

REPORT / NOTES WORKSHOP ITERATIONS

Barcelona, 23-24-25 October 2017

Hangar, Barcelona

Mafe Moscoso

During the 23rd, 24th and 25th of October 2017 a seminar was held whose purpose was to develop a first draft of a theoretical framework of common ethics for the Iterations project.

The workshop was coordinated by Andrea Olmedo and Fran Quiroga (Peman) and took place in Hangar, Barcelona.

Below is a summary of the main ideas collected during the three days of work.

Participants

Montse Romani (artist)
Peter Westenberg (Constant)
Donatella Portoghese (Constant)
Federico Bonelli (Transformatorio / Dyne.org)
Reni Hofmüller (ESC)
Naja Castillo-Rutz (ESC)
Tere Badia (Hangar)
Marta Gracia (Hangar)
Lluis Nacenta (Hangar)
Julien Deswaef (artist)
Irene Dominguez (artist)
Emanuela Ravida (artist)
Giuseppe Morgana (curator)
Mafe Moscoso (notes)
Fran Quiroga (facilitator, Peman)
Andrea Olmedo (facilitator, Peman)
Kate Rich (artist)

DAY 0

Location: HANGAR backyard

At dusk, a conversation is opened on several issues, among which the following stand out: the previous experiences of Iterations, the presence of the same artists in the different meetings, the tools to design / build a collective work, the work methodologies and the opening of the creative process.

It is stated that the initial intention¹ was to open and generate spaces to access the internet and technologies and to investigate "the collective". One of the starting questions revolved around the concrete tools and resources that enable thinking / practicing the collective. It is pointed out that it was evident that what was happening at that time (politically, socially, economically, historically) directly influenced the project. The result of the process, which was characterized as experimental, was to design a tool for people to find out what their future is.

Another issue that is addressed is the presence of the same artists in the two previous meetings: was there a continuity? What is the connectivity between the different Iterations? It is noted that they were not the same artists in the two meetings. However, an effort was made to bring someone who has already gone through Iterations for a transfer of knowledge.

Linked to the above, one of the main questions that arises, in reference to the seminar, is whether a protocol can be created to generate collective processes. Linked to this, it is proposed to design a theoretical framework. The framework, however, is questioned by one of the attendees who points out that he prefers to use the idea of "situation" (where, what, who). The situation is constructed and resembles the idea of the recipe (metaphor of the kitchen). It is pointed out that to speak of a frame / frame, refers to a structure and implies limitations (there is a type of procedure that is difficult to materialize). It is answered, however, that the situation and structure are not necessarily opposed or excluded: one works and lives in frames and situations simultaneously.

It is also pointed out that in reality one should think about the work methodologies that are the mechanisms through which collective practices are constructed. In other words, there are no collective creative work practices without adequate tools. Collective practices, therefore, can not be thought outside the common. It is important to think, therefore, how the commons are understood in the framework of the project, that is, how they are put into practice and how they are communicated.

The collective work ethic is discussed, which is linked to the protocols used in the processes, the limits and possibilities of the notion of authorship, the criteria for evaluating work, communication mechanisms, the tendency to reproduce group patterns that they are not always explicit or put in evidence, the governance, the need to find a system of adequate moderation (to ensure that everyone has the right to speak, for example). It is pointed out that one of the main objectives of the seminar should be to focus the analysis on the invisible dimension of collective processes (for example, invisible hierarchies, although existing). Regarding the above, the case of a participant who left the project was exposed. It supposed consequences and opened questions about the type of links and problems that intervene in a process that is intended to be

¹ Iterations Introduction 2015-2016: <http://www.constantvzw.org/site/Iterations,2438.html>
Iterations Introduction 2017-2020: <http://www.constantvzw.org/site/-Iterations-.html>

collective and horizontal.

