ETHIOPIA COFFEE VILLAGE

Museum & Innovation Centre

Schematic Design Review and Strategic Design Advisory

Independent review prepared ahead of Detailed Design

Status: Draft for discussion
Date: May 2026
Classification: Confidential
Stage: Post Schematic Design, pre Detailed Design

Contents

1. Executive Summary

The proposed Ethiopia Coffee Village rests on a strong, ownable concept. Organising a national coffee destination as a sequence of “coffee-bean” pavilions set within the hilly Yeka Forest landscape is the right instinct: Ethiopia’s coffee story is agricultural, social, spiritual, economic and scientific, and a dispersed village holds that complexity far better than a single museum box. The architectural imagery is genuinely compelling and will market the project internationally. That foundation should be retained and backed.

However, the package as submitted is an advanced concept presented as Schematic Design. It is stronger as an idea than as a resolved place, and it is not yet sufficient, on its own, to be called the timeless, generational landmark the brief seeks. Three gaps must be closed before Detailed Design (DD): a set of technical and deliverable shortfalls (no evidence in the issued package of engaged engineering disciplines; no consolidated area schedule, fire, civil, geotechnical, landscape or phasing information; and site organisation, parking and circulation indicated only diagrammatically rather than resolved); an architectural tension between a beautiful diagram and an inhabitable, buildable, all-weather museum; and a strategic shift the design has not yet made.

The single most useful reframing for the next stage is this: **coffee should not merely be the subject of a museum — it should be the operating system of the whole place.** The strongest version of this project is a living coffee landscape with museum content embedded in it, where forest, farmers, ceremony, craft, science, trade and everyday gathering are experienced as one continuous national story, and where the architecture is memorable for the experience it creates rather than the silhouette it presents.

This report consolidates the review into a single position. It identifies what must be protected, the core design tensions to resolve, the cultural and site realities to confront, and a defined set of conditions that should be satisfied before authorising Detailed Design. A sheet-by-sheet commentary keyed to the issued drawings is provided at Appendix A.

1.1 Recommended Detailed-Design Gate

Detailed Design should not be authorised until the four gates below are satisfied and reviewed. Section 9 sets out the conditions in full; this is the one-page summary for decision-makers.

#	Gate	What it must contain
1	Design definition	Confirmed name and mission; schedule of accommodation, reconciled areas and visitor capacity; curatorial masterplan; defined visitor routes and programme.
2	Technical feasibility	Integrated team appointed; structural and geotechnical concept; civil, grading and drainage; fire and life-safety

#	Gate	What it must contain
		strategy; MEP and façade; roof-light daylight and conservation strategy; universal accessibility.
3	Operational viability	Parking, coach and service movement, accessible bays and arrival resolved; free, ticketed, premium and professional zones; staffing, security, maintenance; phasing and cost alignment.
4	Cultural and economic delivery	Community and farmer/cooperative participation made physical; innovation-centre operating model; retail and marketplace strategy; opening-day versus mature landscape strategy.

1.2 Blocking conditions versus design enhancements

Not all of this report carries equal weight. The following must be resolved before Detailed Design; the remainder can be developed during it.

Non-negotiable before DD: reconciled area schedule and capacity; integrated consultant team; levels, grading and drainage; universal accessibility; fire and life-safety; the roof-light daylight and conservation strategy; resolved parking and servicing; cost and phasing; and the curatorial masterplan.

Design enhancements (develop during DD): deeper Ethiopian spatial grammar; the public heart; the dwell economy and returnability model; the craft-and-labour strategy; the community edge; interpretation and retail identity; and the opening-day-versus-mature landscape storytelling.

2. Basis of Review

This review is based on the following material provided by the client:

- The project brief and stated vision for a national flagship coffee destination.
- The extracted concept narrative (“National Coffee Museum and Innovation Hub”, RAAS Architects).
- The November 2024 “National Coffee Museum” concept booklet (41 pages).
- The April 2026 “Coffee Village” Schematic Design presentation (35 slides).
- The April 2026 Schematic Design drawing set (18 sheets, AR-I to AR-11).

The commentary is offered to strengthen the scheme before Detailed Design, not to question the direction of the appointed architect. References to specific sheets use the architect’s own drawing numbers.

