

18th ifva Awards - Youth Category Jury Meeting Transcript

Jury Members: Adam Wong (Wong), Cheuk Wan-chi (Cheuk), Jessey Tsang (Tsang), Adrian Chow (Chow), Tang Shu-wing (Tang)

ifva Representatives: Teresa Kwong (Kwong), Kattie Fan (Fan), Christine Lui (Lui)

Kwong: The mission of **ifva** is to encourage media creation in Hong Kong and Asia as well as exchanges among filmmakers in these regions. The competition emphasizes content, form and technique, but we pay special attention to independent spirit and creativity. Do you have any questions?

Tang: Can you explain what is meant by independent spirit and creativity? Especially independent spirit.

Kwong: The organizer defines independent spirit firstly by a film's production background. Basically the works we promote are not commercial films, because we emphasize autonomous artistic creation, and if the work brings out the filmmaker's personal ideas, style or distinctiveness. This is just a general way of interpreting independent spirit. Independent spirit can also be seen in a work's ideology or means of expression. If a work is too close to mainstream productions in this regard, then it may not fit in with our independent spirit requirement. However I want to stress that we leave the final say on this topic to our jury members. Do you have other questions? If not, we shall begin our discussion of the 9 finalist works.

Cheuk: I like **Symbiosis**, **Molding** and **Red Apple**. Aside from these three, the rest are not very outstanding either in part or as a whole. These three works are different from the rest, and from my perspective they are quite outstanding in some respects. Therefore my choices would be **Symbiosis** and **Molding**.

Fan: What does the other new jury member think?

Tang: I have to think about this, if independent spirit is the quality most valued by this competition. According to the definition of independent spirit provided by the organizer, are all the works made to be entered into this competition?

Tsang: Not all of them are. Some are made for this competition, some aren't.

Tang: Some works are produced for a certain purpose, for example, to fulfill a course requirement in a school.

Tsang: Not necessarily. Some are produced out of the filmmaker's own volition, like the one about the granny.

Tang: The point she mentioned about “non-mainstream aesthetics” is even more complicated.

Chow: I think “non-mainstream aesthetics” can be quite open. Judging whether a work has mainstream aesthetics can be very subjective.

Wong: I feel a work does not have to have “non-mainstream aesthetics”. The organizer emphasizes independent spirit. Some filmmakers may deliberately try to make something that is “non-mainstream, and the results may be very “mainstream”. I feel that works that come from the heart and are produced out of the filmmaker’s free will may be more reflective of independent spirit.

Cheuk: Speaking of free will, some works really made me feel the passion the creators have in making the film, as if they would give everything they have to make it.

Wong: There are many works like that every year.

Tang: Can you share your past experiences as a juror?

Cheuk: I place a lot of importance on whether the work is good, and whether I find it unforgettable.

Wong: On the whole I find the works this year to be quite decent, and none made me fall asleep or “cut up the chair.” However I can’t compare, because I can’t pick 10 outstanding works this year as all the works contain flaws as well as strengths. I have strong feelings for all the 9 finalist works this year. However, there was one film that I thought very good, was not well liked by the other two jurors in the first round, so it did not become a finalist. On the whole these works are generally good. I initially liked **Molding**, but I can’t stand its sloganizing at the end.

Cheuk: Did the teacher make them do it? I like the fact that even without the slogan, you can still understand the message.

Tsang: The technique of this work is good and the director did it all himself. I liked it initially as well, but this is the third time I watched it, so I’m a bit tired of it. The rhythm of the film is good, and his actors are not bad. Undeniably, there is a cinematic quality to this work.

Cheuk: I also agree that **Molding** is very cinematic. He did very well according to his abilities. I also like **Symbiosis**. Most of the finalist works this year have the city of Hong Kong as their main subject matter.

Tsang: The Hong Kong spirit?

Cheuk: That's right, this kind of topic. As one of the films in this area, I find **Red Apple** to be very sincere. But when I watched **Symbiosis**, I sense that it is about the changing times and the relationship between people. It uses a special technique to talk about something that everyone is talking about, and his perspective is different from most, so I am more fond of **Symbiosis**.

Chow: Let's talk about **Red Apple** first, which I like.

Cheuk: **Red Apple** is very good!