It is identified that one of the problems of the past is that there was not a correct documentary transmission between the different artists, which is related to the question about the tools that have to be used in order to document the project. It was also pointed out, in this sense, that it is important to speak of generosity in the transition between one iteration and another, that is, of the need to "give" and "receive" throughout the process. This is linked to the need to consider how to approach the diversity of knowledge, people and contexts in a project that is characterized by being regional and trans-local. The question of what to experiment is and how it is relevant from the perspective that one of the main pillars of the proposal is to use technology as a medium and as a collective infrastructure.

From Transformatorio, several questions are put on the table:

- Considering that diversity is a wealth, it is proposed to carry out a transparent process of selection of participants.
- The value of Transformatorio is to open the participation and that there is space for all.
- The use of Open resources.
- Given the idiosyncrasy and the idea of art, Transformatorio thinks about not to pay the artists or to do it in other ways or more flexible ways.
- Shadow: perhaps the transfer of knowledge should not only occur between artists, but also between organizations and individuals. In this sense, it is important to make the decision about who goes from one interaction to another. You can think, for example, what can be assumed and what is not between some experiences and others. It is also proposed to make a circular open call. Finally, a shadow is suggested between the last iteration and this one.

How I feel today
Distance between words and actions
Concentrated
Confused
Distance
Shadow and positive contamination
All right
Excited
Tired and happy
Shadow
Funny
Density and light
Silent

DAY 1

Expectations

At the start of the day, Fran and Andrea propose to collect expectations regarding the day. The main ideas / questions that emerged are the following:

- How to set up a protocol to transfer tools to develop collective projects between different groups?
- How can the long-term project be imagined from a practical perspective?
- What practical aspects should be addressed and how to do it? (the money, for example)
- What is the "invisible" that appears when we do collective projects and how can we live with it?
- Interest in participating in the next laboratory. Collect perspectives from the different participants.
- Learn with "the other" participants.
- Investigate how it is possible to connect "desktop" art and art in the "field".
- How could a common ground be developed for the following three years?
- What document can be used to talk about the project?
- What is the "common" language of the project?
- In what way can we work based on the capacities and potential of the artists without generating expectations and pressures?

Main objective of the day

Create a framework of common ethics (dodododoc), that is, a result document

Secondary Objectives

Analyze three aspects:

1. Common
2. Good
3. Governance

When the activity is presented, a series of issues about the questions are formulated by the participants:

- With what criteria have the questions been elaborated?
- It is complex to speak of a "us", in fact there are different "us". How is this difference to be incorporated into the methodology?
- What kind of protocols will be used during the seminar? (for example, when speaking)
- From an operational perspective, is not it easier / desirable to find common questions about how we would like to work rather than make presentations? Maybe it is necessary to think about common questions about what should be present in this project during the following years.
- Maybe from the experiences of each group, you can share mechanisms of proceeding from the knowledge of each particular reality.
- It is necessary to take time to think about the practices, an issue that does not usually occur in European projects.

DYNAMIC 1. WHAT WE TALK ABOUT WHEN WE SPEAK OF COMMON-SHARED ETHICS

- *What strategies / tools will be used for the communication, documentation and coordination?*

The strategies of writing collectively using pads are discussed in detail. It is noted that although it is an appropriate tool for the type of communication required by this type of project, the pad refers directly to the practice of reading and writing, which could be insufficient. In this sense, different "tools" are proposed to document the processes and it is pointed out that it would be interesting to use different means to document and link it to the evaluation process. In this sense, it is argued that there are situations that are difficult to see "from within" and, from that perspective, it is very healthy to have someone who observes.

With regard to communication, it is pointed out that it is important to reflect on the ways in which verbal and non-verbal communication is worked on. It is noted that "language is more against us than in our favor" and from there it refers to the question of how artists could be allowed to produce beyond language.

Another important issue has to do with the handling of the conflict because it is a problem that is also communication. Several participants wonder how to make visible the frustrations and desires that can arise in a group, for example.

One issue that appears repeatedly is that many artists do not work with media which should be addressed and reflected in a project like Iterations because it has practical implications.

It is also pointed out that the work process should be open, that is, that there should be a communication between inside and outside and that it is crucial to find a way to collect data that reflects the process.