3. Project Identity: Resolving the Two-Generation Evolution

The documents contain two design generations. The November 2024 scheme is a red-pigmented concrete proposal with comparatively rich experiential and programmatic development — hall-by-hall key plans, interior concepts, an immersive dome, exhibition routes, and a site plan that addresses parking. The April 2026 scheme evolves the envelope to weathering steel and timber shingle; it is visually far stronger and more durable in character. It is not without programmatic content — it carries an indicated site organisation with parking and drop-off (AR-01) and a developed innovation-centre plan (AR-08) — but its museum cluster is less programmatically resolved than the 2024 hall-by-hall material, and the visitor experience inside the pods is less developed. The design has matured aesthetically, but the interior, operational and curatorial resolution of the museum cluster now needs to catch up with the strength of the architectural image. Recovering that programmatic richness is one of the central tasks of the next stage.

Compounding this, the project is referred to under several overlapping identities across the documents: National Coffee Museum, Coffee Village, Museum & Innovation Centre, and Innovation and Training Centre. Before Detailed Design, the client should fix a single name, a single mission statement and a single architectural language, and require all subsequent work to align to it. This is inexpensive to resolve now and expensive to carry forward unresolved.

The material direction itself — weathering steel and timber over the earlier red concrete — is the correct call and should be confirmed rather than left to oscillate. Red concrete reads as literal and theme-led and ages poorly; weathering steel and timber settle honestly into a forest and evoke roasting tones without caricature. The decision the project needs is not which way to go, but to stop revisiting it and resolve the chosen palette properly.

4. What Is Working and Must Be Protected

It is important to be clear about the scheme’s genuine strengths, because the recommendations that follow are intended to sharpen these, not dilute them.

A legible, ownable concept. The “beans in a roasting pan” masterplan and the split-bean pavilion are instantly readable, unmistakably Ethiopian-coffee-specific, and brandable. For a destination whose explicit purpose is to convert a fragmented narrative into a recognised global brand, this iconicity is not decoration — it directly serves the brief.

A landscape-led processional idea. Treating the experience as a journey through forest, clearings, water and groves — rather than a single enclosed object — is the right organising principle for a museum about the journey from farm to cup.

A strong, complete narrative spine. The sequence — origin and discovery, geography and species, processing, roasting and cupping, ceremony and community, food, retail, innovation — already covers the full story and gives the visit a beginning, middle and end.

The right material and ecological intentions. Weathering steel and timber, indigenous planting, canopy retention and passive-first sustainability ambitions are appropriate to the place and the brief.

These qualities are the reason the project is worth the rigour that follows. The objective is to make the building as intelligent as the image.

5. The Core Architectural Tension: A Beautiful Diagram versus an Inhabitable Building

The bean is a superb diagram and a demanding container. This tension is the central architectural issue and must be resolved before Detailed Design.

5.1 Circular single-volume pods resist museum use

Detached circular or ovoid pods of roughly 25–33 m diameter are inefficient as galleries. Curved perimeter walls are poor for mounting, lighting and reconfiguring exhibits; circulation in a round room defaults to a loop or a central spine, which constrains curatorial sequencing; and the net-to-usable ratio of detached double-curved shells is low, with a great deal of expensive bespoke envelope per square metre of usable space. The pods should be tested against real curatorial and operational requirements, and the structural and envelope approach rationalised into a buildable, repeatable kit-of-parts so that variety is achieved through arrangement rather than bespoke geometry for every pod.

5.2 All-weather, accessible circulation is the biggest experiential risk

The scheme asks every visitor — including school groups, elderly visitors and wheelchair users — to move repeatedly outdoors and across grade between detached pods, on a steep forested slope, at roughly 2,300 m, in a city with a pronounced June–September rainy season. A covered walkway and canopy are indicated in principle (labelled on AR-01 and within the innovation centre on AR-08), but they are not resolved as a continuous, enclosed, gently graded and universally accessible route. That weather-protected accessible spine must become a primary architectural element of the scheme — a designed coffee-grove walk in its own right — not a diagram or the residual space between sculptural objects. A practical way to structure this is to design explicitly for three circulation loops: a full heritage loop (roughly 90–120 minutes), a short public loop (roughly 30–45 minutes for families and school groups), and a free public revenue-and-community loop (café, market, courts, events) that operates without disrupting the ticketed museum.

