

Timestamp	Email Address	How would you best describe this experience? (You can choose more than one)	Do you think that this experience, in its specificity, can be defined as a new kind of genre? If yes how would you name it?	Within this frame of "new genre", is there anything particularly novice about your role? If so, what would that be? And how would you call yourself (for example musician, actor, performer, facilitator, moderator, allnone of these, other...)?	Is there a need for this kind of "performance"? If yes why?	What is the strongest aspect of Aesthetics/Outcome for you?	What is the weakest aspect of Aesthetics/Outcome for you?	Is this a type of performance you enjoy to be part of? Why (why/yes)?	Was there anything that made you uncomfortable? What and why?	What do you think is co-authoring?
12/17/2016 13:03:14		• Generative performance, • Interactive performance, • An improvisation environment/system/ game, • Generative performance, • Interactive performance, • An improvisation environment/system/ game	don't think it is a new genre.		Absolutely! People, artists and audience alike, should be confronted with performances that fall out of the usual and precisely defined ones. Besides in this kind of performance there's a deeply human parameter which reaches other dimensions as well, except for the purely artistic.	The spontaneous and earnest moments that occur between performers and individuals from the audience.	Possible small audience.	I love it! Because I'm being encouraged to explore things I want to do, it feels like a different condition where everything may happen and it seems that performers are asked to give out something from their deeper self, what I sometimes miss in old fashioned concerts.	When I got a task which coincided with my feelings of that moment and I didn't dare to surrender myself to it.	Mutual owing of a work by means of its perception and original form giving.
12/17/2016 13:31:48		• Installation, • Durational performance, • Generative performance, • Human installation, • Interactive performance, • Audience participatory performance, • An improvisation environment/system/ game, • A theatrical landscape, • Installation, • Durational performance, • Generative performance, • Human installation, • Interactive performance, • Audience participatory performance, • An improvisation environment/system/ game, • A theatrical landscape	No.	A novel approach for limit is, I think, the request to perform without acting; that is, the omission of theatricality. As for my role, I'd call myself a performer/object.	In order to keep on challenging ourselves and our audiences.	The atmosphere and the free co-existence of various (and not necessarily related) textures.	The fact that it relies too much on the sense of responsibility and commitment of each performer.	Yes, very much. Because it challenges my limits, asks for involvement, and gives me the chance to be myself within specific requests.	No. That has to do with me personally, because I'm never in comfort (i.e. I'm always on the alert). But this doesn't mean it was easy for me or predictable as I said before, it was challenging.	It's sharing the responsibility (and the copyright) for the conception and the construction of a work of art
12/18/2016 14:22:27		• Durational performance, • Human installation, • Interactive performance, • Audience participatory performance, • A theatrical landscape, • Durational performance, • Human installation, • Interactive performance, • Audience participatory performance, • A theatrical landscape	I am not very good at defining genres to say if it is a new one. I could better describe it as an original and interesting combination of many elements, such as computer generated and recorded sound and visual material, interactive durational performance, a living audiovisual installation-performance. A living organism with its own pulse, which depends on multiple factors.	There were two novice things for me. First one the time period that I had to perform, there was not a flow of the audience passing, it was random and effected on my acting. Second one the shape of the building that it took place, which didn't allow many performers to be on the same spot together. I felt an individuality and lack of connection with the environment that I was a part of. I would call myself a restrained performer that day!	Even if one and only person feels there is a need for this kind of performance to exist to express its little something, I think it should exist.	The environment created, the momentary images and sounds, the lack of linearly the unconscious flow from the view of an observer.	The computer controlled actions, which were random and didn't create an interesting polyphony at many moments, considering that this system couldn't measure the audience flow. Also, I think the fact that the audience could hear the orders in the whole process was kind of distracting and useless. Alternatively, there could be a variety of possibilities from which the performers would choose intuitively what they will perform and for how long, bearing in mind not to repeat the same possibilities a lot, respecting the audience and interacting with the living and non-living environment. The computer interaction, if needed, could be of another kind. This kind of performance, of course, would need more rehearsal and individual practice on learning the possibilities.	Thinking of it, I do enjoy to be part of this type of performances, because they have the factor of the unexpected and interactive. If you feel a part of it and begin to move within it, it is a unique experience, unchained from conventional rules of acting and creating sounds. But by experiencing it in similar types of performances, have felt many times that I cannot let myself so loose. I lose the whole feeling and cannot enjoy it. About this performance, it is a system that has some rules, but sometimes you could break them. For me that was kind of undefined, who, when, or to whom these orders referred to and what we should do with them, how much freedom did we have, how we should act. That uncertainty made me feel restrained and not very comfortable to get in the mood of flowing into it. But it can happen in durational performances.	Adding the above, I sometimes felt uncomfortable of the presence of the creator there and the fact that he indicated how we should act. Was it or not necessary, it made me feel uncomfortable, guided, kind of "forced to act". In my opinion, it should be a process with no expectations, as it is open in time and space, where little by little everyone would find his or her own space. If somebody wants some certain outcome, even in some parts of the performance, he should create that kind of environment, more strict in those parts. Also, the interaction with the audience in moments that there where max 4 persons audience, made me feel uncomfortable about what I should do with them.	People or data collaborating with the main author of a work that contribute with their participation to the progress and fulfillment of the main idea.