In the Italian case, for example, the process was not done in a city, but in a town. The connection between the people was different so that everyone knew the organizers. This caused the meetings to be very enriching. What could be learned from this type of experience?

■ *How is the process for inviting / selecting the participating artists going to be?*

How can the open call be combined with flexible work? It is maintained that the call could be opened but people should also be invited directly. It is proposed that we should also leave an open door for improvisation.

An important discussion revolves around the following question: is there a right way to choose artists? And if so: what is it? Should the criteria be made transparent? If that happens, it is pointed out, maybe there could be conflict.

In this sense, it is maintained that the group must be aware of the decisions that are made. In this framework, different points of view appear on the criteria to choose the participants and it is decided that they should depend on the organization. In the Belgian case, for example, the criterion is affinity. Criteria such as energy or emotional management is difficult to state when setting the selection criteria for people / groups in a call, they argue.

One of the main conclusions of the group is that the process of invitation / election of participants depends on the context of each of the venues and their ways of interpreting and organizing participation.

■ *How contractual relations with artists are going to be regulated?*

One of the main problems is how to evaluate work linked to value and time. This implies, for example, thinking about how to pay for work and doing it in a context of trust or reflecting on how the number of hours dedicated to each job can be combined without the pressure of the result.

Difficulties arise to reach an agreement on the decision to pay artists or not. Some wonder if it is not something that should be decided in advance. This question is accompanied by other questions: who is left out? What is done with voluntary work? It is important, it is maintained, to ask how the artist links with work. It is said that one should think about the number of working hours and not the result. In Italy, for example, we must start from the idea that there is no money (money is sugar in the soup: it speeds up processes but does not ensure that something good comes out); hence, it is important to know that the group comes from different contexts and that the link work, value and time is not understood in the same way.

■ *What will be the criteria that will apply when evaluating the project?*

One of the working groups thought of tools or kits that could cross the process (Iterations). This could be useful to develop a sustained review of the project.

It is also said that it would be interesting if one could record what happens "from the outside", that is, use an anthropological perspective to understand how a process becomes a "story".

It is argued that one of the central issues in the application is evaluation; However, this idea is not deepened because it is a point that is expected to return in the seminar.

The group notes having focused on what should be evaluated and the role of participation in the evaluation. They argue that there may be different ways of doing the

evaluation and that it would be very interesting to carry out an exploration.

However, it is also pointed out that making a short-term evaluation can be stressful for those who are part of the process and that, moreover, it is easier to understand what happened after a period of time has elapsed.

Another question that is discussed revolves around the idea of "with whom one works". It is argued that the question of the contract is important, but we should think that everything that is produced is useful, it is common and belongs to all. From this perspective, the process should be open.

DYNAMIC 2. MONTSE ROMANÍ: THINKING CULTURE AND ECONOMY

Subplots is an artistic project that drives research and collaborative production around the image in movement. For this, *Subplots* puts in value those works that, from the collective cinema and the visual arts, have questioned the relations between the knowledge and the power, fomenting a territory of crossing between the art, the participative democracy, the education and the daily life. The research takes as anchoring points 3 axes of analysis: the *first subplot* occurs when collaborative practices generate new critical imaginaries, understanding by critical imaginary the set of narratives expressed by social practices that claim other forms of life and collective action to the that imposes the biopolitical administration in the disciplined societies. The imaginary creation is claimed here as a political faculty of memory, ideation and subjectivity that, apart from the disciplines, hierarchies and pre-existing protocols within the framework of the institution, contributes to the development of an autonomous or emancipatory cultural action.

The influence of critical pedagogies in the field of artistic education would contribute to producing the second subplot, linked to co-learning. The relationship between Radical Pedagogy and Visuality is found in different thinkers, among others, Herbert Marcuse and Henry A. Giroux, who agree in recognizing the political as pedagogical, and the political as pedagogical, and in conceiving education as a possible instance of liberation from an established social situation.

