



We can use 'ecosystems' as a framework for Erlend's contribution today, in a shorthand statement: **a) open-air**; **b) greenhouse**; **c) confinement** [pandemic] and **d) flower-shop** as 4 ecosystems differently involved with plants, across which plants are both natural and designed entities. But there could be more.

We could easily imagine ecosystems involving plants and computers. Such ecosystems would depend on electricity. More broadly, the electrosphere could be an ecosystem. Ecosystems, thus conceived, need not be environmental. They can be ones that provoke unsustainable environmental change.

Ecosystems simply constitute a framework for working out dependencies that need *not* be of an economic nature. In Erlend's work, for instance, the named ecosystems are not separate, but wired together in a way that something is produced across them. Can sustainability be developed across ecosystems?



On Friday February 4th Charlotte, Christoph, Julia and I interacted on the *methods* and *tools* we develop in the course Theory 2. Kine and Frode joined us later. What I learned from this exchange, is that it might be useful for all class-members to think of the mentioned methods and tools as an *ecosystem*.

For instance, if you take the outcome from the QUADs and develop the *ideas*, *knowledge* resources, *critiques* and *hands-on* input on a *spread* in your BBs. Then you are not passively recording these unto the spread—adding some developments—but you define a *framework* for the task: a spread is a stage.

The reason why *you* create the framework for how you solve the BB, is because—when you have finished your MA—you should be able to *set tasks for others*: the MA should qualify you to teach at the BA level. By setting tasks for yourselves and developing them in QUADs you are preparing for work-life.

The QUADs move you beyond the task of the BB, because it provides you with an experience-base in two regards: how you can contribute with/to others, and what others can contribute with. In other words, you acquire the experience of what you can *ask* and *give* in relation to other professionals.

Which means that you acquire the competence to *network* your ideas, in groups with *distributed* professional competencies. This is, that little part *navigation* skills that you need to add an element of *art directorship*, to your practice as a designer. It gives you a broader creative palette in work-life.

In this course, we *continue* working with professional autonomy as the benchmark of the MA-level. If we consider QUAD as a *method*, the BB is a *tool*. If we consider the *BB* as a method, the *QUAD* is a tool. I am suggesting that this kind of *mutual* dependency between *non-same* elements is *ecological*.

In the sense that they are *actor-networks*, as a baggage from last term. As we are proceeding from the experiment module—our staging of first attempts, sharing and recording these—we will now pass unto the *narrative* qualities that the BBII should have, in order to fulfil its function as a research portfolio.

You do not start your BBII by setting the narrative in advance. Instead, a narrative will emerge as your entries accumulate. And come out with a *statement* in the end. But *not* before. The modules will facilitate the process. The process is not only active, it is *also* passive: letting the BB rest for a week.

And we are therefore considering a process which resembles *gardening*, more than engineering. The narrative we are interested in when considering the BBII is not “made up”: it is cultivated, allied with the *work of time*, rather than opposed to it. Try to find a middle road between order and chaos.