

The 20th ifva Youth Category Jury Meeting Transcript

Jury Members: Adam Wong Sau Ping (Wong), Fat Chai (Fat), Showroom (Show) and Au (Au) from New Youth Barbershop, aruminihifumi (Arum), Eric Poon (Poon), Mathew Tang (Tang)

ifva representatives: Kattie Fan (Fan), Wa Choi (Choi), Diana Cheung (Cheung)

Fan: You have just seen the 10 finalist works. Do you have any questions? Do you need to review them?

Tang: Excuse me, what is the definition of youth?

Fan: Those who are under 18 years old.

Tang: I get it.

Fan: We now require that all entrants are under 18 years old, which is different from before, when we would accept the work to this category if one out of two entrants are under the age of 18.

Wong: Including the director?

Fan: Yes, or we can call them copyright owners. Do you have any other questions? Today, our task is to determine the Gold and Silver Awards as well as up to three Special Mentions.

Tang: Do we consider documentaries alongside narrative films?

Fan: Yes. The 10 works you saw can be considered for the Gold Award, which will get a cash prize of \$20000, a trophy and a Pocket Cinema Camera sponsored by Black Magic; a Silver Award winner, which will receive a cash prize of \$10000 and a trophy. The three Special Mention award winners will only get a certificate. There is also a Youth Enthusiastic Award awarded to the school with the most number of entries, given to a school with 13 entries. This award need not be decided by jurors, and is awarded based on the number of entries. Let us begin our discussion. We can discuss the works one by one, or nominate the Gold Award directly.

Let us begin by discussing the works one by one. The first work is *Happy Birthday!*. I should add that in the first round, three of the jury members including Adam, Eric and aruminihifumi selected the ten finalist works from the 67 works we received in the Youth Category this year. The three have already discussed these works, and in this round we have added Mathew and the three members of the New Youth Barbershop.

Fat: Honestly I quite liked this work. This was the first work shown. I found that the audio and video were out of sync at first. It uses one room as its setting, which is quite bold. I feel that the work has something to say, and the dialogue and the attitudes of the two lead characters express the author's view about youths, growing up and sex in a naked way. I don't know much about filming technique, and to me, the film's audio-visual quality and color is a secondary concern, and the most important thing is that the film gave me a feeling that it's real and let me know what it's trying to say.

Au: I concur.

Fat: The author and I are only separated by eight years and we are both young. That's why I quite like the work and think that it's special because it only uses one home as the setting. What do you two think?

Au: I think the best thing about the work is that it only uses two characters and dialogue.

Arum: I like the fact that they suddenly swear.

Au: The fact that the film relies only on the dialogue between two people, which is different from the other films.

Wong: I agree with you. You mentioned that the work expresses how a lot of young people feel. I think that this is rather secondary. I view this work as an experimental piece. I can't say I know what the director feels, but I feel that his biggest intention is not expressing how he feels, but break down the audience's usual perceptions about romantic films and love with explicit dialogue.

Tang: I quite like this work too because it feels real. I asked about the age limit of the youth category because I think that those under the age of 18 do not have too many worries. They simply make the films they want to make and do not care too much about technique, character psychology, etc. *Happy Birthday!* is an unpretentious story.

Wong: I agree.

Tang: The story is not very clear nor does it have much theory behind it. It does what it wants. Suddenly they are dancing, swearing, quarreling, making up and then taking a bath together.

Au: I think the best thing about this work is the lead actress, especially when she suddenly makes up with him after a quarrel. That's something that happens a lot in real life.

Show: The film is made with more care compared to the others. The lighting, props and mood are all great.

Wong: I think the director is very cool headed and has a firm sense of himself. He knows exactly what he is doing, and has a definite goal that he wants to achieve. Especially when you look at his poster, which references *Pulp Fiction* in a very self-conscious way. His director's statement also mentions that he wants to make an anti-film and deconstruct the established image of film.

Tang: He does not say he wants to make an anti-film. He says he wants to incorporate influences from many different films.

Arum: I think the whole way of thinking behind this work does not belong to the Youth Category. The director's way of expression and the script and dialogue are all very mature. If this is the director's first film, then it's very mature in terms of technique.

Fan: Do you have anything else to add? If not, we move on to *Aggot's Story's Story*.

Fat: One of the scenes in *Aggot's Story's Story* left a deep impression upon me. The film begins with a young child's voice over, which goes on until the titles appear, when the line of dialogue "I know the dog will come back, right?", and the "right?" was spoken by both the kid and an adult, which signals to me that the child has grown up. I think the film goes beyond what we see visually, which is a story about a dog and a common person.

Au: I like the shots showing the dog waiting by the door, which tell us that some things are right beside us all along, but we just don't notice them.

Tang: I like the film's simplicity and directness.

Fan: You have anything to add to *Aggot's Story's Story*? If not, we'll move on to *Light Out Cycle*.

(Jury members review their notes.)

Au: I had a hard time watching this film. The lead character is supposed to be suffering from early psychosis, and I can't distinguish between the two characters, and can't tell which one is real and which is the film within a film.

Wong: I agree, although this film is quite ambitious.

Au: That's right. Very ambitious.

Wong: Some of the scenes are intended to be quite powerful.

Show: I would remember some scenes, like the long take at the beginning of the film. For the rest, there aren't too many memorable shots. However it is good at creating certain moods. Like the scene with the lead character chasing after the mask, accompanied by music. You said just now that you can't distinguish between the two characters. I think this is intentional, in order to put you in the mind of the character.