5.3 The signature roof “crack” is a conservation and weatherproofing liability as drawn

The split-bean roof light is the project’s signature move, but as shown it is an open slot delivering direct, variable daylight and solar gain over galleries that will contain projection, AV and archival material. Without a controlled daylighting strategy this

produces glare on screens, heat load, fade risk and a difficult long zig-zag waterproofing detail at altitude. The roof light must be re-conceived as a controlled daylight and conservation device with an explicit curatorial lighting concept, or it will be progressively value-engineered into a leaking skylight. Relatedly, the technology-led halls (immersive dome, AR/VR, projection) are the elements that will date fastest; the architecture should be a calm, enduring vessel within which the media is a replaceable seven-to-ten-year fit-out.

6. From Museum to Living Coffee Destination

The most powerful strategic shift available to the project is to stop designing primarily a museum with supporting facilities, and instead design a living coffee destination with museum content inside it. A museum explains coffee; a destination lets people participate in it; a living village lets people walk, taste, smell, learn, buy, gather, train and return. This does not weaken the museum — the museum should be excellent — but it should not carry the entire experience alone.

6.1 A defined public heart

At present the scheme reads as a cluster of object-pavilions rather than a village, because it lacks an inhabited social centre. The project needs a clearly designed public heart — a Coffee Court or Origin Court: a shaded, fragrant, flexible, genuinely useful space, not a monumental empty plaza. It should host the daily coffee ceremony, seasonal producer markets, school orientation, outdoor cupping, performance, national coffee days and evening events, and it should be reachable without a museum ticket. This single move does more than any other to convert a pavilion route into a destination.

6.2 A dwell economy and vertical integration

A national destination should not depend on museum admission alone. The plan should be designed from the outset for a range of visit lengths — the one-hour visitor, the half-day visitor, the full-day visitor, the repeat local visitor, the coffee professional, and the investor or VIP — with revenue layers that reinforce a single identity rather than feeling like commercial add-ons. The on-site coffee value chain should be made real and legible: grow and demonstrate, harvest and sort, wash and dry, roast, cup, brew, teach, sell, export, research, and return through events and membership. A returnability model (a resident garden pass, school and student membership, a diaspora coffee club, a professional cupping membership, an “Origins Club” rotating-coffee subscription) should be designed now, not added later, because local repeat use is what keeps a national destination alive between tourist peaks.

6.3 Transferable logic from land-based destinations (note)

Internationally, the most resilient land-based cultural destinations work because the productive landscape is the experience rather than the backdrop, and because food, retail, learning, events and online continuation reinforce one identity under a single

creative direction. Only the logic is transferable here, not any lifestyle or luxury-estate package: make the productive coffee landscape the core; integrate the value chain on site; design for dwell time and repeat visitation; and treat retail as cultural infrastructure linked to producers. This project must remain national, generous and inclusive — premium in quality without being exclusionary — and the project's own brief and concept material are themselves a sufficient basis for this direction.

6.4 One creative direction

A national destination of this ambition fails if architecture, landscape, exhibition, retail, packaging, signage, wayfinding, lighting, sound and digital content are designed by separate teams to separate logics. The project needs a single creative framework so that everything belongs to one Ethiopian coffee world without everything looking the same. This is a governance recommendation as much as a design one, and it should be put in place before the disciplines multiply at Detailed Design.

7. Cultural Authenticity Beyond Bean-Literalism

The brief asks for a generational masterpiece. Literal iconography — plan as beans, building as a bean, roof as the bean's crack — reads well at first glance but dates quickly and risks the project feeling themed rather than deeply Ethiopian. Endurance comes from embodied cultural and tectonic depth, not a logo read from the air.

The architect should be encouraged to draw on Ethiopian building and coffee culture as spatial and tectonic ideas rather than decoration: the processional, subtractive, sacred top-light of the rock-hewn churches as the profound version of "light through a crack", achieved with mass and depth; the conical logic of the tukul and the woven enclosure of highland circular houses; low stone retaining, terraced drying courts, woven-filtered light, and ceremonial thresholds; and working craft edges where visitors see people roasting, sorting, tasting and selling. The strongest version of this project would be impossible to transplant to another country under another name.

