**This was an experiment.**

**What worked well?**

* Finally a glimpse of some different modes of discussing, presenting, putting forth.
* Dance performance neither formed as an illustration of ideas nor as „just“ entertainment
* The playfulness in act: the form of playing develops creativity that we experienced. But we were not forced into it. We were not constraint to comics.
* The humour! The humour creates a space for personal dimension of encounters. Laughter can open up for serious things more than serious speech.
* Generosity: including emails and intimate way of serving coffee.
* Atmosphere that makes people forget about competitiveness. Instead of showing up, they are curious and want to learn from the presenters.
* It was not only thinking and analysing. It made us stop judging ourselves and the others and enjoy
* The encouragement that we can fail enabled to experiment. Not to be under the control = we can be vulnerable
* Artistic dinners made us learn people from Prague and see Prague through their eyes. We went a little bit more inside the town.
* We lived how PP can be an ethical act
* The ethics of encounter was present! Sociology of relationships, of what happens in the room…
* Care for emotions, feelings. We can even be emotional during a philosophical lecture! We can be open to how we feel instead of intellectualisation.
* The feedback to the dance performance
* The feedback formats 4 people/5 min
* Enough time for conversations, time which was well prepared
* The setting of the discussions plus ethnographers made very personal and at the time staged discussions
* Less stiff atmosphere that allowed participants to open themselves
* Interview format worked well
* The experimental and ludic setting and the careful people
* Range of presentational approaches from talks to performances, workshops, meals etc.
* The reflexivity and reflection on the significance and impact of the mode of presentation
* The conference and events became a case study for philosophical analysis
* Practical workshops, participatory pieces, artistic dinners (!!), time slots enabling interactions
* Practical work takes a relevant place. The time schedule was great!
* Artistic dinner is a perfect ideas to be further developed. Well organized!
* Long sessions for discussing
* Long time slots, the scale of the conference (number of participants) was about right, the integration of workshops/performances into the fabric of the conference rather than side items
* I appreciated the amount of time that was given to thinking and discussion, instead of just more presentations. Very generative!
* The ample time for discussions was precious¨
* The attendants were well and clearly informed on all arrangements
* The relaxed conversation between Alice L. and Hartmut
* The contributions/participation of Owen and Jason
* Atmosphere, slow time, easiness to always intervene with questions due to the atmosphere
* The structure of the sessions
* From the outset, the curatorial care of the organizing committee, the generosity of the production team whose attention to detail brought us sound, light, rooms plus small stages for thoughtful practice. Bravo!!
* Great space in that busy part of town (atmosphere is much related to that space, I think)
* The openness of the expansive time sessions and the very fact that the word experiment was enacted through the conference which could be taken much further. It gave me a feeling that anything could happen and I appreciated the spirit of the community in this setting
* Different formats worked quite well. Coming together in different halls, some kind of instructions worked well, too. Making the whole conference a performance is a great ideas. Thank you ☺
* Good organisation of the conference/good set up of the formats
* Whole atmosphere of feeling very welcomed, brilliantly chosen chairs, doing a wonderful relaxed job
* Artistic dinners!
* No paper formats
* Fishbowl discussion
* Community-openness to strangers. Courage to experiment!
* The open spaces in the programme
* Ethics, Ethos, ethnography becoming alive in the doing of the conference
* Alternative formats of questions and answers
* Late start times, long lunches
* Excellent keynotes
* Performances!
* All the experiments that broke the standard conference session organisation format were very welcome. The best thing was to have so much time for discussion without hurry
* Artistic dinners! The Gregor Samsa one was terrific!
* The manifest – place value on failure versus impressing everyone
* Allowing play
* The dance performance and insisting that we say our impressions instead of questions to the choreographer
* The different presentations formats and the spaces given for discussions – both within panels and between panels. And the experiments in guiding discussions. Thank you!
* Thet it was an experiment – making testing Self and failure valuable if not required
* Having a café: social space for people to talk
* Truth and authenticity
* The combination between practice and theory
* Personal encounters because generous time slots. People are passionate about something: Why is this person doing what he is doing? Not: we are showing up.
* Space –DISK café as a space in-between: between Prague, society – and the conference participants.
* Instead of a line of propositions we lived an event. Joy that brought the organizers created new ways of knowing. It was genuinely an epistemological event in my life
* Gratitude for the fact that there was performative knowledge happening in me

