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Over the last several years, the Ministry of Culture and Communications has developed projects in partnership with agencies belonging to the Ministry of Ecology, Sustainable Development, Transport and Housing in order to promote public-sector research. This policy has given rise to several four-year programs to fund research: New Towns («Villes Nouvelles» – 1998-2002), Art, Architecture, Landscape («Art, Architecture, Paysage» - 2002-2006) and Architecture of the Territorial Scale («Architecture de la Grande Échelle» – 2006-2010). The more than seventy research teams involved in these programs have produced a substantial body of work on questions evoking morphological, technological, socio-economic, philosophical and artistic perspectives. In the work presented by the teams at the research seminars of these programs, transformations of established concepts and new applications of existing doctrines have appeared. These events have also provided an opportunity for productive, critical self-assessment and have seen the emergence of fresh perspectives for the spatial design disciplines. A re-evaluation of the products of these previous sessions is currently under way and at the same time the work are being communicated or further developed through seminars, publications and exhibitions. Various initiatives have also developed independently of the initial research programs, notably such as the international consultation on Greater Paris; Le Grand pari de l’agglomération parisienne. In turn, this consultation led to the creation of the Greater Paris International Atelier (AiGP).

The results of these programs attest to the vitality of research in France. Beyond this, they have played a significant role in the ongoing renewal of sources, methods and working hypotheses, and in defining new questions for research. They have provoked fresh, dynamic relations among partners, within the country’s large research conglomerates (PRES) as well as internationally.

In pursuing this dynamic, the Ministry of Culture and its consortium of institutional partners (AiGP, MEDDE) are following state policy with respect to the sustainable development of the nation’s cities and territories. As it advances in this direction, the program has developed a new configuration for research collaboration, including the Department for Research and Innovation of Veolia Environment and the Institute for Communicative Carbon-Free Vehicles and their Mobility (VeDeCoM).

The new, enlarged consortium now launching the third session of the multiannual program, addressing the relation between the spatial design disciplines, the engineering sciences and a fundamental component of the environmental perspective; that of energy. This inter-ministerial and interdisciplinary initiative, which will extend over three years (2013-2015), seeks to promote the kind of transversal approaches to knowledge and know-how that are, more than ever, indispensable to effective, qualitative transformation of inhabited space.
Outside the first years of the 21st Century there has been a sweeping rise in concern for issues touching on the relation between lifestyle and environmental balance. An abrupt reorientation has begun in both the discourses and practices of stakeholders; a reconsideration of the modes of action they promote, reflecting more or less profound conceptions of such notions as ecology and sustainable development. This change is broadly visible in the life- and the experimental- sciences, or from the “exact” to the human and social sciences. The professional disciplines linked to the planning and design of space –notably architecture, landscape architecture and urban and regional planning– have of course participated in this change of perspective. Both their borders and their methods have evolved as they have pursued objectives relating to the design and construction of the manmade environment. The problems of resource management in a time of ever-growing scarcity, and the ever-growing ecological footprint of human life, are being (re-)defined within the context of laboratories, design groups, and educational programs. Those who build no longer consider drinking water, earth, energy and other raw materials and resources simply as “givens” or as quantities to be managed, but also as referring to complex systems of value and as indicators in themselves of life and well-being.

Emphasizing the importance of social equity with respect to these resources in his acceptance speech upon being awarded an honorary doctorate from Laval University (Canada), the Spanish biologist Ramon Margalef (1919-2004) noted –already in 1987– that “it is important that we should be concerned with forms of pollution such as acid rain but [...] there are even greater ecological issues for our future, among them growing inequalities in the use and distribution of energies as they translate into forms of spatial organization and, more importantly still, into the organization of relations between human beings.” While three points –spatial organization, social conditions and the coordination of energy– would thus appear to be fundamental in moving from ecology to the disciplines concerned with the design of space, it is the third one that must be considered the most important. In ecological thinking, emphasis is generally placed on exosomatic energy, the focus thus being on that which allows for the maintenance of life and the organization of ecosystems. This includes energies other that those involved in bodily metabolism, namely those used in heating, transportation, the preparation of food, air conditioning, building and building maintenance, and in the circulation of information.