12/22/2016 23:02:47		• Live art, • Human installation, • Live art, • Human installation	yes, freedom in free form direction	all the above are how I call myself. This is what makes me feel novice about my role	yes, because the situation didn't have only one explanation	movement	stagnation	yes, because I can be expressed in various ways	yes, the repetition of direction, because carrying on the previous process	everyone in performance have the personal way to expression the meaning form tasks
12/23/2016 16:27:50		• Live art, • Installation, • Durational performance, • Generative performance, • Human installation, • An improvisation environment/system/ game, • A theatrical landscape	My knowledge is not in depth enough to answer this question. I think though it differs from more "traditional" forms exactly because of its hybridity. So maybe "hybrid sound and action environment".	I think yes and very much. The most desirable quality of a performer for such kind of "thing" is flexibility. One has to be able to switch between all the different roles listed above (and more) in a split-second. Another quality is also a general detachment about oneself: being able to switch roles so quickly and to do things that seem totally absurd in a convincing manner, without acting them out.	I'm not able to answer to this. I believe we don't make things because they are needed but because we need to make them.	The ability to create a finite world guided by its own rules.	The position of the audience in this world.	A lot! I like creating a world rather than just displaying it. And I love the durational and generative aspect of it.	At some point the interaction with one member of the audience felt a bit abusive. For the performance was amazing, layered emotions, interaction with the audience (also all the people looking at it making it a peep-show) etc... and I loved it because of that. As a human being I felt uncomfortable. But I think it's a great feeling. Ultimately it all depends on whether you consider uncomfortability a negative feeling or not. I think in a performance practice is very positive feeling.	
2/19/2017 22:21:37		• Installation, • Interactive music theatre, • Audience participatory performance	Difficult to find a definition of what's new or not nowadays. Some elements perhaps are new, but generally I think a lot have been made in the past, within the spectrum of live performances.	Performer, that's what it felt to be my role on this work. Being a musician this sort of performance brings me to intervene in other areas which relate more with performance art.	Yes. The fact that audience can interact makes the point much stronger in this sort of performance. The fact that in some way abstract narrative, creates diverse possibilities for critical and creative point of views of the audience.	The paranoia state that can be created within the performance. It feels to me a very strong point of it. Highly personal performance, either for the performer or the audience.		Yes, because it takes me away from my normal role on stage (musician) experiencing other sort of performance.	Not really. Perhaps sometimes the interaction part with audience, since people have different reactions. But generally went all quite well.	
2/23/2017 12:57:28		• Interactive performance	no	still a performer		the really strong visual images that are created in the space	that both audience and performers can hear the instructions (conu kos audiofromtojevc)	yes, I discover new powers and weaknesses of myself everytime I am performing, that I did not know I had at all	the duration although I really think that it works as a concept, as a performer I find it difficult to give my 100% all the time	creating something with someone else
2/25/2017 14:08:03		• Live art, • Installation, • Durational performance, • Generative performance, • Human installation, • Audience participatory performance, • An improvisation environment/system/ game, • A theatrical landscape	It has a link with the "happenings".	Performer/actor/participant/moderator/musician	Yes. - It invites the audience to take part in it. - It pushes the performers to look different at their bodies/thought-patterns/instrument, and their ways of expression. It takes both the audience and performers out of their comfort zone (in a good way!) - It blurs the boundaries between performer and audience, and creates a (temporal) parallel reality.	See answer to previous question - It takes both the audience and performers out of their comfort zone (in a good way!) - It blurs the boundaries between performer and audience, and creates a (temporal) parallel reality.	none	YES! It was great fun, and very liberating. It pushed me to think about interpretation and creativity.	Yes. Again, in a good way, I had to come up with different approaches to my instrument, body, and above all (creative) mindset to pull some of the tasks. Sometimes my first reaction would be "how the hell do I do this?", and you need to push yourself through adn beyond that. GGGATT!	A significant positive contribution (big or small) to a concept of someone else, which takes the whole thing to another level.