The coffee ceremony should be the emotional and spatial climax of the whole museum, not one hall among several. The jebena, the smoke and incense, the act of hosting and the slowness of the ritual are the irreducible cultural core; the architecture's peak should be designed around the ceremony, and it should be presented through rotating, genuine cultural hosts rather than as a staged tourist performance. Authenticity is also won in the making: local stone, clay, lime, timber and bamboo, and — critically for the brief's employment and value-addition goals — local craft and labour in the construction and finishes. A craft-and-skills strategy should be treated as part of the architecture, not an afterthought.

8. Site Reality versus Representation

The location map is sobering against the renders, and the gap should be confronted honestly now rather than discovered during Detailed Design.

The setting is an urban edge, not pristine forest. The site sits at the southern edge of Yeka, immediately adjacent to dense informal settlement and a major road. The existing cover is largely introduced eucalyptus plantation, not indigenous highland forest. The mature indigenous canopy shown in the renders is a fifteen-to-twenty-five-year outcome; opening-day landscape will look very different, and stakeholders should be told this now. A distinct opening-day landscape strategy is required alongside the long-term maturation plan.

The edge condition needs a designed response. Noise, security, the boundary, the informal-settlement interface and views out to the city require an explicit strategy. The brief calls for inclusive growth and employment; the project should engage and benefit the adjacent community — a public edge, training and jobs, and visible ecological restoration of eucalyptus to indigenous species as part of the visitor story — rather than presenting a sculptural back to it.

Coffee agronomy at roughly 2,300 m must be validated. Arabica is generally cultivated at roughly 1,300–2,200 m; the Yeka site at approximately 2,300 m, with a cool highland climate and possible frost, is at or above the practical upper limit. The entire concept rests on “living coffee groves”, so the planting concept must be validated by agronomists, with protected microclimates, demonstration plots or research-greenhouse plots as the fallback rather than a planting idea that may underperform on opening day.

Slope, water and altitude are primary design drivers. Earthworks, retaining and stormwater management on tight contours at altitude, with a strong wet season, are a major cost and design driver and are currently invisible in the set. Water should be designed as both an infrastructural and an interpretive element — collected, slowed, filtered, reused and made legible as part of the coffee story.

The renders should not be characterised as misleading; rather, the requirement should be constructive. The design team should produce two distinct landscape submissions: an opening-day landscape plan showing what visitors will actually experience at launch, and a five, ten and twenty-five-year maturation plan showing the long-term indigenous canopy and ecological-restoration ambition. The first sets honest stakeholder expectations; the second carries the vision.

9. Deliverable and Team Gaps: Conditions to Satisfy Before Detailed Design

The package is an advanced concept presented as Schematic Design. Title blocks carry unedited template fields, and the Structural, Civil, Sanitary and Electrical consultant boxes are blank. The following should be treated as gate conditions — satisfied and reviewed before Detailed Design is authorised — rather than as Detailed Design deliverables:

1. A confirmed schedule of accommodation, area schedule (GIA/NIA) and visitor-capacity brief, against which feasibility, operations and budget can be tested.

2. An integrated multidisciplinary team appointed and demonstrably engaged: structural, geotechnical, façade, MEP, fire, civil and landscape, cost, and a museum/experience designer.
3. A resolved all-weather, universally accessible circulation strategy, including the three-loop visit structure.
4. A levels, grading, retaining and drainage strategy for the slope, with an outline geotechnical appraisal.
5. A parking, coach drop-off, accessible arrival, servicing, loading and waste strategy.
6. A fire and life-safety strategy appropriate to assembly and museum use across distributed pavilions on a steep external site, including the enclosed immersive dome.
7. A daylight and artifact-conservation strategy for the roof light, with a curatorial lighting concept protecting AV and archival galleries.
8. A confirmed, detailed material strategy with weathering, maintenance and local-sourcing logic, supported by façade and interior mock-ups before the repeated pavilion system is committed.
9. A curatorial masterplan that locks the story, artifacts, media, live demonstrations, oral histories and stakeholder representation before interiors are designed — recovering the programmatic richness of the 2024 scheme.
10. A phasing plan defining a complete, operable Phase 1 and logical future expansion.
11. A cost-plan reconciliation showing that the pavilion geometry, façade system, roof-light strategy, earthworks, bridges, MEP and landscape ambitions remain aligned with the approved budget and phasing strategy.
12. An opening-day landscape strategy distinct from the long-term maturation plan, and a measurable sustainability scorecard replacing qualitative “green” language with targets.