Au: What do you think?

Poon: There are some extraneous shots that can be cut away. On the whole it is a thoughtful work. *Happy Birthday!* experiments with dialogue, while the directors of *Light Out Cycle* experiment with cinematography. Both works are interesting, and are trying to experiment with filmic elements. For a director under 18, that's quite good. I didn't think about these things when I was 18.

Wong: What knocked points off for *Light Out Cycle* is that it contains some clichéd elements, like the masks and schizophrenia. Young people often use schizophrenia to express some visual ideas, which should not be encouraged. However, I really felt the sense of ambition behind these works. Making a film like this requires a lot of work.

Fan: The next film is *Kwun Tong - See You Again*.

Au: Is this the documentary?

Tang: Yes. It's hard to compare it with the other works.

Show: It accomplished what it set out to do.

Tang: This is a well-made work, but if I have to compare it with other works...

Wong: What I don't understand is why the textual font is so ugly. This is something that other people have also pointed out before. You shouldn't just show a whole page of text like that. I felt really uncomfortable watching this part. The rest of the film is quite good. This film was entered in the student category of the National Geographic documentary competition, and was one of the finalists. I saw several dozen films by young people on similar topics. I am glad that young people nowadays have their own views about older neighborhoods, which is a good thing. The things they show in the film are very real. When I was 18, I did not care about such livelihood issues.

Fan: The next film is *The Castle in the Pyrenees*. Ant to achieve?

Wong: I wanted to fall asleep.

Show: The first few minutes was okay, and I felt the visuals were quite unique. As the film went on, I lost patience and wanted it to end quickly. I kept wondering if the dialogue has to be reversed to be understood.

Wong: It stops the cause and effect relationship between lines of dialogue.

Show: I kept reversing the dialogue, but discovered that it was meaningless. Should some lines of dialogue go with certain scenes? I spent ten minutes memorizing the dialogue, but gave up at the end.

Tang: I see that he spends a lot of time taking clothes off, and felt that it's worth watching. But when the girl kept pacing around on the MTR, I hung my head low and thought, "What do you want to achieve?"

Show: But some shots were quite nice to look at.

Tang: Some shots are pretty.

Show: In one scene, it goes suddenly quiet, and I can hear myself breathing. You can watch it and start thinking.

Au: The screen goes black.

Show: I feel him struggling in that scene, and it was good. But honestly I don't know what he's trying to say. The plot is too complicated. I couldn't even understand the first part.

- Poon: When I watched it the second time, I felt he should have deleted all the dialogue.
- Tang: Even with all the dialogue gone, he should still cut out two thirds.
- Show: More like a half.
- Tang: The shots are simple. At first sight they seem fine, but on second viewing I felt they were too long.
- Poon: If the film starts with the character sleeping on the floor, it'd be better.
- Wong: You are considering how to tell the story better?
- Poon: This director is quite self-indulgent.
- Wong: That's right.
- Wong: You should not second guess him, since we don't know who the director is.
- Poon: He mentions that he has long been in search of feelings.
- Wong: I think he's quite self-indulgent. Some parts of the work is worth encouraging, while others are not. I have mixed feelings about it.
- Poon: Some of the visuals and shots in this film is quite good and are memorable, like the red chair and the stairs, as well as the upside down images. His visuals are the most powerful among all the works.
- Wong: When I think of my students and people I've grown up with, being able to create such shots requires special talent.
- Poon: This 28 minute work should be cut down to 12 minutes.
- Tang: Or even 8 minutes. Some of the shots are pretty, but I don't understand them. The visuals captures some feelings, but if we just consider the visuals, there are plenty of images like that on the internet.
- Wong: If he could distill it down, it may be easier to comprehend.
- Poon: Everybody has self-indulgent moments...
- Au: His director's statement is also self-indulgent, it's incomprehensible...
- Arum: We decided to let this film into the finalist round because we thought we should include an independent and self-indulgent work. Its technique is quite good, and for sure it is not the worst film of the lot.
- Poon: In his director's statement, he claims this work is a kind of liberation. Isn't that self-indulgence?

- Fan: The next work is *News Chase*.
- Arum: I personally support including this work among the finalists. It is very sincere, and one can see that the students spent a great deal of effort making it. However, I don't recommend giving it the top prizes.
- Wong: I liked it upon second viewing. (Arum: Yes.) This work is worth encouraging. The bad thing about it is that it was made for the purpose of participating in this or other competitions, and so there are some clichéd elements.
- Tang: This is a campus TV work, made with the help of teachers...so it is not an individual work.
- Poon: I guess this is an RTHK...
- Tang: It states that it is campus TV...
- Wong: It participated in RTHK's "young reporter competition" or something like that, which I have attended. Compared to *Kwun Tong*, *See You Again*, I prefer this one.
- Show: *News Chase* has a stronger stance than *Kwun Tong*, *See You Again*.
- Fan: alright, let's discuss the next work, *Intimate*.
- Tang: I only just realize that the film is about three siblings...
- Wong: Really? I didn't know that before.
- Tang: I didn't know that when watching the film, it breaks the mode of romantic films...
- Wong: "Not only incest, but..."
- Tang: "My thought cannot be expressed directly..." This line is significant.
- Wong: What the director tries to do is quite simple. However, the shot arrangement is quite confusing, so we can't distinguish between the characters. Perhaps that is the director's intention. However, if the audience is completely unable to tell the characters apart, this may affect how the film is viewed.
- Wong: Do you have other things to add about *Intimate*? This is a simple story.
- Tang: Seeing the three siblings made me feel...it's not what I expected.
- Fan: It's not a simple work.
- Tang: Not only that, but when she says that "My thoughts can't be expressed directly"...
- Poon: That's right. She needs counseling.
- Tang: I don't have anything to add. This is a simple story.