This ample and global definition of the critical connection of environment to energy can be taken as a compelling argument to reconsider human habitat in terms of a “culture of energy” and its corollary, that of a “culture of entropy”, far from the productivist and mechanistic conceptions of modern times. This new methodology takes on added legitimacy in light of its convergence with the principles of the Kyoto Protocol and the injunctions of the Club of Rome and the Stern Report. All argue in favor of a policy of drastic reduction of energy consumption through the “dematerialization” of processes of production, the reinforcement of relevant social policies and, not least of all, lifestyle changes.

It is precisely on this last point –lifestyle change– that the spatial design disciplines must renew their engagement to respond to the requirements of civil society, regenerating both the body of knowledge upon which these disciplines repose and their modes of practice and action. Up until now, they have concentrated solely on achieving significant reductions in energy consumption through the development of techniques ever more numerous and more complex. Yet despite considerable technological progress of this kind, the size of the reductions achieved in energy consumption levels are far from meeting expectations. More discouraging still is the World Bank’s use of energy consumption level as an indicator of quality of life. In fact, nocturnal maps of the earth remind us that energy consumption levels are indicators of higher living standards, which –not accidentally– correspond to urbanized areas. The most acute energy consumption problems are indeed posed by urban areas, those in which 75% of environmental impact is produced by just over 50 percent of world’s population. And this percentage could grow to 80% by 2050!
This situation is deeply paradoxical. Since our quality of everyday life, henceforth in urban areas, directly relates to the quantity of energy we consume, substantial lifestyle change would appear virtually impossible. At the same time, if urban civilization does not succeed in transforming itself through a renewed consideration of the problem of energy consumption as it affects habitat, transport, production and consumption, no other scenario will be powerful enough to respond to the urgent needs of this century. Put plainly, the equation energy=economy is too simplistic and even unsolvable if the related cultural dimensions of the question of resources are not addressed.
The interdisciplinary research program *Looking at Architecture, the City and the Landscape Through the Prism of Energy* is an invitation to confront the pitfalls of current conceptions of energy and the manner in which these all too frequently influence the design and, more generally, the making of space. The program seeks to contribute to the definition of epistemological conditions that would allow for a better understanding of the complex relations, forgotten or rediscovered, invented or reinvented, inherent in our ways of living in space, as these they relate to energy. This global problem, briefly outlined above through a small set of basic ideas, can be approached here from any possible perspective capable of invoking a variety of spatial scales, in response to the following questions:

a. How might it be possible to think about constructed space through sets of parameters related to energy (concerning for example production, consumption, dissipation, exchange…)?

b. How might it be possible to imagine a cultural framework in which each designed and constructed entity “expresses” its energy value?

c. How might the qualities of the spaces of civil society be rethought through ideas relative to energy?

d. Might there exist an “esthetics of energy” that could inform processes of transformation in the materiality of spaces for living?

e. What might one do to understand, evaluate and produce *energy-conscious* space?

Thinking about architecture, the city and the landscape through the prism of energy requires that one pose questions concerning all manner of environments (past, present, future), employing new tools, a transformed vocabulary and innovative –perhaps somewhat delicate or fragile– methods. This inquiry is considered by many as essential to reflection on possible future intentions and creative acts. If previous centuries sought the transcendence of material and explored the potentials of new materials, this 21st Century could be the one whose intelligibility emerges from its relations to energy.
Basic Issues to be Addressed

Participants will approach current ways of life as they manifest themselves at different spatial scales, in relation to architectural, urban and landscape forms, and as seen through the prism of energy. The possibility itself of apprehending the territorial configurations of human habitation is thus of great importance in the definition of the “objects” to be studied. Also, in responding to the basic problem defined above, the definition and deployment of tools of theoretical, critical and historical analysis must be considered as subjects of exploration in and of themselves. Finally, the research projects must bring cognitive frameworks from the exact, the human and social and the environmental sciences into relation.