The third sub-plot *is* linked to dissemination, understood as the distribution of knowledge sharing the source code. In opposition to the notions of author / observer / viewer, traditionally identified in the social spaces of reception of the images, a scenario is propitiated in which relations of proximity and identification are tested to facilitate the exchange or crossing of knowledge, whether experts or not.

Subplots points to four directions:

- Why is it useful to learn together?
- How do we activate the imagination to create a happiness different from that organized by capitalism?
- What sort of learning arises from social movements?
- What is it that activate images politically?

Montse Romani refers to Subplots in the following terms: "we are a group of 3 people who started to work collectively in the framework of the Reina Sofía Museum. We were invited not only to produce something concrete, but to design a program of activities.

The 11-M was an intense process for us; hence we wanted to invite artists to show works linked to social movements and pedagogical practices. For us, the idea of culture was a very important tool in the transition to make the leap to postmodernity. That is why we had in our heads the idea of the museum as a public institution. The movement of the outraged led us to introduce post-representations about social movements in the museum. We had questions linked to the idea of how it is possible for a public museum to become an instituted institution and how to do another way of governing. That is, we ask ourselves about the ways to achieve an institution in which there is a resonance of social demands. The frame of the exhibition was knowledge.

The job was to develop "walked" assemblies. Every day at 7:00 p.m. an itinerary was organized (at 7:00 p.m. the entrance to the museum is free). The routes were mediated by two people. A consensual process was opened to collectively decide the itinerary. The objective of the program was to generate collective learning processes, resituate the place of the listener, etc. We proposed activities to promote a different participation. It was a completely new tour in the museum. We proposed dynamics for the audience to make decisions and guide the tour itself. It sounds idealistic but it worked quite well.

We wanted to incorporate the idea of "Popular Sovereignty" in the Museum. These are actions that are introduced in the museum in a symbolic way in order to invite people to participate in other ways in exhibitions. The idea was to create disruptive actions inside the museum. We understand these actions as "in between" acts. We worked, for example, with the white tide. They were invited to decentralize both their space of enunciation (they had never been seen in the cultural and artistic field) and that of the museum. We worked through assemblies, performative actions and through a non-hierarchical organization. This work involved demolishing walls between the departments of the museum. The activities were divided into three groups:

- Conversational: Dialogues on the collective production of knowledge with bookcamping and other organizations (squatters, social movements, activism). We ask ourselves how to introduce a political dimension in the Spanish educational system.
- Narrational: A public reading of literature on postcoloniality, design (Somateca, feminist and queer movements) and transgenerational encounters was carried out. We did a job of memory recovery.
- Instigational: Methodologies were proposed to think about organizational strategies that struggle to transform and influence public policies. People were invited to take pictures with the (red) t-shirts of social movements (associations of domestic workers, I DO etc). There were performances in the museum, for example.

> Comments:

- *Do you think that the project affected the institution?*

It is a paradox. After the experience, the museum introduced new practices. However, they did not stop departing. A critical perspective on the museum was also introduced "from the outside." But finally, nothing else happened. The people who got involved, like the director, said it was not possible to continue. The paradox is that they have been asked for three texts to show this change of image internationally but really the practices have not been transformed.

It is pertinent to think that these projects should be temporary to avoid contamination by the institution.

It is important to talk about the economic, linked to the cooperative: the social economy.

By organizing activities at the time people entered for free, the material life of the museum was being affected. This connects with the questions that interest in this seminar. For example, the performance that made the white tide was a disruptive way to participate in the museum through art. They all wore the white coat as a way of pointing out that they were all part of the problem. It is a great strategy to affect the space of the museum.

■ *How is success measured?*

This is an important question that has to do with the impact. It depends on the dimension, the objectives and what is desired. In our case, it is about making small changes that activate other types of dynamics. Sometimes there is no awareness of what is disruptive.

Website: <http://subtramas.museoreinasofia.es/en/subtramas>

DYNAMIC 3. WHO: ITERATIONS COMMUNITIES

It is pointed out that in a project like ITERATIONS communication is central. Everything revolves around "timing" (respect for time and rhythm of others): timeframe.

