

22nd ifva Youth Category Jury Meeting

Jury Members: Wong Sau Ping (Wong), Adrian Chow (Chow), Chan Wing Chiu (Chan),
Kit Hung (Hung)

Absent: Lau Ho Leung

ifva Representatives: Kattie Fan (Fan), Fung Wai Ming (Fung)

Fan: Today, we have to select the Gold, Silver and three Special Mention award-winners from the nine finalist works. We can give brief comments on each of the films so that the participants know what you think about their works. At the end, we will nominate the award winners. Lau Ho Leung cannot make it to the meeting because of work commitments, but he saw the finalist works with us and left comments, which we will share on his behalf.

Wong: Can you give us some overall impression on the first round selection process?

Hung: As I recall, the overall quality of the films this year is not very good, so we could not choose ten finalists. It was difficult to find works to recommend.

Chow: Most of the works, over half of them, are works of around one minute in length. The overall quality is not very good. Many of the works are very rudimentary. Of the other longer films, they feature themes dealing with the struggle between dreams and reality. In fact most of the works are of this theme, and there are too many of them. Also, their ways of expression are similar. For me, even if they have the same theme but the treatment is different, I would be pleasantly surprised. I watched the films in order. The middle part was all one minute-works, and the last three were long, so that affected how I looked at them. That is not to say all the one-minute works are bad. I selected one among the finalists.

Wong: Were they bad in terms of production or creativity?

Hung: Both.

Wong: Do some of the works have good production value but are lacking in creativity?

Chow: There are a series of works that are very well-made, but I feel they may have benefitted from adult involvement.

Hung: Some are like that. As I said before, I dislike works that use actors of similar age as the filmmakers to play mom and dad roles, which is quite common. This makes the work not realistic. Among the finalist works there is one like that, but because its style is good, I accept them.

Chan: I agree, because that affects how I view the work. However, I understand that it has to do with the conditions under which the films are made. As secondary school students, they face many restrictions in terms of production.

Wong: Some of the higher diploma students I teach do that too.

Hung: Yes, and I'd use such works as counter-examples to teach.

Wong: Every year, we tell people that they should make films according to their abilities. Why don't we start discussing the works. I quite enjoyed *Gotcha Go*. The actors really tried hard, but the work has no deeper meaning, no creative ideas, or address any particular issues. It is just a harmless fairy tale that uses children actors to interpret it in an energetic way. I am sure it has adults participate in its production.

Hung: I agree with Wong. The children actors are quite good. This type of comedy is hard to handle. I question whether the teachers were involved with the editing and filming. It raises some doubts in my mind.

Chan: The issue of whether adults are involved in the productions has been discussed many times before. We should just focus on the works and discuss them on their own merits.

Chow: You raised most of the relevant points. The children overacted a little, but I enjoyed it. The use of visual language is also quite good, as was sound effects, voice-overs and time-lapse actions. There are some nice touches, such as the Doctor Treegun part. On the whole, the narrative is smooth and the special effects are not overly showy. Doctor Treegun is well-acted and smooth. Of course I am concerned about adult involvement, but it is evident that the actors are genuine and enjoyed their performance. Compared with other works that have obvious adult involvement (one documentary in the first round is even better than *Hong Kong Connection*), this work does not distort the purpose of the youth category.

Fung: Lau's comments about *Gotcha Go* is that it uses an interesting way to tell a story, which is like ETV. Allowing it in the finalist round is already a big encouragement. Their lack of skills is endearing.

Wong: What does he mean by lack of skills?

Fung: That the children are not technically proficient.

Fan: If you have no further comments, then let's discuss the next work, *Tea*.

Wong: From the first few shots, I know that it is from HKICC Lee Shau Kee School of Creativity, and I turned out to be right. The subject matter is interesting, but the film only subverts it in a very direct way, which is to talk about the peaceful side of tea, and uses Japanese ghostly style to tell the story. Basically that's the gist of it. I can only say that this bit of creativity is worthy of encouragement. However, the execution does not take this idea further and enrich the work.