Fan: Ok, the next work is *Fly Your Dream*.

Wong: The school at the end, Ying Wa, is my alma mater. I am guessing the caretaker is...

Tang: Have you seen Yuen Sir?

Wong: I don't remember.

Poon: He teaches metal works...

Wong: He should be the one in the D&T room.

Show: He should be a caretaker...

Wong: The one in the D&T room...

Tang: But he ages quickly. From 1997 it jumps to 2036, and he ages a lot.

Fat: But the teacher remains the same...

Tang: He doesn't age easily, while Yuen aged a lot.

Fat: The friends also look youthful.

Show: This work is too conventional.

Tang: That's right.

Show: Including the dialogue and the shots.

Tang: Like counting from one to ten.

Show: All too conventional, like using the calendar to denote the time period, and also the radio...

Fat: And singing the song about water rationing...

Show: The mother does not change her clothes from year to year.

Tang: Like a hardworking student's homework.

Wong: Conventional, but not really able to follow the teacher's instructions.

Show: Does not pay attention to details, and do not have many bright ideas.

Wong: Tries too hard.

Fan: Ok, the next work is *The Days Without Ballet*.

Au: I quite like this work, even though it does not have too much technique. However it tells the story in a straight-forward way. I think it's used to chase after girls.

(The jurors nod in agreement.)

Tang: I agree with you.

Au: A girl or anyone who likes something a lot, but can't continue to do it because of physical limitations—this should be something regretful. However, the way the girl acts does not reflect this. I like the fact that the film brings out this issue, it is real and direct.

Show: Compared with the other two documentaries, the interview technique of this one is the best. The audience can gauge the director's character through the film. The audience would try to guess whether the director is trying to pursue her. The situation is real and allows the audience to have a different level of reading, which is very good.

Wong: I agree that this element is nice to watch, but it was not fully explored. I want to see how he pursues her the most. From the way he edits the film, you see that he vacillates. For example, he states that he has to re-shoot, which is no help in pursuing girls. Also it's not as if he tries to explore how he can represent the subject through the entire film.

Arum: He added a great deal of his own feelings into the film.

Tang: He is not making an objective documentary. He's participating in it.

Wong: I would rather see her more involved. Now it's neither here nor there.

Fat: He does say that "I don't really know how to make films."

Tang: For a 16 year old, he is quite sincere.

Poon: Really? He's only 16?

Tang: That's right. He claims to "use a 16-year-old's perspective to interview a person who's just given up ballet." He even goes after the girl.

Poon: That's fine. He does it in a non-calculating way.

Tang: That's the good thing about being 16.

Poon: He just follows his heart and doesn't think too much.

Wong: But it's not completely unpremeditated. This is a homework assignment, and has to fulfill certain requirements.

Fan: The next work is *Someone Who Waits for Someone Who Waits for Sunset*.

Show: The male lead is too perfect. I don't know if this work is clichéd or not, but it's definitely conventional. It tries hard to create comic effects, which take the audience back to their

school days. It allows you to identify with the situation. The male lead is quite good, He looks so pained.

Fat: He feels under-appreciated at school, and claims that making film give meaning to his life.

Wong: Watching it again, I still quite like this work.

Tang: Compared to *Fly Your Dream*, both are clichéd, but this one...

Poon: Is much better crafted.

Tang: That's right, it's much better.

Wong: For this kind of subject, the director must have real feelings about the subject. The director is still a secondary school student, and he must still find such situations interesting, like the class prefect meaning hair length. That shot is really something. The prefect ordering other students around is also funny. I really appreciate it.

Fat: It's good, especially the part where he says he has to bring a belt to school the next day.

Wong: Yes. He is good at directing the other students. However the script is not that good, like the boy suddenly coming to his senses, and go back to take color photos...these parts are not very good.

Poon: I wonder if the teacher helped him come up with these plot points?

Fat: The film ends with two teachers going home together...

Wong: You only think it is the teacher because he is wearing the same clothes and trousers, but you only see half of him.

Fat: It's the same teacher who gives out prizes at the beginning of the film.

Poon: That's right.

Tang: Teachers must have acted as advisors, but it's hard to guess how much they had taken part.

Poon: That's always the problem with Youth Category entries...

Tang: But it's clear that some works did not have teacher participation. I'm sure *Happy Birthday!* didn't.

Arum: After watching this film, do you have the feeling that... (Wong: The urge to call our friends and have a drink at Lan Kwai Fong.)

Fat: Have a drink after watching the film?

Arum: After seeing it the last time...

Wong: We should be discussing *Someone Who Waits for Sunset*.

Arum: It's too depressing. I think the lead character is bothersome. I think the director wants to describe young men's troubles, like not knowing what one wants, and always contradicting oneself.

Wong: That's right. People are like that at that age,

Fat: The girl lets him climb the ladder.

Arum: That's right.

Show: What ladder?

Fat: The ladder to happiness.

Wong: Arum, are you saying that the film is not realistic? Concerning the depiction of the girl? Is she just the director's projection?

Arum: I'm not sure if girls in real life are not very mature already...

Wong: You think that she acts mature?