In responding to all of these directives, the projects must address one or more the three principal themes that follow:

A. From the Energy Crisis to a Crisis of Society
Rarely in other historical moments have questions about energy been posed in relation to a context as complex as that of the current economic crisis. The present moment is unlike any other that has preceded it and in ways that carry important consequences for millions of people. Of course economists agree that the state of crisis is a recurrent phenomenon and historians see it as a defining aspect of modern period. It is difficult nonetheless to ignore the new conditions of recent economic crises, joined as they are with other corresponding ones; crises of identity, crises of art… to which the energy crisis must be added. This situation cannot help but affect thinking about the design of space. It is difficult to continue arguing that this situation will not undermine our certainties concerning the inhabited environment, our behaviors, our habits and our lifestyles.

In such a context, research concerning the three-way relationship between the built environment, the economy and energy resources is of strategic importance. How can one define robust design strategies that engender new ways of defining the inhabited environment, reflecting both economic objectives and scenarios relating to energy? How might we reinvent the life-sustaining rapport between habitat and inhabitant in such a way as to guarantee an equitable and democratic sharing of resources, thus avoiding past errors?

This call for projects is intended to clarify the relationship between built space and energy. On the one hand, it should associate architect’s and urban planner’s perspectives to those of the engineer specializing in energy-related problems. On the other, it should engage with the socio-economic study of contemporary phenomena. It is an invitation to pursue research approaches relating to evolutions in social patterns, from the monadic and individual to familial configurations, from the individual dwelling to the neighborhood, from community groups to social structures… each from the standpoint of energy resources use. It is also intended to encourage applied research involving the use of digital and information-related technologies as integral parts of individual and collective strategies for facing the threat of energy scarcity. Finally, participants are encouraged to give serious consideration to issues involving social capital (integration, participation) and cognitive capital (knowledge and competencies) as they are present in situations marked by transformation in urban forms and by dynamics of energy transition.

B. Buildings and Energy Intelligence
The first oil crisis and the necessity for energy conservation that it entailed gave way to “passive house” experiments, summed up in a building envelope whose mass, geometry, form and orientation allowed it to save or even store thermal energy for ulterior use (albeit short term). Since then, with the increased technical nature of buildings allowing for more efficient energy accumulation, one method for better energy performance consists of rendering the building “dynamic.” Such a building is expected to adapt its thermal performance according to its degree of occupation and the need for heating, cooling, lighting, and air renewal. This requires increasingly sophisticated technical equipment to capture and store energy as much as to use it afterwards. Sensors, metres, and distribution systems imply and require data processing capacities to handle information coming from and destined for the variety of equipment at the user’s
disposal. Such optimisation can serve not only internal needs (“smart buildings”), but also external demands. This is the case of buildings that are “smart grid ready.” It is clear that by way of this technological intelligence – in some ways a by-product of ad hoc outfitting – the built object drifts away from the hypothesis of an “internal intelligence” related to its ecological context and climatic conditions. We may ask if this is the only possible path. Might there be an intelligence shared between “good form” and “good use,” which was often sought by architectural modernity and is acquiring new relevance in the context of contemporary energy considerations? Next to the ideal type of the over-insulated airtight box equipped with prosthetics that regulate formerly uncontrolled exchanges with the environment, is there room for intelligent design that would consist of transforming the handicaps of conventional buildings into advantages? More specifically, might permeability, inertia, and optimizing radiation budgets be mobilized for another kind of “low-energy building” that is more beneficial for its inhabitant, for its user and for the community?

Through the lens of design, the present research incentive program situates the architectural fact in direct relation to its energy environment. It therefore suggests that research directions question the energy conditions and scenarios of the existing building stock not as an inert mass (heritage or other) to “equip,” but rather as a living built organism in full typological and morphological evolution spurred by new parameters. Through what systemic integration might architectural design address energy transition issues? Can an architectural project develop in a new frame of reference and with a renewed set of tools? How might we link energy-wise architectural design with lessons from the 20th century?

To this end, the research projects will endeavour in particular to define the energy scenarios in which future architectural patronage will evolve; to identify the more or less hidden potential in the existing building stock and metamorphosing urban conditions; and on these bases, to examine a full range of architectural form-making from an energy perspective.