Hung: In the first round, I highly recommended *Tea*. Because this is **ifva**, I strongly hope that finalist works include more experimental films. *Tea* is a rather old style experimental film that deals with dreams and the sub-conscious. I agree with Wong that it has some interesting ideas, but the film fails to take them further.

- Chan: I think it is a bit too short; it just brings up the subject but does not develop it further. It has many interesting elements, but does not take it far enough and just ends things very quickly.
- Chow: I don't think much of this work. I consider it an exercise involving background music, musical effect and editing. It is experimental, and is a good attempt. But I agree that it is too short.
- Fung: Lau's opinion is that compared to the other works, *Tea* is visually well-considered, but he doesn't know what it is trying to say. The visuals, sound effects and editing are interesting. It is quite an achievement for this work to get into the finalist round.
- Hung: *The Hedgehog Girl* is interesting. When watching it on the big screen today, I question whether to judge a youth film from adults' perspective. There is also the different standard one uses to judge experimental film and traditional drama. For every work, I use different standards to judge it. With *The Hedgehog Girl*, I use the standard for a traditional drama. The film depends a lot on dialogue to get things across. I question whether I should use the standards of an adult film practitioner to judge these films. Perhaps we should give room to young people to develop their own ideas and styles, and maybe their generation is like that. The dialogue in *The Hedgehog Girl* is a bit too obvious, but it deals with the subject matter at hand, and it is interesting and thought-provoking.
- Chan: The narrative works this year spend a lot of time on story format. Technically, they have a handle on the basics, but it is not outstanding. I see some interesting story-telling techniques. I quite enjoyed watching *The Hedgehog Girl*. It talks about a secondary school student getting bullied, and brings out the relevant message. It is quite a complete work.
- Wong: I like this film. It is made by a secondary school student learning how to make films. It uses a conventional perspective to write a story and uses many twists to develop a complete story. Because it uses such conventional methods, many aspects are not done well. This is not a fault that can be forgiven. I feel that many films that deal with bullying, and not just short films, tend to typify the bully, and there would always be nosey bystanders on the side. *What If* is similar. Must all bullies be like that? For me, bullying is hard to film. Even adults who make films about bullying fall into this trap.
- Hung: However, such stereotypes appearing in films made by secondary school students is easy to understand, because their emotions are very direct.
- Wong: Yes, secondary school students often express such emotions in films, unless it's a very stylized treatment, like making it dark and over-the-top like a Umezū Kazuo comics. *The Hedgehog Girl* falls short of a conventional drama film, and one can see that the scriptwriter used conventional dramatic film style, like incorporating twists in the plot and jumping back and forth in time. Also, the dialogue for the group of girls is clichéd, and "contemporary", as in I was not able to hear what they say. I don't mean this as a put down, because I enjoyed watching it.