Arum: That's right. She helps the boy a lot by preparing him for the competition. She says to him, "The competition is next week. Are you inviting me on a date now?"

Wong: You didn't like that? Were you angry?

Arum: I was angry.

Wong: What were you angry about?

Arum: I didn't have very strong feelings viewing it the first time. When discussing this work in the last round, I didn't notice that the girl does so much for the boy, but he is so unfeeling.

Wong: So are you angry at the boy or the girl?

Tang: I'm not really angry at the boy. Obviously he is playing someone who doesn't know anything, and his acting is correct.

Arum: Kuen is cute, especially when he's young.

Wong: Watching it again today, I think the depiction of the girl is very good and well-rounded. (Arum: Yes!) At first she is a good student, and then she would say "Hey student, you are breaking the rules. You can't go in there." And she'd try to get him to go on dates. The depiction of her is two-sided. Of course you can say that it is the director trying to project his ideal woman onto the character.

Tang: There are four directors. Is it a group project?

Fan: It's a group project.

Tang: Okay.

Wong: His choice of actors is not just pretty faces. (Arum: Yes) (Show: How about the boy?) The boy definitely is. Of course you hope to cast Guey Lun Mei, but whether or not you can get her is another issue. Even though the girl is not a goddess, but...(Fat: The one who has a birthday is quite pretty) (Arum: Yes...) (Fat: They make a good couple.) I don't have that feeling.

Poon: Guey Lun Mei is the one having a birthday.

Wong: She is pretty. (Arum: Very pretty!)

Fat: When he's talking about the goddess, she stands beside the birthday girl.

Poon: This story is very meticulous.

Wong: Right.

Poon: In terms of technique, it is among the top three.

Arum: Are we choosing the top three now?

Tang: What is the usual practice?

Fan: We have tried many ways. If you have any favorites, you can directly nominate the Gold Award...Or you can eliminate some works by nominating works.

Tang: Okay, narrow down.

(The jury members vote for 5 works each.)

<p><i>Happy Birthday!</i> gets 5 votes: Poon, Wong, Arum, Tang, New Youth Barbershop <i>Aggot's Story's Story</i> gets 4 votes: Poon, Arum, Tang, New Youth Barbershop <i>Light Out Cycle</i> gets one vote: Poon. <i>Kwun Tong-See You Again</i> gets no vote. <i>The Castle in the Pyrenees</i> gets one vote: Wong. <i>News Chase</i> gets one vote: Wong, Tang. <i>Intimate</i> gets one vote: New Youth Barbershop. <i>Fly Your Dream</i> gets one vote: Arum <i>The Days Without Ballet</i> gets 4 votes: Poon, Arum, Tang and New Youth Barbershop. <i>Someone Who Waits for Someone Who Waits for Sunset</i> gets 5 votes: Poon, Wong, Arum, Tang and New Youth Barbershop.</p>

Fan: First, we can eliminate ***Kwun Tong-See You Again***.

Wong: Nobody voted for ***Kwun Tong-See You Again***. Two works got all five votes: ***Happy Birthday!*** and ***Someone Who Waits for Someone Who Waits for Sunset***, while ***Aggot's Story's Story*** and ***The Days Without Ballet*** each got 4 votes.

- Poon: Can I change my vote?
- Wong: You can change after we've ranked the works.
- Poon: If I changed my vote, we can eliminate one more work.
- Fan: What do you want to change your vote to?
- Poon: I was wondering whether to vote for *Light Out Cycle* or *The Castle in the Pyrenees*. If I voted for *The Castle in the Pyrenees*, then we can eliminate *Light Out Cycle*.
- Wong: Now we have 5 works...
- Fan: No, we have 8.
- Wong: If we eliminate those that got only one vote...
- Arum: That's right.
- Fan: We have to be cruel. Alright, now there are only 5 works in the running for Gold, Silver and three Special Mentions. Are you ready to discuss the Gold Award? The voting just now did not include ranking. Let us now nominate the Gold Award winner.
- Wong: I nominate *Someone Who Waits for Sunset*.
- Cheung: Who else is in support?
- Poon: Me.
- New Youth Barbershop: We nominate *Happy Birthday!*.
- Arum: I also vote for *Someone Who Waits for Sunset*.
- Wong: That's a big change.
- Arum: That's because there are only two votes for *Happy Birthday!*.
- Fan: You don't have to limit yourselves to these two works. You can vote for all of them. The Silver Award.
- Show: Best Actor.
- Wong: I nominate *Happy Birthday!* for Silver.
- Fan: Is that right?
- Arum: Yes, I agree.
- Poon: Yes.

New Youth Barbershop: We agree.

Poon: I really like *Aggot's Story*.

Arum: Yes.

Poon: Then I nominate it for third place.

Fan: There is no third place, only Special Mention.

Choi: That is a big difference.

(The jury members deliberate.)

Tang: I would switch my Gold Award vote to *Aggot's Story* to keep it in the running.

Wong: Is it really that good?

Tang: Quite good, and it moved me. I would vote for it to be the Gold Award. *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* is a school-based work, and there is too much of the teacher's influence.

Wong: I feel *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* is a film that can be made by an 18-year-old.

Tang: It's not a matter of believing or not believing. I am taking a bet, and betting on *Aggot's Story*.

Poon: There is no Bronze Award.

Tang: That's right, the difference between the two is too great.

Arum: Are you sure that *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* is made with the help of teachers?

Fan: You can't be sure...

Tang: That's right, you don't know.