Chow: This is my second time watching **Red Apple**, and the first time on the big screen. My feelings have been altered. After watching it again, I feel that it could be more condensed, because there are parts in the middle that are a little loose. However, I am still very fond of this work, because it did for me something ordinary but that I don't do myself, which is to stand in a market and observe the people. Ordinarily when I go to the market, I would just buy things, or maybe stay a bit longer at stalls with whom I'm on good terms, but I don't go and talk to every stall-owner and ask them if they want their children to enter the business. I think the directors did in our stead something important, and it is something that at least I won't do. From observing these stall-owners, we can see these ordinary people come to life. The dancing scene at the end is very inspired, and advanced the storyline using music and speeded up the film's formerly lethargic pace. That scene is great. Many of the people in the film say something similar, that because they were not highly educated, they had no right to expect a better working environment or even better living conditions. I think this is something worth thinking about. Just because they are not well educated, they have no right to expect a better working environment or living conditions? Their less than ideal working and living conditions are a structural social problem. The work brings out these things for us to consider, although it is not necessarily the director's intention. However the work gave me room have these kinds of thinking, so I prefer **Red Apple**.

Wong: From the perspective of its directors, I think they explored as they went along. At the beginning of the film, the directors did not seem to have a very clear direction, and just seem to be wandering. I'm not sure if the editing is chronological to the filming, but by the end they found their direction. My feeling is that they was still exploring as they went along, and found their direction by looking more deeply into matters, so the end result is very good. This is why the work lacks a definite point of view. I remember Adrian Chow saying last time that he likes the film precisely because it does not have a definite point of view. I also agree that you do not have to have a value judgment about something. But I still feel that the shots are not curious enough.

Chow: Not focused enough.

Wong: That's right, not focused. You don't know what the camera wants to watch, and is just wandering, capturing what it happens to see. This is one of the flaws of this film.

Tsang: In the previous round of jury deliberations, I my feelings towards **Red Apple** were just so-so, and I was more fond of **Rainbow**. However, after watching them for a second time just now, my views towards **Red Apple** have improved. It reminds me of myself more than 10 years ago, exploring the world with a video camera, collecting bits and pieces of footage as I went along. The scene with the lady at the end is an inspired touch. Certainly parts of it are too long, but it leaves room at the end for people to think about the story of the red apple in the market. Among the finalist works, this film is quite outstanding. Even though it has its flaws, but it tries to explore the world around us. I think about the two little girls who go around asking simple and silly questions, which reflects how young children view the world. This is why I like **Red Apple**. I still like **Rainbow** because of its simple story about the director visiting his grandma. Actually of the 70 entrants in this category, many are films produced for the school's TV channel. I really miss the works I'd seen in this category in the past about growing up, which I rarely see these days. Many people may feel that films about family members are 'sure win' because they can move people for sure and win prizes. Aside from this issue, the filmmaker and the subject must have a close relationship. Only a grandchild can make this film about his grandma. The grandma is showing signs of Alzheimer's disease, and she mumbles and sings in front of the director, who captures the lovely interaction between them, such as the way the grandma walks. I like the fact that this young filmmaker explores things around him and records those close to him. By comparison, many group works explore the Hong Kong "under the Lion Rock" spirit, while **Rainbow** explores the media interaction of young filmmakers. I can't quite accept **The Boy**. I feel that it is too mainstream, and I don't like it.

Cheuk: It feels very cult film, like it could be used to enliven a party.

Tsang: That's right. I also like **Molding** because its technique is very mature. Just like what Cheuk said, **Symbiosis** belongs to a very special genre. Among the finalists, it is the most experimental. If I had to choose three award winners, I feel we would need further discussions, since this is no easy task.

Chow: I want to add that my impression of **The Boy** is just so-so. I want to give young people some advice. I feel the director is overly ambitious if he wants to make a mainstream movie. According to their overall appearance, the actors do not seem to fit the roles in the film.

Cheuk: They perform their roles no matter how unsuitable they seem. The gap between that and reality is one of the distinguishing characteristics of this film.

Chow: The character named "Big Uncle" is not really a big uncle. He's just a middle aged

guy. The self-styled scary contract killer is not too believable either.

Cheuk: The part where the young guy wearing sports shorts claims to be the killer for the association at ifc is also unconvincing.