- Chan: On the whole, many films require subtitles. Without them, I don't know what's being said.
- Wong: It is a very contemporary story. Perhaps this is not the creator's intentions, but life is like that.
- Chow: I don't think much about this film. I think the plot development, like jumping back and forth in time, makes the structure too complicated and not smooth, and the storytelling is a bit chaotic. From a technical stand point, the sound and location sound are not mixed well. This is just my personal preference, but I don't like films with outtakes at the end, because after watching a film like this, you want to think about it, but the outtakes are distracting.
- Wong: Yes, we should tell entrants that even though people treasure the production process and want to put it in the works, a film's ending is also very important, and is a part of the work.
- Fung: Lau says that he was involved with choosing the nine finalist films. Each of them is relatively different from other entries. Some aspects of *The Hedgehog Girl* is worthy of encouragement. It is unusual in that of all the entries, only it is capable of presenting a developed storyline, and makes him feel that the character is alive. If there are three Special Mentions, he would not mind if *The Hedgehog Girl* is among the three.
- Fan: The next film is *The Shadow*.
- Hung: I use another set of standards to judge *The Shadow*. By comparison, *The Hedgehog Girl* has an average script and average production, which complement each other. A teacher once told me that what's important in a work is not what is said, but what it's trying to say. In this regard, *The Shadow* achieves this goal. Even though some shots are out of focus, I feel that there are things it is trying to say. Even though it is lacking in technique, it is a passionate film. I can tell that the filmmakers must have spent a long time planning the film, which I admire.
- Chan: I wonder if the out of focus shots are intentional. I paid attention to this aspect. There are many ways to do out of focus. The elevator door is out of focus throughout, and only when it opens does it become focused, and the girl comes out. When the girl moves, the focus is out again.
- Hung: I think that shot is trying to establish a contrast. With the other out of focus shots, I think it's a technical issue.
- Chan: I have a lot of questions about the technical aspects of this film.
- Hung: Yes. Watching this film reminds me of Wong Sau Ping's *Glowing*. In one of the shots, the scene changes upon impact. This work tries to do something similar.
- Wong: Yes.

- Chan: I think the filmmakers put a lot of effort into this film, because the whole thing has to be well-planned. This film is obviously a very personal work, and one can feel the filmmakers' presence, which I appreciate.
- Wong: This film has some of the feel of *Kaili Blues* (Gan Bi, 2015). I think *The Shadow* deserves to be recognized, both for the filmmakers' efforts and the deliberate way they build up a strong style. However, the work is thin and there is not enough substance. Many things are limited by the film's form.
- Chan: The part without subtitles, I don't know what it's trying to say. The sounds may be meaningful, but the lack of subtitles makes it hard to understand.
- Wong: When there is overlapping sounds, the subtitles disappear. Perhaps the filmmakers are trying to suggest that there are two selves talking to each other. Hung, you think that it is trying to say a lot. What do you think it is?
- Hung: What I see is that there is a self that is afraid, and another self that is an illusion. The use of the figure in white is good, because it allows the character to step out of the darkness. The struggle with the self who is afraid is emotionally consistent throughout the film.
- Chow: I notice that in the director's statement, the filmmakers state that this film is an attempt to go out of their comfort zone and connect poetry and imagery. As an attempt I think this is good. Having served as **ifva** jury members for a few years, I recognize that it is rare for entries to take on the horror film genre. I appreciate the black and white parts, the fact that there is no dialogue between people, and the mysterious background music. I also like the poetic voice over. But I can't connect these various elements. The sound level goes up and down, and some parts I cannot hear clearly. I like the use of horror film genre techniques, and the creation of horror outside the frame. I also like the use of corridors, which reminds me of *The Shining*. The editing is smooth and imitates a long-take style. I quite like this work, compared with other films, it's very stylistic.
- Fung: Lau's comment is that watching *The Shadow* on the big screen magnifies its problems. Technically, many shots are out of focus. He does not understand the filmmakers' intentions. He assumed the out of focus shots were deliberate, and tried to see if the focus either fell on the person in black or the one in white, but felt this was not the case. So he gave up on analyzing why this was the case. Comparatively, the mise-en-scene is well designed and deliberate. Getting into the finalist round is already quite an achievement.
- Wong: I am not much bothered by the focus issue. I think the filmmakers didn't pay attention and it's not a deliberate choice. Not being part of the film industry, they would not be very sensitive to whether shots are in focus.
- Hung: Shots being out of focus is more of an issue for *Gotcha Go* because it uses a more conventional storytelling method.
- Wong: Yes.

