

LARGE SCREENS AND THE TRANSNATIONAL PUBLIC SPHERE: Q&A SESSION

Nikos Papastergiadis (University of Melbourne), Cecelia Cmielewski (University of Western Australia), Ross Gibson (University of Sydney), Scott McQuire (University of Melbourne), Audrey Yue (University of Melbourne), Leon Cmielewski (University of Western Sydney), Amelia Barikin (University of Queensland), Matt Jones (Federation Square), Xin Gu (University of Melbourne)

This is a transcript of the audience Q & A session that took place during “Large Screens and the Transnational Public Sphere” panel discussion at ISEA2013.

QUESTION: What makes a public space amenable to urban screens? I think in Federation Square it works really well, but it’s a difficult paradigm to apply to any space, and I think that’s a really critical question. The other perhaps more important question is, what does moving from rational discourse to the experiential mean in relation to public sphere theory? I was at a conference with a bunch of engineers last week in California, they wouldn’t have bought [your qualitative research findings] because you’re dealing with embodied interaction, with concepts that are so abstract applied to it that it’s difficult to measure, it sounds more like rhetoric. I’m interested in it, but I find it difficult to grasp. So I’m really interested in this difference between what you’re calling the linguistic and the gestural.

ROSS: Nikos, maybe I can just respond to the initial question, about how do you make a public screen work. I think that’s a really critical issue, and I don’t think there’s actually many examples of urban screens that are very well-designed in the public space. They’re not well-positioned, they’re often far too high, they’re remote from the audience, so that really limits what kind of interaction you might have. They’re often used as display spaces, they’re about branding a building or they’re about a spectacle in the sense, which a lot of things in the city do, that they make you feel small while they feel big. So I don’t think there’s many examples where they are done well.

I think one of the things that probably we’ve learned is that using

such a large-scale screen has benefits, because it’s about collective reception and that’s been an important part of our project. But we’ve also found it hard to do events as subtle and supple as we probably would’ve liked, because there’s quite a lot of infrastructure involved, and there’s quite a lot of cost involved. And so I think that’s one of the limitations of screens. In terms of your other question about the framework for understanding the audience experience and interaction, I think there’s different ways of understanding this.

One of the things that I’ve noticed in the audience responses to the surveys – which are from very different groups and it’s very hard to make generalisation, because the samples we’ve got are just far too small to do anything like that – is that people are reaching to describe forms of co-presence, to describe that experience. We’ve often asked people questions like, “Did you feel closer?” And “closer” is a very ambiguous term, but it’s really about people describing some kind of experience which is to do with being in one particular place and being aware of your own embodiment, your own situation, but feeling closeness to someone in another place.

And people have used lots of different languages, sometimes paradoxes, to describe that experience. It is, I think, a very common experience, not just in these events but how we live in this world; we inhabit particular situations, we have networks that extend our communications capabilities with people in all kinds of ways. So that even when we’re in this space, if you’ve got your computer on I don’t know whether you’re looking at your email or talking to someone – you know, there’s that kind of disjunction of spatial and temporal frames that we’re familiar with. This was a very public platform for working out some of those kinds of experiences and for thinking about how the screen might work as a platform for public communication and what that might mean. And I think you’re right, we probably wouldn’t convince many engineers, in terms of our framework, but that hasn’t been what we’ve been really working with.

SCOTT: And what’s being communicated, it’s not necessarily semantic. We find that again and again, both in the questions we’re asking and then in the responses that were coming back. You know, there’s

semantic communication and there’s phatic communication. There’s a situation where the transaction between people constructs a feeling, and that construction of a feeling is one of the things that’s turning up again and again in the experience. We end up talking about the experience rather than the message or what was conveyed.

ROSS: My reference to Habermas wasn’t really so much about that’s how we were thinking, but just that that’s such a dominant way of thinking about the public sphere, and we were saying, actually, this isn’t a deliberative notion at all. It isn’t about people giving their opinion about whether migration in Australia is good or not, although you can read some of the sort of responses in that way if you want to, but it is really about how people might communicate with each other using a public platform if you give them opportunities, whether it’s by revealing certain kinds of personal data, like where they were born and where their parents were born, or by learning a dance from a stranger in Korea and then teaching it to another stranger in Korea, and what that kind of exchange might involve.