A prototype of one pavilion — structure, roof light, façade, daylight, acoustics, exhibition integration, fire, maintenance and cost — should be developed and proven before the repeated pavilion language is rolled out across the cluster.

10. The Economic and Community Mission, Made Physical

The brief is explicit about employment, value addition, investment attraction and inclusive growth, but the current scheme expresses this mainly through exhibits and cafés. The economic mission should be given dedicated architecture and operational space, so that the project is economically meaningful rather than only culturally attractive.

- A public-facing innovation centre: an “open lab” and viewing gallery where visitors see real research, genetics, quality grading, cupping science and farmer and barista training — not a back-of-house building. Its operating model (public, professional,

research, revenue-generating, independently operable after hours) must be defined.

- A visible economic platform: a regional cooperative marketplace, a coffee quality and auction theatre, an origin-traceability experience, an export and value-chain gallery, certification and training spaces, and a national coffee brand wall.
- Retail as cultural infrastructure: a curated national coffee marketplace linked to producers, cooperatives and women-led enterprises — regional coffees, green samples for professionals, ceremony objects, ceramics, basketry, books — with an online reorder and subscription route so the place continues after the visit.
- Real, physical community participation: rotating cooperative and farmer market stalls, women-led roasting and ceremony spaces, artisan workshops with retail, youth and barista training, paid storytelling and demonstration roles, and procurement and revenue-sharing policies favouring Ethiopian producers and makers.

The project should be able to answer a blunt question: **who earns from the Coffee Village after it opens?** If the answer is mainly operators and concessions, the project will fall short of its national promise. Visible economic participation by coffee-sector communities is also an authenticity issue — visitors will believe the project more if real participants are present and active.

11. Consolidated Recommendations

The following consolidate the review into the actions of greatest value before Detailed Design. They are strategic design decisions, not cosmetic adjustments.

1. Fix one name, one mission and one architectural language; confirm the weathering-steel-and-timber palette and stop revisiting it.
2. Reframe the project as a living coffee destination with museum content inside it — coffee as the operating system of the whole place.
3. Design a defined, inhabited public heart (a Coffee Court / Origin Court) accessible without a museum ticket.
4. Make the all-weather, universally accessible connecting spine a primary architectural element, structured around the three-loop visit model.
5. Rationalise the pod structure and envelope into a buildable, repeatable system; prove one prototype pavilion before repeating it.
6. Re-conceive the roof light as a controlled daylight and conservation device, and design the building so the media technology is a replaceable fit-out.
7. Deepen cultural authenticity beyond the bean: Ethiopian spatial grammar, the ceremony as the emotional climax, and a local craft-and-labour strategy.
8. Confront the site reality: opening-day versus mature landscape, the urban and community edge, agronomic validation at altitude, and a visible water and slope strategy.

9. Recover programmatic richness through a curatorial masterplan, and develop the innovation centre and economic platform as real, public-facing architecture.
10. Appoint and integrate the full multidisciplinary team and satisfy the Section 9 gate conditions before authorising Detailed Design; hold the whole under one creative direction.

12. Questions to Put to the Design Team

The following questions should be answered by the design team before the project advances into Detailed Design. They are diagnostic: the quality of the answers will indicate whether the scheme is ready to proceed.

1. What is the confirmed schedule of accommodation, total area and expected daily visitor capacity, and where do queues form?
2. What is the exact visitor sequence from car, coach and pedestrian arrival to the first pavilion, and what is the first emotional moment of the project?
3. Where is the true public heart of the village, and what makes it inhabited rather than monumental?
4. What is the universal-access route through the full journey, and how do elderly visitors, families and wheelchair users move comfortably in the rainy season?
5. How is the pod structured and supported on the slope, and what is the repeatable structural and envelope system?
6. What is the daylight and conservation strategy for the roof light over AV and archival galleries?
7. Why are the buildings shaped as they are beyond symbolic resemblance, and how does each pavilion differ experientially in light, scale, sound, smell and material?
8. Which coffee varieties can realistically grow and be maintained at approximately 2,300 m on this site, validated by whom?
9. How are stormwater, erosion and earthworks handled and made part of the experience?
10. How do service, waste, delivery and emergency vehicles move without disrupting the visitor experience, and where are back-of-house, plant and loading?
11. What is the precise operating model of the innovation centre — what is public, professional, research-based and revenue-generating?
12. Where are farmers, women, youth, artisans and cooperatives physically located in the plan, and what income do they earn after opening?
13. Which areas are free, ticketed, premium and professional, and what brings local people back each month?
14. What is the night-time identity, what can operate independently and after hours, and what is the phasing strategy if the full project cannot be built at once?