- Hung: I even tend to feel that if the whole film were in focus, it would look fake. Because of the limitations with actors, costume and locations, the presentation now leaves room to the imagination, and lets me enter into that horror world.
- Chan: I think it's part of the film's style, and the director is conscious of it. I strongly feel the style that the director tries to present, and it's a matter of what can be achieved technically.
- Wong: I somehow find the work pretentious and the content lacking. It lets style take precedent, and is reminiscent of many other films. I was pleasantly surprised by the snooker part, which imitates a camera effect. It would be good if the entire film were this surprising. Now the film stays on the level of feeling and mood.
- Fan: The next work is *The Condemned Eighteen*.
- Chan: This is the outstanding one-minute film.
- Fung: Lau says that the film expresses a concept in a complete way, and the sense of protest is interesting. It's an achievement for it to get into the finalist round.
- Chow: I had picked this work in the first round. Among the one-minute films, this one is outstanding. It uses its one-minute very well to present a complete idea. Another reason I chose it is because it is because it fully reveals the great pressure that young people feel: it's so great that they can only think about dying when they grow up. People need to see it. Technically, it is just so-so.
- Chan: I encourage him to make a longer version, but using the same method. For example, a three-minute or five-minute version, and use the same one shot method to show a person being put on trial. Perhaps that would be more powerful.
- Wong: I think one minute films can achieve something. Commercials are one minute long, and they use a lot of symbolic elements to give an impression. This is a clear manifesto about the problems that young people face. I was impressed by the film. Such things seem clichéd, but reality is like that. I agree strongly that this film needs to be seen. To make better use of this one minute requires more creativity. The last shot with the gunshot is already very strong. A flaw in the film is that people's faces are pixilated. I don't know why the filmmakers chose to do it this way. Perhaps it'd be better if the people wear hoods over their faces.
- Fan: The next work is *Ripple*.
- Fung: Lau did not choose this film in the first round. In his essay, he mentions that most of the works this year share the same theme, which is crying out not to be forced to study, and that students have dreams. The only strong point about *Ripple* is that among all the works, it is the only one that mentions that teachers face pressure, too, rather than telling a story only from young people's perspectives. This is the outstanding part in the film's 14 minute

running time. It's an achievement for it to get into the finalist round.

- Hung: I like this film the most. If you use conventional film standards to judge it, it breaks conventions about narrative point of view, and mixes memory with the present. Like editing the running scene with the shot of running with the brother in the past. The editing style is not motivated by wanted to show off, but out of necessity. I don't like having students play the role of teachers, but I feel ok with this film. The actor playing the mother is very young, but from her tone of voice, I assume she may have married early.
- Chan: Image-wise, it is stylish, but the story itself is ordinary. Although the plot arrangement is interesting, with the brother committing suicide, followed by the sister, the story is not complete. The work has lot of obvious flaws. At the beginning, I found the work quite interesting with the way the characters appear and how the shots cut together, but it doesn't hold up towards the end.
- Hung: I think this kind of style can only appear in short films. If was a long film, the audience may not like how the editing jumps around.
- Wong: I can't forgive having fellow students play the teacher. The editing and cinematography are well-intentioned. It uses a lot of close-ups, and the traditional story-telling method is quite good. However, the casting and acting are flawed. The dialogue and characters are too direct and one-dimensional, which made me uncomfortable. I can sense the director's anger, which turns the mother and teacher into monsters. The filmmaker depicts what is happening in the world in an absurd way, but this is not an absurdist film, so it seems unbalanced.
- Chow: I selected this film in the first round, but it is not my favorite film. The presentation is very clear and strong, which is about the difficulties and problems faced by students today. With the increasing number of student suicide cases now, the work is relevant. But after watching the big screen, a lot of the film's problems are magnified, like with the students playing the mother, which really bothers me. Having the mother constantly urging the main character to do homework very one-dimensional. It is also not very realistic. Perhaps the mother also faces her own pressures in life? Is she a single mother? Does she have other problems? For a film with a 14-minute running time, the story could have been more multi-dimensional.
- Hung: This relates to what I just said: do we use adult's world view to judge what young people do? Can we allow them to present the world in this simple way? I ask myself this question.
- Chow: I think this has to do with the way of presentation. Actually *The Condemned Eighteen* shares a similar theme, and both are short and direct. Because they are short, this type of presentation is okay. However, *Ripple* tries to use a realistic story-telling style to tell a longish story, so shouldn't it try to be more multi-dimensional?
- Fan: The next work is *Implication*.