C. Energy Challenges Related to Urban Mobilities

According to the United Nations, the energy needs of each person will on average increase 2.5 times between 2000 and 2100. As for mobility over the same period, the increase will be closer to 8 times, given current trends. In reaction these gives, a very direct relation has been drawn between the lifestyles of citizens, mobility technologies and the spaces that are dedicated to, or that are associated with, them. This is true in several ways. The first of these is that new modes of occupation of space in the city by individual vehicles, both in movement and stationery, reflect the energy-related parameters in relation to which they were conceived. These parameters are often also prominently displayed. At the same time, modes of public transport vehicles are rapidly evolving under the influence of the new integrated and multimodal platforms. As these combine with digital user technologies, citizens become more and more able to define their own personal combinations of means of transportation. The result is a direct connection between individual vehicles and public transportation; they act as parts of a global, multimodal process at the heart of which the public and private realms conjoin. The hypothesis according to which mobilities are altered by the growth of home-office work adds weight to the idea of a mixing of the public with the private realms, and suggests the premises of new urban programs and pointing to emerging urban cultural developments, between the home and the workplace.

One of the key aspects suggesting perspectives of energy transition will be associated with new representations of urban mobility offered to, or perhaps created by, citizens. On the one hand, novel uses arising based on new technologies, inventive uses, shared and individual responsibilities… on the other, collective representations appear as a strategic means to sustainable development, constructed ideologically and esthetically in reaction against the ideological and esthetic values associated with the car as a symbol of modernity.

This call for projects will seek to expose these subjects of inquiry to rigorous examination. The research groups will be encouraged to associate competencies in the fields of spatial design and transportation and energy-related engineering with concerns of a socio-economic nature relating to mobility; to explore the complex meanings associated with “spaces of mobility” from multiple points of view, be they symbolic, operational or economic. The research carried must thus be oriented towards the exploration of the role played by he energy parameter in the development of new
behaviors in the field of culture and mobility. It must also take care to situate emerging modes of transport within a logic of historic development and towards the perspective of an accelerated, intelligent turn towards “sustainable mobility”. Finally, it is expected to be convincing in its capacity to deploy sets of existing technological, economic and communicational opportunities in such a way as to contribute to the optimization of energy use in the field of urban mobility.

Qualities Expected

The research proposals must directly or indirectly develop questions relating to the theory, history and technological dimensions of the constructed environment as these engage energy-related issues. They must deploy the capacities associated with the spatial design disciplines (architecture, urbanism, landscape architecture and territorial planning) in association with the exact, the human and social, and the environmental sciences. The proposals can incorporate modes of exploration through design into an overall approach articulating diverse spatial scales and disciplinary perspectives. In effect, transformations of the urban milieu provoked or engendered by correspondences between new uses and energy-conscious forms of mobility have become commonplace.

A. Energy and Form

The “object” of study must be defined in such a way as to position the act of form-giving within the context of the production, management, distribution and consumption of energy. It must be developed from both theoretical and practical points of view, in such a way as to invoke relations between multiple spatial scales. The work perspectives can, notably, address the historical, philosophical and cognitive relations between the environment and the systems or representations that are associated with energy, be it by specialists, actors or the general public. Such approaches are certain to contribute to the understanding of the articulations connecting geometric form, topological configuration or, perhaps, esthetic values attached to spaces of territory, with the semantics and historical meanings evoked by the notion of energy. These are the core issues presented by this research program. Responding to them implies a return to the triangular relation between theory, history and criticism – often evoked yet seldom developed – in order to define new design practices and processes. This return would appear to be an essential step towards the emergence of new and singular approaches characterized by a degree of epistemological ambition.