CECELIA: I think the other thing to bear in mind is governance. I think for me, seeing the Perth experience really brought that into sharp relief, because in Perth there’s two large screens, one in a public centre of the city and another one literally, five blocks away; one that has a very restrictive governing set-up, it’s very high and it’s programmed as a TV screen; and the other one, in Northbridge, where it is possible to interact. So I think that role that the civic leaders play is very important, and in a way part of this project was to try and influence that thinking.

AMELIA: It would be great to be able to have multiple screens in multiple cities accessible, cheaply, for people to make use of. And we are so far from that. Well, that’s basically what we found. It seems really very straightforward, but it’s not.

NIKOS: We thought that would be something that would happen in the life of the project. It might not even happen in our lifetime. But adding on to your point about the shift from the normative to the aesthetic, for us one of the fascinating dimensions that’s come in that shift, has been the idea of

recognition. And the idea of recognition here is presupposing so many of the conditions of the communication that both Ross and Scott and everyone else have already referred to. But what we found through the feedback was fascinating, because there's a strong desire for recognition, but what kinds of recognition? Two kinds. One is simple, you know, I want to feel close, I want to see their face – facial recognition, and all that signified in terms of proximity and familiarity and friendship, right? Another kind of recognition we've also identified is the idea of face creation. Many of the participants in *SMS_Origins* talked about the pride and presence-ing that they felt, the civic engagement and civic recognition that they get when their own biographical details appeared on this civic platform, the screen. So that was a sense that they often communicate, is, "I feel like I exist, I belong, even though I'm a student here," or a tourist, or a visitor, or even a resident. They would often sense that, "This gives me a sense of being and belonging in this place." So that was a kind of face creation exercise, which is fascinating.

QUESTION: I have a question. Scott, you started talking about – or the whole panel started talking in many ways about – this identification of 'the third space', this coexistence, this shared space. And then there was a comment about Kit Galloway and Sherrie Rabinowitz and *Hole in Space*. And I think the third space is this shared, this coexisted space, and how we identify with this new space is so important. But I think also from Kit and Sherrie's work it's so important we look back to 1980 – I mean, this is almost Stone Age in terms of media – and we think about what looked so simple, to connect a video conference in two shop windows. But what was so simple and what was so complex as well, and so sophisticated, was the way that – where those locations were, the choice of the locations, and the unannounced activity. No one knew what was going on, and it opened up this opportunity to do whatever you want. So the sort of "giving it up", saying, "I don't want to have any control over this. I don't want to put signs up, I don't want to tell people what to do," was so important in making that whole piece work.

SCOTT: Discover what's possible.

QUESTION: Yeah, and that was almost identifying this third space.

Because the more you let go, the more you give up, the more you go towards that third space. You won't make it by announcing what it's going to be to the public. You have to let people find it themselves and that's so important. ROSS: And that's been a great difficulty for the project, because of the nature of the spaces in which we're working, there's legal constraints on how much you can do that. But for something like *SMS_origins*, when it was run multiple times, it wasn't advertised, so it was a more ambient mode, and that's certainly something we really wanted to explore. *Hello* was advertised minimally, so it was more about getting people who are moving through the square to come along and to engage in that, looking for passer-by traffic, so people come without preconception. The *Dance Battle* was a totally different kettle of fish, because it got a lot of media publicity. But what was interesting was not just the cultural diversity, because you'd expect that in Melbourne in particular – but the diversity of ages, and a lot of people who'd never had contact with that culture. And I mean, one of the things about it was to try and get young people to be able to be central stage in a central-city public space, because youth culture is often really excluded and marginalised within those spaces, so that had that interesting aim, but we totally agree with you, and I think that's something we've learnt, that it's actually very hard to do that kind of spontaneous project in that kind of site.

QUESTION: Well, audience differentiation is a big issue here.

QUESTION: You chose to work with possibly one of the most multicultural countries in the world and coupling it with one of the most mono-cultural countries in the world; it's a kind of an apples and oranges kind of situation. So from the perspective of qualitative research I'm just sort of wondering how you juggle that. And a little wider to that, I think the thing that I found that countered that was in that the hip hop stuff is such a kind of globalised, kind of floating culture, that both of those cultures could engage really easily on equal terms. You could have done the same also with jazz, for example, very popular in Korea, very popular here. So I just wonder if I could get some comments on that kind of compare and contrast kind of situation you've put yourself in.

AUDREY: There were a lot of quotes from the respondents saying, you

know, music doesn't really require any kind of translation, dance as well, so it was experienced as a kind of universal platform in that context. But as I tried to show, Korea's kind of 'globality', if you like, is very much marked by its outwardness: the fact that is mono-cultural means that it's looking out, and you saw that in the responses. Australia's multicultural context is very much marked to a certain extent by difference – some of the responses suggested, "If we want to know you from the outside it was about knowing cultural differences." So that's perhaps simplifying it, but one direct response to your query. From the production side I'm sure there's a lot of rationale there too.