- Fung: Lau feels that *Implication* provides a contrast, and this work is the only one that has a relationship with our world and our community. Unfortunately, this is difficult to achieve in five minutes. The film is about how children are oppressed. This issue is worth discussing, but the film fails to develop it. Letting it into the finalist round is already encouragement enough.
- Hung: I saw this for the first time alone, and felt more touched than watching it on the big screen. Perhaps because young people nowadays watch films on tablets or mobile phones, they are not as meticulous with details, which becomes apparent on the big screen.
- Chow: I selected this film. After watching a series of one minute works, this one really stood out for me. As a documentary, it is technically proficient. The subject matter resonated with me because it is about music and performance venues. The point of view for the interviews is also interesting, I initially thought that the lady interviewee is against the busking, but she turns out to be a supporter. The foreign tourists' opinion, which is expressed simply, is also good, which is to say, why doesn't Hong Kong allow busking? This type of information needs a platform to be presented to the audience.
- Hung: Yes, I agree with the part about the woman interviewee. Nowadays a lot of people confuse news and documentary. Documentaries can have a very clear perspective and point of view, and unlike the news, do not have to be neutral. Students are affected by the news media of Hong Kong's main media, and they feel that documentaries have to be neutral. This documentary has a personal point of view, which is worthy of encouragement.
- Wong: I feel that the film is ordinary, the film paints too good a picture and seems superficial. The situations in the film and what I encounter in real life is so different, and doesn't address the difficulties and complexity of the actual situation. It's too simplistic. The overall quality of this year's entries is not high. In the past, there were documentaries with a similar topic as this, which dealt with the relations between buskers and the police, but it didn't get into the final round.
- Hong: Technically, during the interviews, there are intermittent singing performances in the background, which is distracting.
- Chan: This is the only documentary among the finalists. Were there other documentaries in the first round?
- Chow: Yes, and the quality was quite high. There was one that has obvious adult participation.
- Chan: This work is like an essay, and the topic is presented in a similar way as a news program. I would expect to see more of the filmmaker's own feelings. I believe the filmmakers like this topic, otherwise they would not be doing it. They should dig deeper and observe more, and spend more time shooting. We haven't seen all the band members before the film ends. They should devote more effort into the project and make the work more complete.
- Fan: The next work is *Me and me? Me or me!*