Arum: But *Aggot's Story* is more independent.

Poon: That's right.

Tang: It has stop motion, and is well considered.

Arum: Mathew, I agree with you. I change my vote to *Aggot's Story* for the Gold Award. You changed my mind.

Tang: Among all the works, this is the only one that moved me a little.

Wong: It is very coarse, which prevented me from appreciating the work.

- Poon: Will this influence the outcome of the Gold Award?
- Tang: Quite obviously...
- Arum: It's clearly not Gold Award material.
- Tang: We don't know that yet.
- Fan: Okay, let's calm down. Let us nominate once again for the Gold Award. The candidates are *Happy Birthday!*, *Aggot's Story* and *Someone Who Waits for Sunset*. Right?
- Wong: Yes.
- Fan: Is there a fourth candidate? (Everyone thinks.) Okay, so there are only three. Discuss these.
- Arum: New Youth Barbershop, you have to cast your vote again...
- New: Sure...
- Fan: Your vote is the deciding vote.
- Tang: This is unavoidable...
- Arum: Now it's two against two.
- Fat: But will you change your mind again?
- Fan: You can defend your choices.
- Wong: I support *Someone Who Waits for Sunset*. Let me defend it...
- Tang: Can we have two Gold Awards? They can each get \$10000. That would be good.
- Wong: We have had two Gold Awards many times in the past.
- Tang: People have worked hard and put effort into so many works, can we have two Gold Awards? In case New Youth Barbershop cannot come to a conclusion.
- Wong: My stance and suggestion is that we should not give out two Golds easily.
- Show: Between *Aggot's Story* and *Someone Who Waits for Sunset*, I would choose the latter. Between *Aggot's Story* and *Happy Birthday!*, I would choose the latter too. If I have to choose one among the three...
- Fat: I suggest that we discuss this...
- Fan: That's right. We can discuss the three works.

- Wong: I want to defend *Someone Who Waits for Sunset*. I don't think we need to assume that it has the help of teachers just because it is well crafted. This is not fair, because *Aggot's Story* could also have had teachers' help. The teachers are amateurs, and even with their help, the work can still look crude. I have seen many works, and I'm sure that *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* is not likely to have had adult involvement.
- Tang: How can you be so sure?
- Wong: Of course I can't be completely sure, but I have been in contact with teachers, and can be sure what a teacher-controlled film looks like.
- Tang: It's hard to tell.
- Show: Perhaps I have not seen many other films. Of the three, *Happy Birthday!* is the boldest in terms of content, visuals and subject matter, while the other two are more conventional. Their subject matter is something that most people can think up. However, their filming and script is more meticulous. Yet *Happy Birthday!* has more layers. I like works that are creative and bold in their thinking and are able to execute them.
- Wong: I don't oppose *Happy Birthday!* getting the Gold Award.
- Poon: *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* is more meticulous, and many of its points are just right. It's hard to guess how much influence the teacher had wielded. We can treat it as a collective creation. Many of the dramatic points are very precise, and is certainly collective creativity, which is a good thing. Comparing *Happy Birthday!* and *Aggot's Story*, the latter tells its story in a simple way, but the feelings it conveys is very sincere. Among the 70 entries, I spotted *Aggot's Story* early on. It is an interesting work, but it is crude. As for *Happy Birthday!*, when I watched it I felt embarrassed, which means I'm getting old. Aside from youthful, this film is quite embarrassing.
- Arum: I should explain why I changed my vote. To me, if a Gold Award winner is a love story, then it's a bit old-fashioned. Of the three, I can identify emotionally with *Aggot's Story* the most. *Happy Birthday!* does not feel like a Gold Award winner to me.
- Fan: There could be three Special Mentions, the winners of which will get a certificate.
- Poon: Okay, then we have to eliminate one more work.
- Fat: We don't have to award all three.
- Poon: Maybe giving one is enough.
- Fan: Youth Category is the only one in which we give out three Special Mentions, because we feel that this category deserves this kind of encouragement. The other categories including Open and Animation only has one Special Mention.

- Fat: Some jurors feel that *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* may have had teachers' involvement, which is unfair and regrettable. If it is in this category, I trust it.
- Tang: On second thought, I should go with my first impression and choose a work that I like and moves me. Whether or not it received help from teachers, we can never find out.
- Show: It is futile to argue about the standards. I would hope that award winners use the money to make another film. What kind of person would you want to give the money to? Some jurors vote for films that move them. I would vote for a bold film. Now it's like majority rules, which is kind of strange.
- Wong: Should we vote to determine the standards?
- Fat: You all seem to think that filmmaking should be like *Someone Who Waits for Sunset*, made with a group of people and a proper crew. We like *Happy Birthday!* because it is simple, just one camera and the two people in the film. It seeks to challenge media practice and has the potential to create an independent force. You don't need a whole crew and a lot of resources to make films. Just as what Showroom said, what would he do with the money we give him? Probably make another film. If we let *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* or *Aggot's Story* become the Gold Award winner, it's regrettable.
- Wong: Why don't we have two Gold Awards, *Happy Birthday!* and...
- Fan, Choi: You agree that *Happy Birthday!* is ok?
- Wong: In the first round, my choices for the Gold Award were *Happy Birthday!* and *Someone Who Waits for Sunset*.
- Fat: Now *Happy Birthday!* is not in the running...
- Wong: I feel *Aggot's Story* is nothing special. If I vote for *Happy Birthday!*, then we can continue the discussion.
- Arum: If you change the vote, then Eric will have to make a choice.
- Wong: If we put *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* out of the running for the Gold Award, then it seems...
- Arum: How about Silver?
- Fat: I have a condition for changing my vote. Giving Gold to *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* is okay, but *Happy Birthday!* should at least get Silver.
- Wong: There is still *Aggot's Story*. I didn't expect this. I didn't pick it in the first round. I understand that it's subjective. I put a lot of weight on technique, and because it's crude, I shy away from it.