SCOTT: But your question about, you know, the dream of social science, where's the control and then where are the variations against the control. We've had to decide pretty early, there's no control! Or the control is the dream of direct communication of semantics and phatics. You know, let's use that as the thing we're chasing across these different venues and different cultures, and then let's observe the wild variation around which that control – that dreamed control – actually gets enacted, and then let's not worry about the data that's coming in all directions and the variations in it. That's what's interesting, especially in this interplay between national integrity – take some of the connotations away from that – but integrated, singular idea of national culture and transnationalism, all of these wild variations of interpretable action and information coming through, that's what the project has turned out to be about.

AMELIA: Which is why we chose the curatorial approach that we did, so that we could test those kinds of different parameters in very different situations, in 'apples and oranges' contexts. Sure, if you had more time, you could get bigger samples and you could do more questions and you could collect more data and you could repeat the same experiment in different countries, but really we were more interested in trying to picture the variables. We've got a very good sense of those now!

CECELIA: And in a way curate, produce, design the art projects that would create benefit – that would be able to actually generate the most useful responses.

QUESTION: Firstly, I just thought that was wonderfully rich and very complex and also very risky, and I think it's not such a surprise that the engineering community would find it problematic, because it's much more nuanced and it has a very complex cultural dimension. But my question now is about legacy and sustainability. I know these are big projects and money lasts for a particular length of time, but I think that point you were making, Nikos, about face creation, and this idea of a sense of citizenship must have a political impact. And also I wondered about the kind of cultural policies within the particular environment in which it was situated, particularly Melbourne ... I'd be very interested to know how you would bring that discourse [on citizenship and public policy] forward into what is being such a narrowed down discourse, as what constitutes the public, the social.

NIKOS: What I might try and do now, given that we've only got 15 minutes left, is take a suite of questions together.

QUESTION: I originally thought my question was a bit more for Matt, but having listened to Tim talk maybe it sort of has broader options. It is about this kind of temporality that you talked about, about the kind of programming and usage of space. Because we think about public often in terms of public infrastructure which has some sense of permanence, and I think that's what Tim's talking about with his project which is kind of excellent, but then, Matt, you talked about how there's a five to ten per cent kind of temporal programming in the space of Fed Square which goes on. I was just wondering if you could talk a bit more about the kind of spill over of that event time into the non-event time and how that perhaps constitutes a public space or public spaces that sit around those events when they're not actually on, and also whether there's been, over the ten years any kind of differences in the sort of rhythm and pacing of events, and what you've kind of learnt about that in programming things at Fed Square.

QUESTION: Very similarly, Audrey, do you have any sense of how important it is to your audiences that this form of cultural participation is free? And then, Matt, and anyone else on the panel, how do you view this research, and how does it relate to other research that's being undertaken, for example, by the dance festival in Korea

or ongoing research by other tenants at Federation Square? And then as someone who's a curator involved in contemporary art spaces, I'm very interested in how the methodologies that you're developing about cultural participation and the qualities that you are associating as indicators of cultural participation might be applied to other ways and spaces and situations like contemporary art spaces where people are engaging with artists and art.

NIKOS: That's a lot to deal with already, but I might actually ask Matt to start, and Audrey, and then maybe other members of the panel can chip in. But let's start with this first question about sustainability/programming and curatorial application. In other words, how does – what ongoing significance can we attribute?

MATT: I think that all those questions are part of the same continuum really, at least from our venue-based perspective. On the legacy and sustainability, at a real simple level, some of the models of those projects, especially the hip hop dance battles – and we've done a couple of them now, only one of them that's involved Korea, but we've done a couple of them – the learning for us is that stuff like that works and people like to come to the square to participate in it. Many of my colleagues here have already made the point in different ways that there really isn't any role model, there really is no exemplar for this sort of stuff. Somewhat through accident, somewhat through intent we are the pioneers of this, and so, you know, there are limits on what you can plan in terms of that. But we learned that people like to come into the square to relate and they like to come into the square also to relate to people in other contexts and spaces.