15. What is the one architectural move that will make this project unforgettable without relying on the renderings?

13. Recommended Client Actions

This review should not end only as critique. The following actions are within the client's control and would most strengthen the project before Detailed Design is authorised.

1. Confirm the official project name and a single mission statement, and require all subsequent work to align to it.
2. Require the design team to submit a Detailed-Design-readiness package against the four gates in Section 1.1 before proceeding.
3. Appoint or confirm the full technical consultant team (structural, geotechnical, civil, façade, MEP, fire, cost).
4. Appoint a museum/experience designer and a landscape ecologist and agronomist.
5. Require a curatorial masterplan and an operations and revenue model.
6. Require one prototype pavilion to be proven before the repeated pavilion system is rolled out.
7. Require an opening-day landscape strategy and a long-term restoration plan as two distinct submissions.
8. Require a community and economic participation plan that states who earns from the Coffee Village after it opens.
9. Issue Appendix A to the design team and require a line-by-line response, with discipline owner and status, reviewed before Detailed Design.

14. Concluding Position

The concept has genuine potential. The landscape setting is strong, the pavilion journey is promising, and the museum-plus-innovation-centre ambition is the right one. The project correctly understands coffee as a living culture, economy, ecology and body of knowledge rather than a commodity.

It is not yet, in its current schematic form, a timeless and generational masterpiece — but it can become one. The path runs through resolving the diagram-versus-building tension, deepening cultural authenticity beyond literalism, confronting the site and operational realities that are not yet reflected in the rendered vision, recovering the programmatic richness the design lost between its two generations, and standing up a properly integrated team and deliverable set. The ambition should not be reduced; it should be made more precise. A national landmark is achieved not through novelty or scale, but when a visitor moves through it and feels that it could only belong to this country, this culture and this story. That is the standard to which this Coffee Village should now be held.

Appendix A — Design Team Response Schedule

This schedule is keyed to the architect's Schematic Design drawing set (AR-I to AR-11). It records the principal observations on each sheet or sheet group and the action required before Detailed Design. The two right-hand columns are left blank deliberately: the schedule should be issued to the design team for a line-by-line response, with the discipline owner and status recorded against each item and reviewed before Detailed Design is authorised.

Where the drawings indicate an element diagrammatically, the comment says so; the issue in those cases is resolution, not absence. This distinction is intended to keep the schedule precise and the response constructive.

Sheet	Drawing Title	Key Observations	Action Required Before Detailed Design	Discipline Owner	Status / Response
AR-I	Cover Page	Title block carries unedited template fields ("Author", "Approver", "Designer"). Consultant boxes for Structural, Sanitary, Electrical and Civil are blank. Register lists architectural sheets only (AR-I to AR-11); no landscape, civil, MEP, fire or area sheets are scheduled.	Issue a register naming all disciplines. Confirm the integrated consultant team is appointed before Detailed Design (DD).		
AR-V	Location Map	Confirms the site sits at the urban edge of Yeka, immediately adjacent to dense informal settlement and a major road — not the deep pristine forest depicted in the renders. AR-V itself carries no boundary, area, scale or north ("NTS"); the property-line boundary is shown on AR-01.	Provide a dimensioned site analysis (boundary, area, datum) and an honest context study: edge, access, community interface, noise, views.		
AR-01	Site Plan	AR-01 (1:1000) sets out the whole site with a keyed legend, the property-line boundary, a path network and labelled zones: parking (PAR), roundabout/drop-off (RUD), visitor control (CNT), offices, entrance route	Re-issue as a legible, dimensioned site plan that resolves parking capacity, coach and service and emergency movement, accessible bays, queueing,		