**What should be kept and reworked?**

* The dance performance and the dinner-events were wonderful especially for meeting people we did not know before
* Workshops! More workshops!
* Keep everything that didn`t work and is unruly
* I liked the ethnography business. The idea of ruled conversations was also quite stimulating
* Re-work relationship to the local communities in Prague
* The exercise with the 4 chairs giving the respance person was really interesting but rather tricky to work effectively
* Encourage “no-paper” lectures
* Ethnographers ok, but must be specified
* Performances as a starting point for discussions, but it must be on somewhat professional level, some kind of artistic legitimacy must be there
* Long time slots were good-could it go longer, develop a kind of flow of energy, perhaps with people coming and going
* Perhaps a wider range of form devices for feedback and discussion – nonside interview etc. like writing on big paper or “no questions” interview
* Ways of combining/moving between “theory” and “practice” – great innovations here – still sometimes felt a split rather than a permeating each other
* Workshops are welcome but they should not make alternative to panels. Maybe some of the workshops could be more theoretically, conceptually oriented instead?
* Generous time slots, maybe even more open-space-like
* The visuality of the website/the quality of the photography and performances could have been in my opinion higher. They weren’t really on the level of the fields/workshops. Otherwise , a wonderful!
* Further experimentation with presentational structures
* Further experimentation with presentational structures – appreciate the challenges of “no paper” presentations. What about “dialogue” format? Or other philosophical formats for discussions and talk
* Collective permission to fail: for us to reflect on what we do at all levels even if we are not always successful and see others who are senior to me fail to fully understand how they act as much as I might fail, who has less experience in academia.
* Inclusivity=extension+expansion i.e. other firlds (including non-experts) – continue colouration
* The space for genuity – icecream eating during panel discussion, informality, generosity of sharing/opening up to artistic practitioners+venue of art institution, alive rooms with sculptures, paintings etc. good feeling
* Interdisciplinary approaches to ways of knowledge. Radicalize dehierarchisation of systems of knowledge production?!
* I think one important factor behind the openness of discussions and actual “thinking-together” meetings – finding cross-references – is the hard work put in reworking the format. Let`s remember that it`s hard work, to work against the conventions, but it gives way to something else – mutual ATTENTION to finding out, or failing, or both
* The Field idea can be refined. It is really a good idea. Ethnographers ok, but more “educated” in taking field-notes
* I did not understand the logic and necessity of ethnographic observations as well as the form of past panel hybridisation of debates
* Keep workshops but not embed in panels/fields. Fields shall be contextualized and their purpose/intention made clear to everyone
* Include key word along abstracts. Concepts and arguments that were embedded in papers were obscured, causing some to
* The ethnography was alright but it did something very good which was give a chance to xxx proceedings before questions/further discussions

**What should not be done again?**

* There were too many events happening at the same time and it was really a shame to miss some a have to choose
* Writing and writing materials
* Imposing game order in making comments (chairs and minutes)
* Some rooms very very warm. Big dance hall acoustics was poor
* As a non academic: next time try to avoid papers (standard) – the genre is dead. The reading our a paper is quite bizarre
* Workshops held simultaneously with lectures . created frustration when you missed context
* Many sessions happening simultaneously made some groups small – sometimes difficult to foster discussion
* Too many parallel sessions. The difficulty to jump between talks and workshops because of the loose time structure. Sometimes I wanted to go to the opening talk but attend another talk or workshop in another field. More fluiding would be appreciated

Making people sit with eyes closed and tell sensations of the previous session

The parallel moving sessions on similar/related topic often made it necessary to miss content that would have been very key.

Lectures that are read (quickly!). Instead keep the no-paper format

Dinners: a little party for all participants after the dinners.

Image-memory-theatre – reflections and mystifications. Creating a false distinction between rationality and sensing

No keynotes

A bag of one participant including her laptop and other precious personal belongings was stolen on the first morning of the conference inside the conference venue. Given the topic of the event – ethics and performance – maybe organizers could have drawn a public attention to that unfortunate incident, so that its affective consequences could have been shared together.

The heat in some rooms.

Thinking of the conference as a heterogenous assemblage when the participants are structurally very homogenous

Too many parallel sessions, though I know it`s difficult to avoid that without excluding too many people from the whole conference.

The field concept was great otherwise but there, too, splitting up into two different sections was a bit frustrating – I think it would have been better to stay as one group

Time restrictions on interviews/Answers – abruptly interrupted people

The field-idea is good but not everyday

Only listing surnames in schedule (made cross-referencing too difficult) separate of abstracts without schedule