The question arises whether communication always implies that everyone communicates with everyone. And if it were not so, what would it consist of and what implications would it have for the project?

They also speak of the "shadow" and it is pointed out that it could be proposed to broaden its scope to promote interinstitutional learning process: how an organization develops knowledge and how it transmits it. Questions like "who learns from whom?", "Is everyone shadow?" are important because they connect with the organization of the process. It is pointed out that sharing the same space, for example, allows one to look and learn what the person with whom that space shares is doing. It is also said that shadow is linked to the idea that one person affects another. In this way, if you are the person who is going to be "shadowed", you are more aware of what is happening. That's why respecting time is very important. As noted, shadowing can only occur in coexistence. This is important because maybe it is a decision that is taken in the program. The fact is that if you do not leave your space, you are not affected by what happens in another group, it is said. The question is, consequently, for who has this practice VALUE, to whom it benefits.

DYNAMIC 4. DRAWING COMMUNITIES

■ *Internal Community*

Transformatorio has artists, invited people, the community and the people of the organization. The key to work is to build trust among the participants. That is, you have to find a key and learn from it: trust. Here, history in common, mutual support and constructive criticism are fundamental.

There is a problem of sustainability (economic), especially if working in rural communities which is accompanied by interest in social relations and its environmental impact. Other issues of interest to Transformatorio are: access to resources, local participation (methods to achieve the participation of people in the community), gender balance, inclusion of local artists, permaculture design (related to how to design the land, the economy, politics, etc). What is proposed is that the community affects the process and that the process affects the community.

It is said that in Transformatorio there is no money involved because this balances the project to one side. The rest of the seminar participants ask if this is really the case. For Transformatorio the value of work has to do with experience and what happens there.

They are asked how the lack of money affects people who take part in the laboratory. It is answered that they start from the conviction that in collaborative projects nobody should earn money because it is collective.

However, it is answered, in practice it is not so simple. In the Belgian case, for example, it is said that when something is organized, people say that they can not work in a week.

In Italy, it is pointed out, it is expected to be an underground process. If someone collaborates with local people there are problems if you are the person who brings the money. It is a strategy for people to participate.

They are also asked how Transformatorio imagines the movement from their project to Iterations. It is answered that it is necessary to start from a real situation to build the dynamics and from then on to build the community. It is a work methodology. From Constant it is pointed out that it is not clear how the work dynamics of the communities with the outside world are interconnected in Iterations.

It is pointed out that if you think about relational communities, it is important to think about how Transformatorio interprets the relationship between your community and the community that you intend to build in Iterations. It is said that this is a topic that should be put on the table because it is the heart of the meeting.

■ *Relational community with artists / creators*

The group asks what a community is and how it differs from an association / group of people. It is pointed out that a community is, for example, a church, the mafia or political parties. To answer the question, the group developed a timeline to see when there was a connection with other communities, that is, unexpected communities.

A question is exposed that is linked to the above and addresses the impact that a project such as Iterations can have on the community. And there is also talk of the need to carry out a sort of classification of different types of interaction between the community and

the outside: it is possible that there are communities that do not necessarily connect with the local and it is possible to think of communities that do connect with it -local- and vice versa, that is, local contexts that do not necessarily connect with communities.

There is talk of two energies: a volcano that goes out and a whirlwind that attracts. Is it a work methodology? It is pointed out that this has to do with a kind of pedagogy of the encounter.

It is argued that, for what has been pointed out, it is interesting to think about what is meant by community and how it works (how to include, for example), know what you want to do and clarify it in order to find common work strategies more easily.

From Transformatorio it is indicated that, considering that diversity is a wealth, it is proposed to carry out a transparent process (budget). The value of Transformatorio lies in allowing a great participation through the use of open sources. And it also indicates that they would like there to be a shadow between the last interaction and this one.

■ *Final comments*

It would be advisable to design a participatory evaluation.

Authorship, commons, collective production are important for the project and cross iterations. The question of how the need for the commons is expressed and how it is communicated, for example, is fundamental.