- Fung: Lau says this work is a strange “thing”. He doesn’t want to call it a work. In the first round, the other two jury members felt the same way. If the work ended in the first part after a minute and a half, it is possible for it to win the Gold or Silver award. But with the latter part, about getting the award and killing himself, he doesn’t know why it’s there. The first half is impactful in terms of visuals and sound, and for a person under the age of 18, it’s a very good work. As it is, it only qualifies as a finalist, and that’s it.
- Wong: I feel the opposite. If the work stopped at the first half, it is complete, but we have seen stuff like that before. It is easy for a young person to use imageries such as copy book, flashing words, tearing of books to express anger. The first part is clichéd and familiar. I think the latter part is the filmmaker’s self reflection, a film within a film that points to something more. Even though I find it hard to understand the second part, which seems to be talking about another topic, I would rather see a work that makes me think than having just the first minute and a half.
- Chow: I did not give this work a high mark. If it ended at one and a half minutes, I can accept it as a complete work. But I don’t think it is worthy of Gold or Silver. I don’t understand a lot of it, like why kill yourself? What is it trying to say? I do not understand. So I for me it’s just so-so.
- Hung: In the first round, we used different perspectives to discuss this work. My first impression is that the images are strong. However, Lau wonders what role the director plays in the film. There is another work which did not get into the finalist round that also features a scene with the director getting an award, which is for a film about picking up shit. The young person who shot this film must be very conceited.
- Chow: The work you are talking about is *Dream Stealer*.
- Hung: Lau said that some directors are good at executing the work, but they are too conceited, so it’s not worth encouraging them.
- Chow: I want to add that I gave *Dream Stealer* a high mark, but it was not selected in the end. I don’t agree with you or Lau that being conceited should be a factor in the consideration because that has nothing to do with the film itself. I didn’t use this criterion to judge the film, but that’s another matter.
- Chan: No, it is important. Just as you two said, in the Youth category, the “self” is important, and only youth entrants dare to be conceited. They just follow their own ideas, and even if it doesn’t work, they still believe in themselves. I treasure this quality in a work. When looking at a film, I look for the self and for auteurs, and recognize a work for its author’s style. I want the creator to jump out from it, and look for signs of their passion. That is their value. When looking at *Me and me? Me or me!*, for the first minute and a half, I wondered why you chose this work as a finalist, but the second and third scenes reversed this feeling. We should treasure this kind of directors, because this is their way of telling a story. I don’t care about the difference between adult and youth entrants. After watching the film, I

wondered what's going on. I think that's enough. What more do you expect? It's just a short film. Even though it is only three minutes and twenty-six seconds long, you'd remember it. I find this film interesting.

Wong: I want to encourage him to keep trying, but I don't think this attempt is successful. I think this filmmaker is trying to self-reflect and about their creative intentions.

Hung: Is that pride?

Wong: Is it really being conceited? Or is it self reflection? On the positive side, perhaps the filmmakers feel the first part is too clichéd, so they tell you that this is an award winning work. They are reflecting the role of the individual in media presentation, but barely touches on the subject and does not really explore it.

Fan: The next work is *What If*.

Fung: Lau's comment is that his first impression of *What If* was good. As he recalled it's the only work selected by all three jury members. However, watching it again he found some parts embarrassing. This is a film with a complete story and concept, and he enjoyed watching it. If he is being generous, he can give this work Silver award or Special Mention.

Hung: For me, *What If* and *The Hedgehog Girl* are equal. I judge their style and narrative methods by the same standards.

Wong: I find this work ordinary and it fails to move me. The subject matter does not touch me, and it is too safe. I don't have much to say about it, except that the production is uninspired—most of the shots are done with steadycam with frontal framing.

Chan: I understand your perspectives from discussing these two films. *What If* is average on the whole. The actors are worthy of praise. The director is smart in casting and there is little to fault. The overall technique is good and I enjoyed it. Watching it on the big screen, there are many flaws. It's a matter of your preference. What do you want to encourage? *What If* and *The Hedgehog Girl* are both distinctive in their own rights. On the whole this film is not ambitious, but it is complete.

Chow: The fact that all three first-round jurors picked this film is a reflection on the overall quality this year. I gave this film high marks, but not the highest. I find this film similar to what I see on TV. The narrative is smooth and the editing ok, but there are no surprises. There are some twists, but they are not strong. Comparatively, I gave *The Hedgehog Girl* lower marks. I think in terms of techniques and narrative, *What If* is smoother, and the acting is also better.

Hung: As a story, *What If* is just a live-action *Doremon*.

Wong: I don't think this work has anything to say.