- Tang: No problem. I have already made my decision. Because I don't have any feelings about the other two works, I don't mind that you vote for them. We can't come up with a common standard, because our backgrounds are so different, which is what a jury panel needs. If you ask me, I suggest giving two Golds.
- Wong: What are your choices for two Golds?
- Tang: *Aggot's Story* and *Someone Who Waits for Sunset*.
- Wong: My choices are *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* and *Happy Birthday!*.
- Tang: Let's go for it.
- Poon: I vote for *Aggot's Story* and *Someone Who Waits for Sunset*. *Happy Birthday!* should get Silver.
- Fat: *Happy Birthday!* should at least get Silver.
- Wong: Are we voting again? If we vote again and get the same results, then *Happy Birthday!* will get no awards.
- Fan: It'll get Special Mention.
- Wong: That would be a shame.
- Au: If you won't change your minds, then we should vote for two Golds.
- Fat: Then there will be no Silver?
- Wong: That's right.
- Fan: Okay, please write down your choices for two Golds.
- Choi: Will we have Silver Award as well?
- Wong: No.
- Tang: Can we have two Golds and a Silver with no cash prize?
- Choi: No we can't. It's already stated that the Silver Award gets \$10000 cash prize, the Gold Award \$20000 and a pocket camera. We can't deduct the prize money from Silver Award to give to the Gold Award winner.
- Tang: How about one Gold and two Silver? The Gold Award gets \$10000 and the camera, and the Silver Award winners get \$10000 each.
- Fat: I second that.

- Tang: That's because you think that one of the work will get nothing, or if it only gets jury recommendation, you'd feel bad.
- Wong: We will have to eliminate one from the three.
- Tang: I think if we give one Gold and two Silvers...
- Wong: I don't recommend that. I would rather choose two best works and give up one.
- Fan: The last time there were two Gold Awards in the Youth Category, it as the year of *Paper/Plane* and *Besides Dreaming*. The other two memorable double Golds were *Life Must Go On* and *My Rose*. Both times there was no Silver. But must there be no Silver if there are two Golds? No.
- Choi: It had happened in other categories.
- Fan: The problem is that if there are two Gold, they would share the \$20000 equally, but there is only one camera. Also, it's a bit strange of the Gold Award winners get the same amount of money as the Silver. Since we cannot share the camera, we must determine who gets it, which is indicative. If we decide that there are two Gold and no Silver, you have to make a statement to explain why. This is something for you to consider.
- Wong: I object to three awards, meaning two Golds and one Silver or other possibilities. As for two Golds, I was opposed to it before, but now I find it acceptable.
- Poon: If I was a secondary school student, I'd be interested to know who were the past award winners. They are like the past exam papers. *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* is a more conventional work. With its script, dialogue, acting and cast, it looks like a Gold Award winner. If we give *Happy Birthday!* the Silver, a work that subverts many things, other entrants will think, this is the kind of work that would get a Silver. *Aggot's Story* has a certain realness about it, but it may not deserve the Silver. Now you think that *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* is very precise, which may bring out the message that it has to be like that. I'm thinking, under what circumstance would *Happy Birthday!* get the Gold? Maybe if it had different male and female leads. Every time I see the male lead, I want to turn away.
- Wong: It is exactly this kind of...it successfully gives you a disgusting feeling.
- Fat: I like the poor way they deliver the dialogue. I think the director did that on purpose.
- Poon: They did it like a recitation on purpose at some points.
- Fat: Some of the literal dialogue is quite awful.
- Poon: They probably did that on purpose.

- Show: As three don't know much about production, so when you say the director is precise, I don't know what you mean. I don't really care whether entrants in the future will use the awards as a yardstick. Having us on the jury panel is already quite nonsensical.
- Wong: I don't think we have to worry about serving as a yardstick for the future, because either way it is indicative. When I was in my 20s, I would say to my friends, "In ifva, good works don't get awarded. Only films you don't understand win awards." In fact, winning works differ from year to year. In past years, there are more conventional works as well as more experimental ones. We should focus on the works themselves.
- Show: Being bold is important. I think if *Aggot's Story* and *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* were made by adults, they would have been 100 times better. However, only young people of that age and mindset can make a film like *Happy Birthday!*, and age when you are willing to take risks.
- Poon: I try to discover what I found so impressive about *Aggot's Story*, and it comes from the mangy dog. If a director can capture that dog, the audience would find him remarkable. However, I still insist that there is something wrong with his editing, and some incidents should not be arranged that way. If he can consider things more thoroughly and don't reveal things until the end, he could have achieved the same effect, and used less stop motion in the editing. If he could bring out the idea of searching a bit earlier, the whole thing would have been more well thought-out. I'm not sure how many versions they edited for *Happy Birthday!... The Days Without Ballet* must have been edited very quickly...
- Fat: He didn't have enough shots.
- Poon: But it's a good film. It could be Special Mention.
- Show: I still think that being bold is important in this competition.
- Arum: Are we choosing three out of two?
- Show: Do we choose a combination or...
- Fan: How about if you come up with a combination and tell us, and we will list them out and see if there are any overlaps. Then we can decide which is Gold, Silver or two Golds.
- Show: *Happy Birthday!* for Gold, *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* for Silver.
- Wong: *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* for Gold, *Happy Birthday!* for Silver.
- Poon: My choice is the same as Adam. (*Someone Who Waits for Sunset* for Gold, *Happy Birthday!* for Silver.)
- Arum: *Happy Birthday!* for Gold, *Aggot's Story* for Silver.