Peter argues that much of what is proposed is already written, the case is how to implement it.

It is again pointed out that perhaps the idea of shadow should not only be between artists, but also between organizations and individuals. It is important to clarify the details / decisions that allow the shadow to be made. Perhaps it is important to decide who goes from one interaction to another.

You can think about what can be assumed and what is not between some experiences and others. It can be proposed, for example, that Hangar select 2 or 3 artists following their own selection criteria in order for Transformatorio to receive them.

It is also pointed out that a circular open call can be made: in each country two or three artists participate in the residence of another and this is repeated from country to country. In this way, there is a circulation of artists and a continuity. However, each country will decide autonomously how it links with artists.

The idea is to make an exhibition with the work of all the participants and this could happen in Brussels.

Another issue that is talked about is what is going to be documented, how and what you want to share with the rest. It is said that you have previous experiences in the documentation process and you talk about how to take it to open source. The difficult thing is to bring the open source to the result of the artist. Maybe it should be clarified in advance that everything will be open, included in the results.

Should the entire process be contaminated? Should the whole process be a common

work? Are there activities that are done collectively? At what point should artists be informed about art licenses? What is the common way of thinking through the use of art licenses? How to think about authorship? These are some of the questions that arise in relation to artistic work, open source and licenses. However, it is answered that these questions are the starting points of the project and that research is precisely about that.

DAY 2

DYNAMIC. TRACE THE RESOURCE

The second day is focused on governance; in its main foundations. Groups of three people are formed who have 15 minutes to solve or answer different questions. The main links of the exchanges are the following:

- What tools will be used for the communication, documentation and coordination of the project? Operative questions to begin with.
- Will the budget be managed collectively? How?
- How is the process for selecting the participating artists going to be?
- How will the contractual relations with artists be regulated? Answering with common experience and discuss other possibilities
- What will be the criteria that will apply when evaluating the project?
- How is the conflict management going to be addressed?

It is proposed, from a time line, to carry out a traceability and mark the main milestones in the chain of the Iterations system. The group requests to form several working groups, one on process documentation, visualization and another on licensing.

At the same time, Peter, Julien, Irene and Mafe form a third working group in order to collect the main ideas of day 1.

ARTIST EXCHANGE BETWEEN ITERATIONS

We write a paragraph about the way that the artists will be exchanged between the organizations. We have discussed the wish to always integrate one or several artists from one iteration into the next.

During the project, there will be 4 Iterations. For each Iteration, the responsible organization will select the artists according to their own house rules (open call, invitation, etc.). The organization that will take over the next Iteration can also send some artists to the previous one according to the schema below:

- Iteration in Sicily: Transformation will make a call / invite 16 to 35 (?!?) Artists to participate at the Iteration in Sicily and 10% of the artists will come from Hangar.
- Iteration in Barcelona: ESC will select 10% artists that will be participating in the Hangar Iteration. Hangar has in total 6 places available. There will be an open call.
- Iteration in Graz: Constant will select as well 10% of the artists that will participate in iteration in Graz. ESC has in total 6 places available. They will be selected as a result of the previous Esc lab. The residency will result in an exhibition.
- Iterations in Brussels: One artist coming from each of the previous Iterations will converge to Brussels (3 in total). Constant will choose the remaining 3 artists (?). The residency will result in an exhibition. In parallel Constant will organize a work-session with 18 participants from different background for which there will be an open call (percentage of participants and open call participants participants).

Between the Iterations, there will be 4 handover moments. There is a fix for 10 artists + 2 staff from each organization for 2 days (1 night), the budget is small. The artists can

choose how, when, where to make the exchange. They can also choose which trace (s) will like to bring along from the previous Iterations. It is expected that the staff are non-interventionist observers (they act as witnesses) and they report back to the other staff that are not present at the meeting. Another option is that the budget for the staff could go to "shadows".

The artists involved in the handover will be chosen on the basis of the organization and the artists that participated in the previous Iteration.