B. Energy and Ways of Life

The research projects must be founded on a dynamic interdisciplinary relation in which human and social sciences and the engineering sciences are likely to be present. Its ultimate goal is to contribute to the comprehension and –more important still– to the interpretation of content or data collected concerning the uses of urban spaces, landscapes and territories, and relating to mobilities, the use of technological products and processes, production technologies or the planning, management and exploitation of landscapes at urban and rural fringes. The hybridization of research objects and practices is thus encouraged. It must articulate both “fundamental” and applied research perspectives and interactions between the domains of research and development. The analytical and/or speculative dimensions of the research carried out under this program must be informed and stimulated by knowledge on matters relating to energy resources management, defined where necessary by a resistance to socio-economic realities and to commonly encountered space planning policies. This implies an approach in which the practices of researchers and practitioners’ perspectives converge.

C. Energy Between Scientific Practice and Pedagogy

Projects receiving funding can be structured in such a way as to define mutually beneficial relations between teaching approaches involving prospective project practices on the one hand and research postures on the other. Teaching programs can thus play a clearly identified role within the project proposal. This implies an overall methodology within which prospective design-practice in the studio
(be it architectural, urban and/or landscape) is instrumental in the development of the research project and, at the same time, benefits from close proximity to the ideas and the work of the researchers. The physical space selected for study by the research team at the outset can serve as a basis for an exploratory design process and as a basis for defining planning strategy concepts. The resulting group dynamic should not be oriented to the design of a specific project. Rather, it should focus on the capacity of design practice as a means of theoretical reflection.

### Project Development

The program *Ignis Mutat Res. Looking at Architecture, the City and the Landscape Through the Prism of Energy* intends to mobilize a broad sector of the research community while promoting creative interactions of its members with education and professional practice. In responding to the demands and constraints imposed by such a perspective, research teams are free to enter into all manner of initiatives or develop working relationships outside the program. Candidate groups are entirely free to define their own courses of reflection, methodological constraints or epistemological challenges. In responding to the overall framework of this call for research projects, they can develop the interdisciplinary configuration of their choice in view of producing innovative results, and are free to develop or to participate in whatever work-groups or networks they consider beneficial. The project can be aligned to any institutional dynamic promoting research on questions reflecting current public interests. The analysis and selection process will be based on four criteria: the team’s credibility and apparent capacity to produce results by deploying its diverse resources; the rigor and originality of the proposed project; the precision and probity of the results which the proposed methodology could yield; the judiciousness and ambition of the group’s expectations concerning the use and/or publication of its results.

**A. Forming the Research Team**

A research team responding to this call for projects should be united by a shared vision of the innovations it will propose through the objects of study it defines, the terrains it chooses, the methods it develops, the modes of practice it proposes and the results it intends to pursue. Its principal participants should be researchers of renown in France and/or internationally. They should be affiliated to recognized research institutions; these institutions will be officially mandated of behalf of the research teams. The research teams will work with both public and/or private practices and with educational programs that are clearly identifiable parts of a Master’s curriculum.

**B. Developing the Project**

The members of the team will develop a common work perspective involving:

- a general problem concerning the inherent tension in the environment between the manmade and the “natural”, as evident through a range of spatial scales;
- a specific question relating this fundamental tension, along with the meanings it generates, to a diversity of interactions between energy, constructed objects and ways of life;
- a body of ideas and explorations from which the epistemological issues raised by this call for projects can be addressed;
- a case study capable of sustaining an interdisciplinary research dynamic involving applications and developments of ideas, modes of exploration or forms of direct involvement;
- a strategic relation to innovative teaching situations in the domains of design, technologies, theory or history.

**C. Defining/Orienting Research Methodologies**

The project should be based upon a shared methodological “vision” defined by a set of inherent ambitions, means and limits. The proposals should include a detailed description of the group’s
working relations, evoking the modes of participation of both the research groups and the public or private sector professionals involved. The proposals should also offer an objective and realistic appraisal of available opportunities for defining an innovative educational component to the project. In presenting the organization of a program of regular research-team seminars, the proposals can emphasize how, concretely, the application of the chosen methodology will allow for an iterative relation between “active” research practices and the work of conceptualization. Finally, the proposal must present the goals, the methods and the means of evaluation –internal and external– of the work the group produces.