Tang: I am like Arum. After thinking back and forth, I discovered that works like *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* have appeared many times before. It is too correct to me. I'm not saying that it's not creative nor that the work is not difficult to make, but everything is too conventional. I think an independent film and video award should not be too conventional.

(Everybody considers this.)

Fan: It is up to you to decide. If we let New Youth Barbershop cast the deciding vote, they need to choose one of the two combinations on the table.

Fat: Definitely the one above. (*Someone Who Waits for Sunset* for Gold, *Happy Birthday!* for Silver.)

Show: Then the votes don't make sense. If *Happy Birthday!* got the most votes, why should it get Silver?

Fan: Because people voted for it to get Silver, which means that they think it doesn't deserve the Gold.

Show: It is the work with the most support.

Fan: That does not mean that most people want it to get Gold.

Show: It should not be third place.

Fat: No, it is Silver.

Fan: Just because most people like lit doesn't mean that it should get Gold. For example, if other works also get support...

Fat: So far, it is the work with the most nominations.

(Everyone looks at the board.)

Fat: Maybe we should vote again.

Choi: That's because three people voted Gold for *Happy Birthday!*

Cheung: That's because you are voting for a combination.

Tang: We should vote again to decide which work should get Gold and Silver out of *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* and *Happy Birthday!*

Wong: Then you are eliminating *Aggot's Story*?

Arum: Aside from the fact that New Youth Barbershop changed its vote, *Happy Birthday!* has actually won.

- Show: Right, but we are not competing to get the highest number of votes, but are voting for different combinations.
- Arum: Would anyone object if it gets Gold?
- Au: We can vote again.
- Cheung: We have eliminated *Aggot's Story*, but we still don't know who gets Gold and Silver.
Choi: But do you all agree to eliminate it?
- Arum: I don't agree. I don't think we should vote for combinations. We should directly discuss who should get Gold.
- Cheung: Then the same situation would arise, with two against two.
- Arum: For me, it is clear that the Gold Award would go to *Happy Birthday!*, while Silver is a choice between *Aggot's Story* and *Someone Who Waits for Sunset*.
- Fan: It shouldn't be like that.
- Wong: It is a matter of your way of thinking.
- Arum: To me, *Happy Birthday!* is the Gold Award winner. But we still have to decide who gets Silver.
- Show: We should look at it this way. Now that we have decided the Gold, and everybody has decided that *Happy Birthday!*...
- Arum: I haven't finished. We should vote among *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* and *Aggot's Story* to decide which one is better.
- Show: What she means is that if we have decided the Gold, we should decide who gets Silver.
- Poon: So the two works on the board reflects New Youth Barbershop's new vote?
- Show: Not yet.
- Arum: They will only change when we vote for combination.
- Poon: If they don't want to change...
- Arum: They want *Happy Birthday!* to win an award. Now *Happy Birthday!* gets Gold, while the other two works vie for Silver.
- Wong: Are we sure that *Happy Birthday!* gets Gold?
- Arum: I was asking this question just now.

- Wong: It's two against two.
- Show: No, it's three against two.
- Wong: That's right.
- Poon: If you changed your vote, then the results are different. *Happy Birthday!* will get Gold and *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* gets Silver.
- Show: We should vote again for Silver.
- Arum: That's right.
- Show: We have 5 votes. Let's vote to determine which work gets Silver.
- Poon: There is no need. I think *Happy Birthday!* gets Gold and *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* gets Silver. Since *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* had two votes for Gold, it should get Silver now.
- Fan: We can't vote for combination as well as Gold and Silver separately. If you had voted for combination and then used that vote to determine the Gold and Silver, there would be a mistake. I suggest that you decide whether you are voting for combination or voting for Gold and Silver separately.
- Poon: Why don't we vote again?
- Fan: You can vote for Gold Award first, and then nominate the rest. You have used different voting methods so far, and honestly speaking, this may be unfair to you and the entrants. According to your previous vote, *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* and *Happy Birthday!* are in the running for Gold. You can discuss them. No matter what, you should decide on the voting method.
- Tang: Then we should vote to determine the voting method.
- Wong: But we have already agreed on this method (combination).
- Fan: You agreed to it at first.
- Show: Do you agree with *Happy Birthday!* getting Gold? If not...
- Wong: This is the results we get using the current method. But New Youth Barbershop thought about it and used another system instead.
- Poon: We followed this method to get to this point. We voted for the top three works, but can't decide whether we should go for two Golds or one Gold and one Silver, because we feel bad for the third place.
- Tang: We feel regretful if one work got left out.