Chow: This scene reminds me of Matt Damon in *The Bourne Identity*, but the film failed to deliver the right effect. I think the director is too ambitious in some respects. With this cast, they don't need to film this kind of story. I appreciate the fact that the director was able to make such a professional looking work without special effects. However, watching it a second time, I was less impressed with the professional technique. When watching this film against other entries, this film really stood out. But watching it again, this feeling was less so. My advice to young people is that they should not be too ambitious. They should make films according to the kinds of actors they have at their disposal, and work within their means. The result would probably be better.

Tang: I think I can divide the 9 films into 3 categories, dramas, documentaries and films like *Symbiosis* which are more based on image and form. I don't know why they made their films, so I could only judge by the outcome. If I know their intentions, I'll be able to tell whether they had achieved what they set out to do. I am more concerned with whether the work displays certain potential that would auger better works in the future. If it contains some outstanding qualities then it's even better. Some of these outstanding qualities may be consistent throughout the work, and displays the filmmaker's ability to handle the medium vis a vis what he wants to put across. In other cases the work may be only so-so, but there are some parts that are more interesting, or that there are strong feelings expressed in certain situations. For example, *The Boy* is a good case in point, because it is different from other finalists. From the perspective of the script's structure, it seems to have borrowed some elements from mainstream cinema. The audience sees a clear story, with certain characters and shooting style. For a filmmaker under the age of 18, he is able to use editing, background music and different camera angles to tell his story, which is commendable. But from the perspective of the script, the story involves different foreign countries, and the main character becomes a killer, and there are many innocent people. Perhaps the director does not quite know what he is trying to say. When he was writig the script, perhaps he thinks he has made things clear, but to the audience things are still a mystery.

For the point of view of a drama, the sructure of the script belongs to a certain genre. By comparison, *Twin Ice* is also a drama, but for me it is closer to the feeling of such films as *You Are the Apple of My Eye* or *Big Blue Lake*, because the story takes place in a village. It captures the feeling of many young people so-called in love or the feeling of intimacy between them, and it makes me smile in recognition. In terms of the script and its treatment of character, *Twin Ice* is better than *The Boy*. The latter is closer to a typical Hong Kong cop drama in its style and narrative

rhythm. Whether he is copying certain Hong Kong films we have no way of knowing, but it is obvious that he is influenced by mainstream films.

For films that are closer in style to documentaries, **Red Apple** left a deep impression on me. Whether or not the directors started out with a clear direction, they were able to capture the reaction of the stall owners, and arranged the stories of the different characters, culminating in the scene of the woman dancing. After digesting this film, it captures an important social issue, and how the people of a certain social class view their own existence. From this perspective, the directors' achievement and potential is stronger than that of **On the Same Boat** and **Good Riddance**.

I think the best work of the lot is **Rainbow**, because the granny is unconscious of the camera, and is simply being herself. The outstanding thing about the film is that it tells the story of the granny and the grandchild through their normal daily interactions.

As for **Molding**, I agree that it is very strong for a director under the age of 18, it is even stronger than **Symbiosis**. But I was perplexed when one of the characters suddenly takes out *Tuesdays with Morrie*.

On the whole, of the 9 finalist works, **Red Apple** is the best documentary, while for dramas, **Twin Ice** is better than *The Boy* and **Invisible notes**. The latter's handling of the script and actors are still not mature enough. The actors in **Twin Ice** are very good. Also I feel that we should consider giving awards to both **Rainbow** and **Molding**.

Wong: Just now, Adrian mentioned that he feels the director of **The Boy** is overly ambitious. I have some views about this. I wrote about this work in the **ifva** booklet. I have seen other similar works in the past, and this work is not bad compared with the others. The work displays a devil may care attitude. In previous editions, I have seen similar works, like young people playing killers, or using Halloween costumes from school to play vampyres. Sometimes this phenomenon can be seen as young people's cult film. **The Boy** tries very hard and does it very seriously, and it is different from other genre films. In those other films, the filmmakers just go all out and have fun, but for this film, I feel that the director tries very hard and takes the film very seriously.

Cheuk: Do you think the director is aware of the casting problem and the problems with the dialogue?