I find it interesting to note that Northbridge Plaza, the Perth screen partner – although that screen is controlled by council and that comes with its own particular limitations – but the guy [Damien Blyth] that actually drives that forward, for what it's worth, is an ex-Fed Square staffer. So he was involved probably at Fed Square from year four, through to about year seven or year eight, and he was very close to that journey as well. And he, within his particular context, has tried to replicate some of the models, which is what has enabled, frankly, us to have a much more direct and harmonious relationship with Perth. So in terms of sustainability and legacy, we learned some models for projects that we

would like to program and we would like to emulate.

In relation to your question about the temporality of that programming, there's sort of a sliding scale that we have to use in the allocation of our resources and the allocation of our staff and programming priorities. At one end is passive content, it's doing the best we can with the relatively small resources we've got to make the screen content interesting, relevant, dynamic, worthwhile and non-commercial. I really try to resist what we were doing even a couple of years ago, which was just to turn on Foxtel and play a wildlife documentary or whatever, even if sometimes that results in pretty inexplicable fringe art content that will irritate some people, it's better. It's better to try to aim for that and occasionally fail than it is just to treat it like a big telly, which is probably what we were doing a few years ago, and the legacy of that is that we still use language in our marketing collateral such as "Fed TV". There are new models that we're trying to learn and we're trying to articulate big screen access, and that isn't just about replicating a big TV.

At the other end of the spectrum are projects like this one, which are high resource, high input, and low output in terms of screen-time, as I said, but that are really cutting edge. And yes, it would be great if us and many other screens around the country and around the world had the ability to have portals and if we could up the percentage of time that we could devote to those sort of projects that would be ideal, but that is a lifetime thing, that is a generational thing. Really interestingly, one of the easiest payoffs we can have is, even if it's just a step, you know, more primitive than the hole in space, is to use the screen as a mirror. We have something called *Fed Cam*: a webcam which is embedded in the wall, we turn that on, turn the screen into a giant mirror and we'll leave that on for an afternoon, and it just – it delights people and it's so simple and it doesn't cost us anything.

Really, really briefly on how this relates to other research: from our perspective we obviously do a lot of surveying of site visitation anyway, but probably our two core drivers are visitor satisfaction and visitor yield: the conversion of visitation to spend. And it's worth noting that one of the areas that we have to grow more as a venue is this kind of dichotomy we've got going between events – and I include our screen program with that – and Fed Square's tenants. Put simply, does

bringing people to the square convert into business for our tenants? Or do the events themselves, including this sort of stuff, actually detract and prohibit visitation to those tenants? There is an unavoidable tension at the heart of that. Are we getting in the way of a more effective retail precinct, or are we enhancing that? And different tenants will have very strong views on that, as we do, but that is the kind of a tension at the heart of the programming philosophy of the space as well. When is too much too much?

SCOTT: I just wanted to say something about just the first question, which was to do with the legacy of this, particularly in terms of cultural policy, because I think there are really fundamental issues here. One is at a planning level. If you look at the way large screens are treated in all Australian planning jurisdictions, they're billboards. So that presumes they're for static, one-way content and for advertising, and there's really no consideration of the other possibilities. And I mean, one thing that was really odd about something like the *Dance Battle*, but really nice, was we had no sponsorship announcements. We were actually doing something that was about putting value back into a civic space, or this idea of the public space, so I think that's a very contested and uncertain idea right now. And we didn't have to acknowledge commercial partners in that, and that was really interesting, to actually have a three-hour event in the middle of Fed Square where there was no announcements and saying, "Thanks, it's brought to you by this."

AUDREY: And a lot of audiences mentioned that too. You know, "It was great, we want to participate because non-commercial event," and a lot of quotes around that. Whereas the *SMS_origins*, right, we had a few people pulled out because they asked, "How much does it cost?" I'd say, "The cost of an SMS," and they say, "Oh no, I'm not going to participate." Right, so you know, that's that. But as to the broader question around impact and cultural citizenship and cultural policy, there's been a discussion paper on multicultural policy, but flagging only two kinds of citizenship: economic citizenship and social citizenship. So cultural citizenship, in the way that we've tried to materialize and engage it, introduces a third dimension into this debate. The fundamental unit of cultural citizenship, having access to culture, is

about participation. You'd probably be familiar with all the theoretical work on cultural citizenship, but this project to a certain extent tries to operationalize it, by looking at the qualities of cultural participation and creating situations for participation to occur.