- Hung: It says you have to depend on yourself.
- Wong: It's hard to imagine using this as a work's theme. I don't feel this is what the filmmaker is trying to say, whether in terms of subject matter or style. *The Hedgehog Girl* has many flaws, but I feel that the filmmaker is trying to tell a story about a girl in a school, and about her relationship with friends.
- Fan: You can now nominate award-winners.
- Hung: *Ripple* for Gold, *The Shadow* for Silver, Special Mention for *What If* and *The Hedgehog Girl*.
- Chan: I think these five works are worthy of discussion: *The Hedgehog Girl*, *The Shadow*, *Implication*, *Me and me? Me or me!* and *What If*.
- Fung: Lau's conclusion is that he doesn't mind *What If* and *The Hedgehog Girl* getting Silver. For the rest, getting into the finalist round is encouragement enough.
- Wong: I can't come up with a Gold award winner.
- Chan: We can have two Silver awards.
- Chow: We can have one Silver and two Special Mentions.
- Chan: You can nominate your favorites.
- Hung: I can tell Lau favors narrative films, while I prefer more experimental works.
- Chow: I can accept *The Shadow* getting Silver, while Special Mention goes to *Implication* and *Gotcha Go*.
- Wong: I am ok with *Gotcha Go*. I don't dislike it.
- Chow: As for *What If* and *Ripple*, getting into the finalist round is enough.
- Wong: I also feel that *The Shadow* deserves the highest award, but it's not worthy of Gold. It can get Silver, while we omit the Gold award. For Special Mention I pick *The Condemned Eighteen* and *Ripple*. Perhaps we can also discuss *Me and me? Me or me!*, *The Hedgehog Girl* and *Gotcha Go*.
- Fan: *Tea* did not get any nominations.
- Hung: I picked *Tea* in the first round. However I think that letting it into the finalist round is encouragement enough. Every year, I try to push for more experimental works, like with *Ripple* and *Tea*, and their styles are not similar. *The Shadow* already has 4 votes, followed by *The Hedgehog Girl*. *What If* has 3 votes.

Wong: Can I raise an objection?

Fan: Yes, we can discuss.

Wong: I don't know what we are recognizing *What If* for, and it sends a wrong message. I also dislike *Implication*.

Chan: I think it's hard to come to a consensus. Let's vote.

Fan: There are 9 works, and we had eliminated one, which leaves 8. Why don't we give each of you 3 votes? Do you think we should omit Gold award, and give *The Shadow* Silver?

Chan: If there is no Gold, then the focus is on Silver. Shall we have two Silvers?

Wong: I don't think that's a problem. It reflects on the fact that the overall quality is not good.

Chan: I don't think it's that bad.

Hung: If there are two Silvers, what are the choices?

Chan: I suggest two Silvers. *The Shadow* is outstanding, but traditional dramas are also worthy, and can serve to balance things out. If you don't agree with two Silvers, then perhaps *The Shadow* can be Gold, and we can nominate a Silver.

Wong: Since we are discussing together as a group, we should not give out awards willy-nilly. If the overall quality is not good, it should be reflected in the award distribution.

Fan: Since you have all been **ifva** jury members before, you can compare this year's works with previous years.

Wong: I think the contrast is very obvious. I hope this is just by chance.

Hung: Maybe film equipment is too easy to come by.

Chow: But they don't really make good use of the equipment.

Chan: Equipment has become more common, but the overall quality has not improved. If you want to omit Gold and just give out Silver, I suggest giving two Silvers.

Hung: Which do you nominate for Silver?

Chan: I hope it will be a narrative film, either *The Hedgehog Girl* or *What If*. In terms of narrative technique, both are well-considered, and the acting is also worthy of commendation. For a work done by secondary school students, they are quite something. We should give them a chance. *What If* is unambitious, but it is complete overall, and coming up with a story like

this is not easy. Aside from Wong, you all nominated it. Writing a screenplay like *The Hedgehog Girl* requires a pure heart. Both works should be treasured. They are the product of teamwork and hard work. One should not dismiss them so easily.

Hung: *What If* is very smooth, while *The Hedgehog Girl* has some kinks. If we were to give awards, I prefer *The Hedgehog Girl*. I tend to like works that inspire reflection.

Chan: I hope to give out two Silver awards.

Hung: Even though I prefer experimental works, I agree with giving an award to a narrative film.