Wong: I feel that he is not aware of them. From my experience dealing with these directors, they always make the same mistake. From our perspective these are obvious problems, but they don't feel they are problems, and would even go on in the same

direction and repeat the same mistakes.

Tang: They really believe in what they are doing.

Wong: For example, when I taught secondary school how to make films, and if there are father and mother characters in the story, I would ask them who would play them. They would say we'll just get one of the classmates to play. They do not feel this is a problem.

Cheuk: That's right. I agree.

Tsang: But this is a problem. A serious film should not do that. I feel that children playing adults is the worst. The whole work is problematic this way. I don't think we should award this kind of film, and thus encourage them to keep doing things this way, as if they can simply pull the wool over our eyes. Young people should develop stories based on their own lives, rather than play at being adults.

Cheuk: But they have a passion for film. Film is their lives.

Wong: Even though they are not doing it for a living, they want to make a commercial looking film.

Cheuk: So they should have a youth playing the role of the father?

Tang: It seems that many of these works lack independent spirit?

Wong: Isn't this kind of blind passion a kind of independent spirit?

Cheuk: Should we award such blind spirit?

Tsang: This is worthy of discussion.

Cheuk: Many of the finalist works have some connection to me. For example, with ***Rainbow***, I see my grandma almost everyday. And because I see old people everyday, I feel that this work does not have enough details, and the emotions expressed are not sincere enough. Therefore I was not touched by it. As for ***Invisible notes***, because I have relatives living in Cheung Chau, I feel this is a portrait of that island. The film deserves encouragement because the acting of both the male leads is good, especially the one wearing glasses, and so is the one playing music with the girl. They have a sincerity and warmth, so that even lines that seem cliché are okay when uttered by them. I also should mention ***Red Apple*** and its connection to my life. I often go with my grandma to the market, and have to stand beside her as she chats with the stall owners. Because I spend so much time standing in markets, I recognize many of the scenes in this film. I appreciate the director's point of view

and ways of seeing. They are simply observing the market, and do not inject themselves into any situation. Even when they meet the dancing woman, they do not get involved. Getting that song is quite an achievement.

Wong: When I was watching it this time, I really noticed how the song is introduced. The first time I thought things were smooth, but this time I know for sure that it is a soundtrack, and this added soundtrack seems forced.

Cheuk: I agree. The director's biggest involvement is when the interviewee asks, "Are you filming me? Let me show you some vegetables." This is very purely about the birth of a shot. The works I mentioned are only related to me via some personal experiences. I won't give them higher marks because of that.

Wong: I appreciate the purity of **Red Apple**. Just now, you mentioned that anyone making a film about any grandma would yield the same results. I agree with that. I've also filmed wet markets, and filming at any of them would give you the same effect. I think both films have similar qualities, but **Red Apple** is more hardworking and goes deeper. We do not see the directors having any clear intention when they filmed. The results are not jarring because they start out with good intentions. The film captures images as it goes along, but it does not leave a deep impression. I want to mention **Molding**. Its directorial vision is similar to the sensitivity of the director of **The Boy**. However, the flaw of the latter work is that the director tries to tackle a subject that he cannot handle. Because the scale of the film is big, its flaws are more obvious, while the former completed a work with simple ambitions, but it does not deliver a very deep message.

Cheuk: I think the visuals of **Molding** is stronger, and there are not so many obvious flaws.

Tsang: I also agree that its visuals are strong and full of tension. I don't feel that **Rainbow** deserve the gold or silver award, but perhaps a special mention. I understand that he is only filming a journey. I am now living with my grandma and I have filmed her in the past, and I also focused on everyday details. The director of this film is a novice who tries to record a relative during a visit, and to him this is an important experience. I don't feel that it is worthy of the Gold or Silver award, but you should consider it for Special Mention.

Kwong: Do you have anything else to add?

Wong: Not too many people mentioned **On the Same Boat**. I also feel that this work is not too outstanding.

Kwong: I would like to hear why the first round jurors chose this film as one of the finalists?

Chow: I can provide some information. My original intent was to give more people a chance

to view this work, so that people will know more about the “Equal Share Campaign.” This is just my personal view. But I also feel that as a documentary, it has its flaws, just like **Rainbow**. First of all it is too short, and can only interview the organizer and one or two participants. I would want to know more, such as what the homeless people feel. In the same way, I think **Rainbow** is sincere, and the director really wanted to record his grandma out of the pureness of heart, and I was touched by this act.