Sheet	Drawing Title	Key Observations	Action Required Before Detailed Design	Discipline Owner	Status / Response
		and entry plaza, the museum cluster (pavilions, sensory garden, water feature, covered walkway-canopy), the innovation centre and food court, and water towers. These are indicated diagrammatically only. Capacity, coach movement, accessible bays, queueing, service/visitor separation, gradients, emergency access, levels, scale bar and north are not given; earthworks, retaining and drainage on the contours are not addressed. Linework is low-contrast and hard to read at issued size.	levels, gradients, scale and north, with a grading and drainage strategy.		
AR-02	Museum Cluster — Plan	Pods carry a radial structural grid, dimension strings and the central “crack” spine, but read as single large volumes (approx. 25–33 m diameter). The internal programme — room designation, cores, WCs, back-of-house, vertical circulation and exhibition layout — is largely undeveloped. No room names or areas; no scale bar or north; no level datums.	Develop plans with a schedule of accommodation, areas (GIA/NIA), occupancy, circulation, BOH, levels and an accessible all-weather connecting spine.		
AR-03	Museum Cluster — Elevation	Elevations are faint wireframes with no material indication, datums, dimensions, levels, context or human scale.	Re-issue developed elevations showing materials, datums, levels, adjacent grade and the forest context, with scale figures.		
AR-04 / 05 / 06	Museum Cluster — Sections	Sections show a thin shell with ribs but no structural depth, foundations, or support strategy for the pods elevated	Provide engineered sections (structural concept, foundations on slope), levels and		

Sheet	Drawing Title	Key Observations	Action Required Before Detailed Design	Discipline Owner	Status / Response
		over the falling slope. No level datums, dimensions, scale bars or material callouts. The signature roof “crack” is shown as an open slot with no daylight, glare or weatherproofing strategy.	dimensions, and a daylight/conservation strategy for the roof light over AV and archival galleries.		
AR-07 / 08	Innovation Centre — Plan	AR-07 is effectively a massing/roof plan. AR-08 is a developed floor plan: named rooms (admin, meeting, training, teaching, library, research, prototyping, exhibition/breakout, kitchens, food court, public toilets, lobby/foyer), a multi-purpose hall with a raked seating layout, toilet fixture layouts, stair cores, per-room area figures and a radial structural grid. It is not yet developed to the level a major research, training, library and conference facility requires: operating model and public/professional separation, laboratory standards, servicing, egress, MEP, acoustics, security, a consolidated and reconciled area schedule, scale bar and north remain unresolved.	Develop the operating model and resolve servicing, egress, MEP, acoustics, security, laboratory standards and a reconciled area schedule; add scale and north.		
AR-09	Innovation Centre — Section	Same single-shell typology embedded in a berm with an apparent auditorium; no levels, dimensions, structural depth or datums.	Provide an engineered, dimensioned section with levels, acoustic and MEP intent for assembly use, and egress.		
AR-10 / 11	Visitors Centre — Plan	The Visitor Centre is shown as an early planning gesture by the roundabout/drop-off; AR-11 indicates the footprint and toilet fixture layouts, and the presentation (slide 21)	Develop the arrival building and forecourt: ticketing, orientation, security, lockers, WCs, school assembly, accessible parking and coach		

Sheet	Drawing Title	Key Observations	Action Required Before Detailed Design	Discipline Owner	Status / Response
		describes welcome and orientation, ticketing, lockers, restrooms, security and administration. The arrival as a resolved sequence — forecourt, ticketing hall, group and school assembly, accessible parking, coach management, queueing and the security sequence — is not developed; no room labels, areas, scale or north.	management, as a resolved arrival experience.		
AR-II – IV	3D Visualisation	Renders are compelling and on-brand, but depict a mature indigenous forest that is, in reality, eucalyptus plantation at an urban edge; the depicted canopy is a 15–25 year outcome. They risk setting an opening-day expectation the landscape cannot meet.	Retain for vision and marketing, but pair with an honest opening-day visualisation and a separate long-term landscape maturation strategy.		
General	Whole set	No consolidated or reconciled area schedule or GFA and no stated visitor capacity (per-room areas appear on AR-08 only); parking, drop-off and circulation are indicated diagrammatically on AR-01 but not resolved; no fire or life-safety strategy; no landscape, civil or geotechnical drawings; no phasing plan; no cost-plan alignment. The package is an advanced concept presented as Schematic Design.	Treat the listed items as gate conditions to be satisfied before authorising Detailed Design (see Section 9 and the Detailed-Design Gate).		