QUESTION: I've got a couple of questions and I haven't condensed them all, but as a former programmer of screens I came here curious about the kinds of ways in which large urban screens might serve art and other cultural phenomena, so I was interested in feedback on successful events of other kinds than this particular interactive one that we've talked so much about... I just wondered what other kinds of events could be described as interactive and what kind of ventures into art, or narrative, or other forms of culture that have been particularly successful could be deemed to be interactive and globalised as well. I also just want to throw in that I was involved with a little project that did a very similar thing as you dance project between Yokohama and Sydney in The Rocks, in January, and we did it with webcams and choreographers, and programmers, a very simple system, really ... and it actually had a very, very similar response but on a smaller scale. So I'm curious as to why you needed a larger urban screen to do that, or whether the events actually needed a public precinct. That throws to the governance issue about public space, too.

QUESTION: My question is about methodology. How did you make all your questions for the survey, and how actually – apart from the SMS – how was the survey conducted?

QUESTION: We've done quite a number of projects for the BBC big screens, initially *Picnic on the Screen*, which was for Glastonbury, but we've also done linked with China and Manchester and Liverpool. I'm also doing a PhD on urban screens and looking at open systems of interaction and how as media artists we can design artworks that engage with a broad audience giving them agency, offering them agency. But my question really is around the curation of the projects – do you think perhaps they could be exclusive? You know, do the dance projects exclude certain age groups, for example? Or do they kind of tap in, maybe, to the celebrity culture?
ROSS: Picking up on that questioner talking about the Yokohama/Rocks project, one of the buzzwords we

haven't thrown in yet, and I'll throw in, is "intimacy". One of the things we were trying for – but I now realise that we were working more and more and more towards – was how, with these huge public facilities, do you develop intimacy as a sort of shared experience, and to what extent then has the public sphere as an idea always been about this tension between exposure and intimacy, or distance and intimacy? So for me in some respects, yes, exactly right, throw up a little screen quickly in a space, do a dance battle, get out again, that is in a way a perfect model. But what we were testing was the affordances and limits and potentials of this big, big installed facility. Can you throw in that particular battle scenario and develop intimacy? Do you develop something else?

QUESTION: Or can you have longevity, can it be over a longer time, so that people know where to go to seek that experience.

ROSS: And just very quickly, and then I'll turn off my microphone for the duration, I reckon the Fed Square charter, as a constantly reiterated, redrafted legal document, is one of the classic administrative documents of the last ten, fifteen years or so. I actually saw it from its first scrappy draft through to about 2003. We might think that each time the lawyers would come in, it would lock down more and more; it's actually kind of loosened up more and more. The commerce that was all over it in the first drafts has kind of bled away quite a bit, and so the dystopian view you'd have of this redrafting has kind of not happened, and that's very, very interesting. I mean, Matt will have a much clearer view of it than I have over recent years.

MATT: This isn't going to be anywhere near a comprehensive answer to your question – but can I just offer one example of that, as a counterpoint. One of the other things that we do on that screen, really quite ad hoc, is we'll facilitate people proposing to each other. And probably over the last two years we've had about 20 marriage proposals. They always say yes [laughter]. But really, it's as ad hoc as someone will email or call up my screen programmer and say, "Can you put a slide to say, 'Will you marry me, Julie?'" And if we can, we'll do it, and if we can we'll do it for free and we'll sync that up with people. So although we can't get away from the kind of epic aesthetic we've got going on, and the range of different things we've got to

do, we do try to find the little grains of sand in the day. And that's just one example of it, which is, you know, one of the most intimate acts, I guess, amplified to the most exposed circumstances. So there's something in that conversion that is obviously compelling for people.

CECELIA: From the curator's perspective, we spent quite a lot of time actually trying to reinject the art back into the project. It kept running away from us. And I'm very conscious of that. It really was every time we'd be discussing it, I'd be saying, "Where's the art? Bring it back in." And on that term we'd become – so the collision, or collusion between producing and curating then that blurs, and then working with the artists in a more direct manner, it's not like they're just commissioned to do something. I think *SMS_origins* and *Value* was much more that more traditional relationship and then the other two projects were more blended, but the public screens are fluid spaces as well, very much, and it takes a lot of flexibility on the part of all the parties to pull that off.

AMELIA: Yes, flexibility in terms of the transnational element as well. Art Center Nabi have their own curatorial agendas and audiences; they're primarily a high-end media art gallery. The majority of screen works they show have an aesthetic that is very clean, in that well-produced new media kind of way, and so they were understandably nervous about doing these kinds of live, largely unpredictable screen events. But since we've completed the dance projects together, they're now holding a series called *Lunch Beats Seoul*, where they've actually turned one of their gallery spaces into a temporary lunchtime club where the public can come to eat, and dance, so their large screens are now being used in a very different way.