Cheuk: It has another strength. The director also interviews his mother, so he is not just interacting with one person.

Chow: I would want to know more, like why the grandma likes to sing, the origins of the song, what she was like when she was young, and under what situations she likes to sing.

Cheuk: I think one of the most common problems of the youth category directors is that they do not know how to ask questions. This is not only the directors asking questions of other people in their works, but also how the directors ask questions that concern the theme of their works, and what angle they approach their themes.

Chow: I would want to know more, such as what work the grandma did in the past. From her personal history, I expect to learn about history. As a documentary, it has many flaws.

Cheuk: **Good Riddance** also has the same problem. The director found a very special store, but didn't ask any good questions.

Chow: I agree. The director only interviewed a few people in the store. It should have some regular customers. I would like to hear what they have to say. This store may be gone soon, will the regulars miss it? Or do they welcome its closure? I want to know different sides of the story. I think the outstanding thing about **Red Apple** is that it is fortunate enough to find many different elements.

Tang: After hearing what you have to say, I feel that when young people do research and plan for a documentary, they encounter many problems. If they do not know how to ask questions relating to the theme of the work, it means that they have not properly digested the topic or captured its essence. This reflects on how young people undergo the creative process, and how they use media to create. In the same way, **The Boy, Invisible notes** and **Twin Ice** from the perspective of script structure, show that their directors are still inexperienced in their handling of dramas, and perhaps it'll take them some years. In terms of handling a character and certain situations, I see that some works are better and some are worse than others.

Cheuk: I want to hear what you think about **Symbiosis**.

Tsang: I quite like **Symbiosis**, because I see almost no experimental films in the first round, or works that use non-realistic imagery. I like the fact that the director tries to tell a story this way. Of course, because it is in a different genre, it is hard to discuss the film.

Wong: Usually this kind of competition does not attract many experimental works, so such works receive more attention, and tend to be selected. I like the fact that the director spent a lot of effort in creating the work, but I feel on the whole, it does not work because there are too many disparate elements.

Chow: I want to know if you'd read the synopsis. The director wants to explore how modern media affects our perception of beauty. The content on the wall represents the ever-changing content of the media. The mud in the middle represents a person's thoughts and inner views. The director wants to show the contrast and interaction between the two. But when watching this work, I did not get this meaning at all.

Cheuk: I feel that the director should not state this intention.

Chow: My feeling is that when viewing a work, a director's intentions are not the only possible interpretation. The audience can make up their own minds. However the contrast between the two elements is interesting, and I like it. Just as Adam said, this is the only experimental work among the finalists, so it stands out.

Wong: I feel that many novice experimental filmmakers like to mix in many different elements, but it does not always work.

Chow: So if this is the director's intention, then his execution needs to be improved.

Wong: Just now we talked about directors raising questions. **Red Apple** asks a question many times, "Are you happy?" The tone of this question left me feeling uneasy. My impression is that these two young girls seem to think on the outset that working in a wet market is something unhappy, so they want the stall owners to find happiness. I don't like this part.

Chow: Its technique has room for improvement.

Wong: I don't think that's a problem, but rather their life experiences and living environment made them consider wet markets as an unhappy place to work in.

Tang: I'm not sure if they had met wet market stall owners in the past, or had talked to them?

Tsang: I think they only met them that day.