D. Use and Publication of the Results
The project proposal must define the different uses and publications of the expected research results. It should present these in the form of a phased plan. In explaining how the results will be exploited, care should be taken to point out the possibilities for cooperation through which a diversity of complementary perspectives can be expressed.
Preparing the Candidacy Document

Research teams responding to this call for projects must prepare a candidacy document (20 A4 pages maximum). It is to be noted that content will not be submitted for evaluation and selection until it has been confirmed that the form of the document corresponds to the following four sets of administrative rules:

A. The Research Project (5 A4 pages)
   A1. General line of questioning, hypotheses and preliminary bibliographic survey
   A2. Object of study and case study terrain
   A3. Perspectives to be pursued in terms of the production of knowledge
   A4. Objectives and innovativeness in the educational approach and the design experimentation
   A5. Objectives in terms of epistemological reflection and theoretical construction

B. Methodological Principles (4 A4 pages)
   B1. The interdisciplinary defined for the group
   B2. How the design professional’s capacities will be deployed
   B3. The role to be played within the whole by innovative educational practices
   B4. Details of the organization of the team’s ongoing seminar program
   B5. Approach to internal evaluation and ideas and about ongoing project development

C. Perspectives for the Use and Publication of the Results (2 A4 pages)
   C1. Publication and/or distribution of the research results
   C2. Online publications/presentations
   C3. Presentation of the student work produced
   C4. Possibilities for involving doctoral students in the research
   C5. Possibilities for making the results know to design professionals

D. The Research Team (6 A4 pages)
   D1. Name and titles of the team director
   D2. Names and titles of the director of the candidate institution
   D3. Composition of the research team
   D4. CV of each member of the team
   D5. References of the institutional partners

E. Calendar, budget, summary (3 A4 pages)
   E1. Proposed calendar and phasing
   E2. Budget proposal with the proposed distribution of funds
   E3. Project summary of 3 500 to 4 000 characters

The research teams are required to present (notably in section B1) the process through which the research project was conceived. This preparatory phase can also be presented in the research group’s seminar for the information of invited participants, thus encouraging as effective an involvement as possible of their capacities and authority in the development of the project.
Grants for the development of the projects over the two-year work period will have a value of 100,000 Euros, VAT included.

Selection Criteria
The Evaluation Committee for the program will present its analyses of the proposals to the members of the Steering Committee for a final decision concerning the financing of the projects it has selected. The seven main criteria of selection are the following:

1. Originality and pertinence of the problems to be developed and responded to;
2. Interdisciplinary structure of the project proposal;
3. International character of the proposal;
4. Feasibility of the work program;
5. Methodological articulations between the various components of the project;
6. Internal organization of human resources and budget distribution;
7. Use and publication of the research results.

Work Calendar
The research projects selected for financing will be carried as of the start of the 2013 academic year and will continue for two years. The work period thus corresponds to the four university semesters that follow, starting in the Fall of 2013. The introductory seminar will be held at the end of November 2013. It will bring together the selected teams over a period of two consecutive days. The teams will be asked to present their project to the Steering Committee, the Evaluation Committee and to guest Keynote Speakers. The first seminar will be followed by two annual “coordination” seminars. The participation of the research teams in their entirety is expected for each of the seminars.

Program Calendar
- Publication of the text of the Call for Projects ........................................May 24th 2013
- Deadline for project submissions (before noon) ...............................September 9th 2013
- Selection Results announced ............................................................September 30th 2013
- Introductory Seminar .................................................................November 28 & 29th 2013

Submission
To submit a research project, please send it **exclusively as one PDF file** to the following e-mail address: panos.mantziaras@culture.gouv.fr

If the file is exceeding 2 Mo, please use the Ministry of Culture and Communication official uploading platform service **only**: http://zephyrin.ext.culture.fr

Contact
Corinne Tiry-Ono
Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication
Direction générale des patrimoines / Service de l'architecture
Bureau de la recherche architecturale, urbaine et paysagère (BRAUP)
182, rue Saint-Honoré, F - 75 033 Paris Cedex 01
Tél. +33 (0)1 40 15 32 84
corinne.tiry-ono@culture.gouv.fr