Chow: I don't object to *What If* getting Silver, but I do object to *The Hedgehog Girl* getting it.

Wong: I would rather give one Silver award. We should not favor one genre and allow a sub-standard narrative film to get an award. If we were to give an award, I prefer *The Hedgehog Girl*.

Fung: Lau said that if a jury member nominates *The Hedgehog Girl* or *What If* for Silver, he'd second it. We asked him which one he prefers, and he said he prefers that both films get Special Mention.

Fan: He means that the works are not up to standard. If we were to give an award, this is his preference.

Chow: *The Hedgehog Girl* and *What If* are both narrative works. Which do you favor for Silver award?

Wong: Compared with *The Shadow*, *The Hedgehog Girl* is obviously inferior, so it is unreasonable to give them both Silver.

Chow: I agree with Wong.

Fan: So both Wong and Chow favor giving only one Silver, while Hung and Chan prefer two Silvers?

Hung: I think two Silver is better, one for a narrative film.

Chan: Not giving a Gold is already making a statement reflecting the fall in quality. As for giving awards, should we not show that we also care about narrative films?

Hung: I agree.

Wong: Because storytelling is important, we should give a Silver award to a narrative film?

Chan: I treasure these works. Even though not too many works this year moved me, I enjoyed watching a lot of them. Despite the fact they are works from secondary school students, I

get what they are trying to say, and I feel for them. Technically, nowadays cameras are common, and it is not difficult to grasp technical skills. Secondary school students grow up consuming images, and the most important consideration is what they are trying to say. I look for auteurs, and that's why I favor *The Hedgehog Girl*. It tells a story about secondary school students in a distinctive way. I enjoyed *What If*. It is an unambitious and modest work. *The Shadow* is not without its flaws, otherwise it should get Gold. *The Shadow* and *The Hedgehog Girl* can both get Silver.

Wong: After considering all the issues, I still think we should just give out one Silver.

Chan: I respect your opinions.

Wong: I think it's a pity about *Condemned Eighteen* and *Ripple*.

Chow: I also feel that one Silver is good enough, but if you want two, I can go along with it.

Hung: I prefer to have *The Hedgehog Girl* get Silver. Chan talked about finding auteurs, but it is not evident in *The Hedgehog Girl* or *What If*.

Wong: I think *The Hedgehog Girl* is more auteur-ish.

Chow: Unfortunately there are many technical flaws in the work. I re-considered this during our discussion, so I no longer insist.

Wong: I can imagine that if *The Hedgehog Girl* has a bigger budget and the director more capable, it would be a more complete work. But what if *What If* had a bigger budget?

Chan: If there is only one Silver award, what are your nominations for Special Mention?

Hung: *Ripple*, *The Hedgehog Girl* and *What If*.

Wong: How about if we give one more Special Mention?

Fan: Sure.

Wong: I choose *Ripple*, *The Hedgehog Girl*, *Condemned Eighteen* and *Me and me? Me or me!*

Chan: My choices are *Me and me? Me or me!*, *Implication*, *Ripple* and *What If*.

Hung: You can bring up what you just said at the awards ceremony, that not giving awards to narrative films is a pity.

Fung: Lau's choices are *The Hedgehog Girl* and *What If*.

Chow: If there are 4 Special Mentions, I choose *Implication*, *Gotcha Go*, *Condemned Eighteen* and *Ripple*.

Hung: I am not opposed to *Condemned Eighteen*.

Wong: One more, then: *Condemned Eighteen*.

Chow, Chan, Hung: Agreed.

Youth Category Award Winners

Gold Award

Omitted

Silver Award

The Shadow

Cheng Wai-ching

Special Mention

The Hedgehog Girl

Fong Ho-ching

Ripple

Kwok Ho-hin

What If

Chan Tsz-shan Adrian

The Condemned Eighteen

Fong Lai-hin