ROSS: And that goes back to the first question about, "Why do you need scale? When is it appropriate to use scale?" and I think it's really around this idea of symbolic value of doing something in a central city space that is addressing a collective audience; that has a particular kind of charge to it. Yes, there's lots of ways in which we do global media now one to one, you know, you can do it on a mobile phone or a laptop, you can use Skype in that way, or with small-scale interventions. But this idea of centrality, which isn't simply geographic, but it is about the

kind of cultural visibility that something like the national apology achieves because it took place in that space, or something like the dance battle achieves for hip hop culture in the centre of Melbourne, in the centre of Perth and so on. It's a very different terrain to work in and it certainly has its limitations, but it also has these kinds of advantages to it.

NIKOS: We're going quickly speak to the methodology points, where the researcher is in all of this.

AUDREY: Yes, that's right. How's the survey constructed? We weren't interested in replicating the kinds of surveys that Fed Square already does, the kind of institutional audience satisfaction survey. We wanted to firstly assess our audiences' experiences of interactivity, and secondly focus on the transnational and cross-cultural engagement, so we devised questions with those two themes in mind. Across all the events we kept the questions as similar as possible so that longitudinally we could compare responses.

AMELIA: But we also added questions as we learnt from each event. These are paper surveys, so we literally have teams of researchers on the ground at each event, with clipboards and pens, asking people questions and writing down the answers. We also used voice recorders to capture the more detailed responses as audio files. The data is transcribed, coded and analysed, and then the findings are shared with our partners Art Centre Nabi and with Fed Square, so everyone has access to the audience responses as the project develop; a kind of feedback loop that influences future trajectories.

NIKOS: I want to stress that vital point. Normally the research comes at the end. A key part of this project is that the researcher is present across all stages: technical, curatorial, artistic. And the feedback from the research goes to all parties and influences – in a significant way – that process.

AMELIA: Yes, and instead of researching the affects of existing art works, we were commissioning new works to act as sites of research and affect.

QUESTION: I just wanted to ask, because it really struck me right at the beginning, when you were talking about the Sorry experience: what's the role of architecture and design of urban

spaces in relation to engagement? [...] It seems to me that there's a lot of architectural questions in this, in terms of designing the screen space, designing the space from which the screen is viewed, and I just wondered if there were any published results or some aspect of the research that get at that. Fed Square seems like a really successful example.

ROSS: I was involved in the development of Fed Square in one particular way, and one of the things that the architects just hammered from the first drawing was this idea of Fed Square as a system of flows with a catchment, with a loose catchment. And the flows are all – imagine extending all of the laneways of the city across to Fed Square, start from that, and then make sure there's a little eddy pool where congregation happens but not capture. And from that simple architectural premise they actually delivered, I think, in that regard. You can argue about the facades and everything, but that flow and catchment and ease of egress they got right, and I do think it's a model for the kind of architecture of an epic screen of some kind. You know, maybe bring it down to the ground a bit more, the screen, etcetera, but these are big issues.

SCOTT: I think the general issue of how we integrate media into urban public spaces is a really important one. People like Roy Ascott have been talking for nearly 20 years about the need to bring architecture and media planning together, and it hasn't happened very effectively in other places. And I think that the issue we often face is that urban spaces are often over-designed in terms of being prescriptive about uses and what the media infrastructure allows as improvisation and creating different ambiances, particularly localised ones that can evolve and so on. I mean, all the stuff we know media art can do very effectively, and I think we just haven't seen really good, substantial models of how we can actually design public space around that particular set of affordances. So that's still to come, hopefully.

QUESTION: And architects are opening up to it, because I worked with the architects on that public space in Auckland.

SCOTT: And I think that's the key, the answer doesn't come in at the end, the answer comes in at the beginning.

QUESTION: Exactly. In terms of exactly what Ross said about flow.

NIKOS: Okay. I'd like to take this opportunity to thank the audience for their interest and engagement and attention, and as you can see, that this project has had a lot of iterations and variations, and confronted many new challenges, some of which we didn't ever anticipate. For instance, we were quite conscious that being in the same, more or less, time zone with Korea would facilitate the process of interaction. What I forgot was the seasons would be the opposite. [Laughter] The Koreans thought the Koreans wouldn't dance, that is the opposite of what happened. Preconceptions were often reversed. This has been an extremely productive and surprising journey that we've been on, and thank you very much. And I'd like to thank this enormous team, which has been a great joy to work with.