- Poon: That's what made us vote for combination instead, which pre-determines that the awards will be on Gold and one Silver. However, this creates another problem. If we vote for combination, the Gold Award winner will be different for each combination. But even with this method, we can't decide which work gets Gold and Silver.
- Show: The strange thing about this is that a work with two Gold Award nominations (*Someone Who Waits for Sunset*) gets Silver at the end.
- Tang: No system is completely fair.
- Fan: That's right. So you should agree on a method and come up with a consensus.
- Arum: Since Eric has to leave. I think the matter is simple. We go back to the original position. After voting for combination, we continue to vote for Silver. I don't want *Happy Birthday!* to get Gold. Our discussion so far has been trying to find a Gold Award winner.
- Show: You don't want?
- Arum: Right now, the decision is *Happy Birthday!* gets Gold. Are you changing your vote?
- Fat: No.
- Show: Each person gets to vote once.
- Au: The problem is that if we return to the beginning, Arum would vote for *Aggot's Story* instead of for *Happy Birthday!*. It is only because we are voting for combination that she voted that way.
- Fan: Excuse me, please calm down.
- Choi: The strange thing is that Mathew and Arum voted for *Aggot's Story* as Gold Award, but when we voted for combination, you voted *Aggot's Story* for Silver.
- Tang: That's because the voting method changed.
- Arum: Because we're voting for combination.
- Fan: Different voting methods have different implications. You have to decide whether to vote for combination or vote for Gold first, and then the remaining works vie for Silver.
- Wong: We can do it another way. You can vote for the work you most want to eliminate. You can write down one choice on a piece of paper. After eliminating one, the other two will vie for Gold and Silver.
- Fan: You can do that.
- Fat: The results would be very different then. I think it's best to vote for combination.

- Fan: Different methods will give different results, but if we try to choose a method based on which work we want the Gold Award to go to, then it's unfair.
- Wong: My position is simple. I don't insist on *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* getting Gold, but I think both *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* and *Happy Birthday!* should get Gold and Silver.
- Fat: My position is the same as yours.
- Wong: For me Gold and Silver does not make much difference. But *Aggot's Story*...
- Poon: I'm fine with both works.
- Fat: I'm fine with *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* getting Gold, but I don't want these two works to miss out on Gold or Silver.
- Arum: I am the opposite. I do not recommend letting *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* get Gold. So we have to come to a consensus: do we want *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* or *Aggot's Story* to stay?
- Wong: Right. That's why I suggested we use elimination. If you do not agree, then we don't have to consider this option.
- Fan: The reason we do not use points to rank works is because we want jury members to come to a conclusion through discussion, even though we may have to spend a lot of time bargaining. Until now I have not casted a vote. But after listening to you, I realize that it is a choice between *Happy Birthday!* and *Someone Who Waits for Sunset*. You two like *Aggot's Story*, but the fact is that the other three parties support the other two works more. If nobody wants to compromise, then it's hard to continue...
- Tang: Can we have one Gold and two Silvers? Surely we can change the rules a bit.
- Au: If we follow the method, we don't need to compromise (meaning voting for combination.)
- Fan: But they will overrule this method.
- Tang: I think the competition should serve to encourage people, so why not let more people get awards? Why do you object to this, Adam?
- Wong: Special Mention is also a type of encouragement.
- Tang: That's different. There are three Special Mentions, so the work would rank the same as another two. Special Mention is a consolation prize.
- Poon: I wonder if we have to give out three Special Mentions? Perhaps we can only give out one, then the awards will be Gold, Silver and Bronze.

Tang: I think we should award more prizes.

Poon: One Gold and one Silver is what the competition requires, so we should be true to that. I don't mind giving out more Special Mentions.

Wong: Right.

Poon: I don't care which among *Happy Birthday!* and *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* gets Gold.

Show: I think those who participate in this competition would look at the mission of **ifva**, which is to create an independent new force for the Hong Kong creative industries". For me, the other two works fail to achieve this, while *Happy Birthday!* can, plus it opens up new possibilities for the medium. I think you should bear that in mind and vote, rather than think about which work you want to eliminate.

Fan: Do you agree to vote again for the Gold Award?

(The jury members agree.)

Fan: We do this my secret ballot. If the result is 2-2-1, then the one with single vote must choose between the other two works.

(The result: *Aggot's Story* gets one vote, *Someone Who Waits for Sunset* and *Happy Birthday!* get two votes each.)

Fan: The one who voted for *Aggot's Story* now cast one more vote.

(The Gold Award winner: *Someone Who Waits for Sunset*.)

Choi: Now let's vote by secret ballot for the Silver Award.

(The result: *Aggot's Story* gets two votes, *Happy Birthday!* gets 3 votes. The Silver Award goes to *Happy Birthday!*.)

Fan: Now for Special Mention.

Wong: *Aggot's Story* is a shoo-in. Does anyone object?

(Everyone agrees.)

Choi: Aside from *Aggot's Story*, you each have two votes for Special Mention. Please vote by secret ballot.

(The result: *The Days Without Ballet* gets four votes. *News Chase* and *The Castle in the Pyrenees* compete in second round voting, and *New Chase* gets four votes: Wong, Arum, Tang and New Youth Barbershop.)

Youth Category

Gold Award

Someone Who Waits for Sunset

Tang Ka-huen, Kong Ming-sum, Leung Pui-man, Luo Zhi-ji

Silver Award

Happy Birthday!

Chan Hin-kong

Special Mention

Aggot's Story,

Ma Man-ching, Leung Kwok-pang, Chan Pak-long, Chung Ka-wai Whitney, Chan Chun-hong Billy,
Cheung Yat-long Thomas, Yeung Kwan-on, Ng Kin-fung

The Days Without Ballet

Chu Tsz-yui

News Chase

Tam Lai-ting, Kwok Ue-yau, Tsang Tsz-san, Fu Cheuk-hin