SHADOWING

There is a wish for a "shadowing" role in the project. For example: an organization goes to visit another organization while they work. This can happen during the artist in residency period or during an Iteration or during a handover meeting. This can be used as a period of observation to learn procedures, methods and training new skills. Participants can apply and request for being to shadow when they feel they need it.

At this stage of the project we can not see how to define better this role. There are many questions open.

AUTHORSHIPS AND COPYRIGHT/COPYLEAD

Letter of agreement about use of open resources

ARTIST AGREEMENT - at the beginning

License agreement, First draft

The draft in progress is here:

http://pad.constantvzw.org/p/iterations-license_agreement

DECISION MAKING AGREEMENT

Written reference about organizational structure for making decisions and communication during meetings, evaluations, discussions. Behaviour code and conduct.

SURVEYS

We will make two types of surveys/ enquiries: forms in which we try to gather the feedback of people that have taken part in Iterations. The first is for artists and organisers. The second is for audience / spectators / visitors /

The goal of these surveys is to collect opinions / remarks to be used in the future of the project. This can be for example for the publication, the exhibition, the reporting.

We think it is important that we start this survey today.

5.1: Survey: questions for the artists who are participating and, during the duration of the project

5.2: Survey / gathering feedback from the public in order to make a continuous

evaluation by the public possible.

DOCUMENTATION AND USE

Surveys, recordings, video, interviews, audience evaluation.

EVALUATION

Here is the first draft of the text for the surveys:

<http://pad.constantvzw.org/p/iterations-survey>

DOCUMENTATION & TRACES

Website = interface for the public

Git (independent or on one of our server > to be decided) = repository based on tags.

Tags should be multilingual + own cloud?

Digital

Analogical

After every event upload documentation: everything can be in different languages except for a read me document and the scores (verbal or not verbal description) to be used as a kind of report of what happened.

We should include "gray literature" : budget, notes of meetings, contracts, agreements, etc... = transparency and shadowing

Political context we are using

Two mailing lists:

Zappa = administration between partners

Iterations = open to all the participants

Handover moments = 4 in total, only artists invited

- Artists are responsible to organise these moments

- Artists and the responsible organisation should communicate about that (how to administrate the budget, etc.)

- Artists from the previous iterations bring something they choose to transmit to the artists of the next iterations

- Artists should report in a way or another to the organisations

GOVERNANCE AND COMMUNITIES

That is used

How

Prices

Paw print

Change in production

Budget

Iterations: trace, transformation and toolkit

Iterations Website: Portal for sub_folder structure with content for each iteration (sub_folders)

Vision & Mission eligibly on the website: Disclaimer / agreement for the terms of the project

TO DO LIST

Mailing list - All have to sign

GIT Set Up

Transfer traceability structure in repository

KATE RICH, FERAL TRADE IMPORT-EXPORT

Feral Trade is a grocery business and public experiment, trading goods over social networks. The word 'feral' describes a process which is wilfully wild (as in pigeon) as opposed to romantically or nature-wild (wolf). The passage of goods can open up wormholes between diverse social settings, routes along which other information, techniques or individuals can potentially travel.

The first registered feral trade was in 2003, with the import of 30kg coffee direct from Sociedad Cooperative de Cafecultores Nonualcos R.L. (CODECANO) in San Pedro Nonualco El Salvador to the Cube Microplex, Bristol UK. The import was negotiated using only social contacts, and conducted via email, bank transfer and SMS. The coffee is traded on through the UK and Europe over social, cultural and occupational networks; harnessing the surplus freight potential of existing travel (friends, colleagues, passing acquaintances) for the practical circulation of goods. New products are chosen for their shelf-life and capacity for sociability: feral trade goods in recent circulation include the whole coffee harvest of Finca El Volador in Coatapec, Mexico; plus olive oil from Spain, green tea from China, salt from Georgia and Cube-Cola from UK.

