Summary—Thank you for your presentation! I will use this occasion to summarise your theory-piece titled *Between compromise and integrity in design practice*. I am using a course-standard to address your piece in 3 aspects: **1)** your field of inquiry: **2)** your discussion; **3)** your conclusions.

Specifically—you discuss a variety of collaborative projects in which the process of locating yourself as a graphic designer, creating a leeway for ideas and outcomes that drive your interest, in a social context with other creatives and stakeholders, with each their understanding of the project.

The projects you have in your case-base are used to spark and drive a discussion on how you come to terms with the learning outcomes that you invest in your professional practice as a graphic designer—working in the edgeland of your specialisation—in the spirit of *Jugaad*. Hindi for *hacking*.

There are two levels of hacking in terms of hacking: **a)** what works under the *circumstances* [a commercial book project, a voluntary community project, professional dialog on UX design]; **b)** what works for in the short run, but still a different time-scope than the project as such. *Compromise* and *integrity*.

Precisation 1—beyond this staging of your practical mind-set, the references you draw on (as you analyse your own practice in terms of outcomes and process) reflect a much wider range of interest; including a discussion of social responsibility, generative design and the winding toil of satisfaction.

Your references (unlisted) reach from Slavoj Žižek, Victor Papanek and Maziar Raein, to Karl Gerstner, Fritz Zwicky and the temptations of creatives to work well under regimes of order (as reflected in your previous interest in fascism). The dilemmas you discuss and develop verge unto philosophy.

However, you do not cross that line. Wanting, as it appears, to locate your theoretical query in the reflective practice of a graphic designer. You do not seek to close the gap between the professional ethos and the more wide ranging dilemmas you face as a member of contemporary culture.

Precisation 2—your decision to go out of your comfort-zone therefore also reflect a resolve to stand and work in a set of tensions and contradictions— as a project participant and a contemporary person—as a *discovery procedure* not seeking closure, but openness to *corrective* experiences.

This is how I read your process at a different level; the theorising process— based on conversations, interactions and encounters on your way— investigating how the understandings you develop perform when subject to corrective input from the site and people you have been working with.

I understand your choice of not seeking theoretical closure at the brink of emerging insights is that this is where you are looking for *opportunity*, rather than for problems with a solution. However, you do vehicle a synthesis in the concentric model where you balance value and interest. Thank you.