was contained at the compound perimeter wall. They were seen as being visual elements, where we had looked at classic hutongs in Beijing, which is that maze of small
structures and narrow streets and in some Asian cities
that is interspersed with canals. And so that was a
referential idea behind creating this sense of scaled
gardens that were broken up between landscaped places
with greenery, juxtaposed against more canal-like
river-like water elements. And of course they also
provided opportunities to display yet more public
artwork, like these Jeff Koons pieces that you see in
this photo. So it was really just a way of
introducing some variety to the element of the gardens
that were filling up the negative spaces between the
buildings.

MS. NITSCH: And is it potable water? Are
you recycling? Or what are we --

MR. DIAMOND: No. No. It's not potable
water. It's, they are not very deep. They are only
one- or two-feet deep.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Okay. Adi, I think you
had a comment?
MR. KANGA: Yeah, just very quickly. In the morning session we talked a little bit about OBO’s increasingly greater commitment besides great architecture to also long term performance of our facilities and our capability to actually maintain them over their life cycle. And then at lunch one of my IAG colleagues said, you know, it would be really great if we had a database that tells us something about individual posts, or at least by region, of the capabilities. You know, what can you accomplish in terms of facilities maintenance, your staffing? You know, the vendors that are available to outsource performance or maintenance? Those kinds of things. Available materials. Anything and everything and I think that’s a great idea, which we could easily put together, maybe by region to start with, which she felt would help you inform us about certain choices that we make in our design knowing that kind of information. We’d love to put that together for you.
if you think it's going to be useful to you. Yeah, because we are there. We know what we can and cannot do. We'll be happy to share that with you. So we'll try and put that together.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Okay.

MR. KANGA: Thank you.

AMBASSADOR MOSER: Okay. At this juncture, I have to close it. And I want to give one more round of thanks to the members of the Industry Advisory Group for my personal thanks.

(Appause.)

AMBASSADOR MOSER: And thank you again for the wonderful insights that you shared with us today, and you continue to share throughout the year. Because it's something that was really important for our program.

And to everyone here in attendance I'd like to invite you to a happy hour immediately outside. You'll get a chance to see our delegates lounge, which
is something that we use quite a bit to have a little bit less formal occasions. And once again, thank you for coming to the Department of State today for this very, very important event. Thank you all very much.

(Applause.)

(Whereupon, at 3:53 p.m., the above-entitled meeting was concluded.)