<http://www.feraltrade.org/cgi-bin/courier/courier.pl>

<http://irational.org>

MEETING TO DISCUSS ON THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE DAY 1

Decision processes

Writing down in a group summary of yesterday's decisions

Open License document

Timetable

Artist handover process

Documentation

Visualization

License

It is pointed out that an external look could offer a new look at the existing documentation. Someone unfamiliar with the project could interview the participants, for example. It is suggested to invite observers who are responsible for following the process during the residences.

It has also been talked about how to use the previous experiences in Iterations as an inspiration to get ideas about implementation mechanisms, use of resources, organization, etc. It is said that if new artists feel that they are using other people's work, using licenses may not be necessary. It's like using data to create new data.

SURVEY

- Iteration project helped you explore new ways for artistic collaboration? Yes/describe – No/why?
- Which tools/strategies that were provided to you during Iteration were helpful in the collaborative aspect of the project?
- What is the output of Iteration on your work?
- Do you have suggestions how we could improve?
- Can you point us to previous experiences or indicators on the evaluation process?

- What is your definition of success for this project?

POLICIES ON COLLECTIVE WORK

When talking about work of a collective nature, it would be necessary to specify what type of collaboration is being discussed. It is also said that evaluation is a pedagogical tool that could be implemented during the development of the project.

It is fundamental, it is pointed out, to work on micropolitical practices. This consists not only in thinking about how we could work together, but also in the observation and evaluation of those who have been working together so far. The practice is built on trust, not through direct copying. In this sense, perhaps a call should be made in which the artists know in advance that they will have to use creative licenses.

It is important that the documentation is developed through creative commons systems. There should not be an obligation to submit a piece at the end of the residency and there should be an environmental impact code to develop the work.

OPEN LICENSE DOCUMENTS

Exchange of artists

Participation

Open resources

Authorship

Copyright / copylead

Agreements with artists

Open Call Protocol

Decision making

Project Iterations and practices

Possibilities of Shadow

Documentation: surveys, video, interviews, audience evaluation

Final exhibition and publication: how the documentation will be used and developed

Licenses - it is pointed out that there is a difficulty for organizations with different structures to achieve that artists decide to use free licenses in their work. There could be a confrontation between authorship and free license.

CONTACTS

Marques Anderson from WE Education Foundation, working with Smart cities project, Lora networks, etc: www.worlddef.com (smart cities): thinkinggreener@gmail.com

Letizia Jaccheri from IT Faculty NTNU Trondheim, project ARTEC (Art and technology, artist in residency), social innovation, gender equality, art and data, recycling, learning kids to program using art and creativity: letizia.jaccheri@ntnu.no

GRANTS

Step beyond grants: Travel grants for artists up to 35 years old based or active in EU and a big list of non EU countries. A max. Of two individuals can apply for the same grant together. Min 60 days application previous to travel. Guideline application form: http://ecflabs.org/drupal/sites/www.ecflabs.org/files/step-beyond-grant/STEP_travel_grants_guidelines_2017.pdf

Awesome Foundation: 1000 eur for an art project, technology, community development... They fund ideas, so it can be presented as idea for trasformatorio by an artist (f.ex. I can apply for Letters to the World project in Scaletta, which covers social, artistic and cultural aspects...): <http://www.awesomefoundation.org>

The Foundation Arts Initiative: gives grants to individuals for travel and research and to institutions for general activities and projects. This is fantastic for Trasfomatorio <https://ffaiarts.net/grants>

LINKS

<http://pad.constantvzw.org/p/iterations-hangar>

<http://tinyurl.com/y9mmemw>

Free art licence 1.3: <https://gogs.dyne.org/fredd/iterations>

Website: <http://iterations.space>

Coglemindmap:

<https://coggle.it/diagram/>

[We7qhthdtQABAUE2/6e68ea5bd03f5179a8df1d431877ea76029dd94b9229dda967a5d3ccb37a1b6](https://coggle.it/diagram/We7qhthdtQABAUE2/6e68ea5bd03f5179a8df1d431877ea76029dd94b9229dda967a5d3ccb37a1b6)

Dyne publishing platform <https://github.com/dyne/Writedown>