- Chow: The synopsis mentions that the directors visited wet markets frequently when they were young, but since then they had moved. They had not visited the market for almost five years, and are revisiting the place for the film.
- Lui: I'm sorry, but two works have not been much discussed: *Invisible notes* and *Twin Ice*.
- Tsang: *Twin Ice* is full of youthful spirit, and the girl is quite attractive, while the boy is comparatively less so. Watching them for the second time, I feel that *Twin Ice* is better than *Invisible notes*.
- Cheuk: The lead characters of *Twin Ice* are both okay. I don't know if they are good actors, or because of the director's efforts. I suspect it is the latter. There is a part in the middle that is like silent movies. This is quite novel.
- Wong: The two works are very different. *Invisible notes* has many different elements, and it seems that its director really wants to make films or TV dramas, while *Twin Ice* is a bit more individualistic.
- Cheuk: It is more free spirited.
- Wong: Because it is more individualistic, it is easier to watch. I like its naturalism and unique humor, the lazy village, fake burglary and even fire truck. Later, when talking about how he met the girl from the day before, the director uses a wide angle shot. It is free spirited, and shows the director's sense of filmic rhythm. He knows when to involve the audience and when to take a step back. The female lead is quite lovely. *Invisible notes* looks very decent, and one can see that the director really wants to convey a cinematic effect, although the end result is more like TV drama, yet the content is not clichéd. When you look at it closely, the content is not clichéd at all. It is not just about love relationships and life goals. I quite appreciate that.
- Tsang: But I can't accept the part where the character goes blind at the end.
- Tang: I wonder if it is based on a true story or made up?
- Wong: I find it a bit clichéd, but not completely. Of course you may not accept this story from the beginning. I think both the male and female leads are very good. I agree that the script has holes, but the direction and acting are good, so that the end result is quite pleasing. Also I find the images of Cheung Chau really beautiful.
- Chow: I think this is a very interesting work. On the surface, *Invisible notes* tells a clichéd story about school and life dreams, or the conflict between dream and reality. But at the end there is a twist, and the older brother's past made him face this conflict. On

the whole its technique is quite good, but the music transitions and establishing shots between scenes remind me of TVB dramas. I also like the original song the girl sings at the end. One of the technical problems is that when the band is rehearsing, the image and background noise is not synched. I don't have much to say about **Twin Ice**. It did not leave a deep impression on me.

Kwong: Can each juror nominate 3 works so that we can concentrate on discussing them?

Tang: If we each nominate 3 works, does that mean the work with the most nominations would get the Gold Award?

Kwong: We can discuss that. Just because a work receives a lot of nominations does not mean it is the best work.

Wong: Either we give Special Mentions to all the works, or not at all. All the works this year have something worthy, but at the same time are all flawed in their own way.

Kwong: Please start your nomination. You can also nominate fewer than 3 works.

Cheuk: I still insist on my initial choices: **Molding**, **Symbiosis** and **Red Apple**.

Tang: I nominate Red Apple, **Twin Ice** and **Molding**.

Wong: I nominate **Twin Ice**, **Molding**, and **Invisible notes**.

Chow: I nominate **Red Apple** and **Symbiosis**.

Tsang: I nominate 4 works: **Molding**, **Red Apple**, **Symbiosis** and **Rainbow**.

Kwong: 3 works did not get any nominations. They are **The Boy**, **Good Riddance** and **On the Same Boat**. Do we agree to exclude them from discussion?

(The jurors agree.)

Kwong: There are 6 works left. Two works with the most nominations are **Red Apple** and **Molding**, both with 4 votes. **Symbiosis** has 3 votes. **Twin Ice** has 2 votes, while **Rainbow** and **Invisible notes** each has one vote. Let's concentrate on discussing the films with 4 votes, **Red Apple** and **Molding**.

Tang: Can you explain again the criteria for judging? Does a work have to be the best in every respect or is the best work overall to get the gold award?

Kwong: The Gold Award winner should be the best work overall that year, but each year the jury members have their own criteria for determining the winner. I am mainly

speaking about the Youth and the Open categories. Aside from the overall quality, some jury members may feel that in recent years, the quality of screenplays have been declining, in their personal opinion, so they would choose a film that has certain flaws, but has an outstanding screenplay as a show of encouragement. The interesting thing about ifva is that jury members can freely make decisions on their own.

Tang: With regards to the Youth Category, should we extol certain common qualities? What quality do we most value? The organizers emphasize independent spirit and creativity.

Cheuk: With regards to the gold and silver awards, we should consider the work as a whole. Judging the work as a whole is very individualistic and subjective. I feel that **Red Apple** has its problems.

Tang: Why is that?

Cheuk: I agree more and more with what Adam said. The directors did not have very clear intentions and plans, and just happened to see a dancing woman. The Gold Award has special meaning, so we should be careful in our choice. I feel the Gold Award should go to **Molding**. The director is clear in what he wants to express. Even though the message is not too complex, he successfully achieved his goal. This is actually a genre film. With limited resources, there are no flaws and no cringe-worthy shots. The director handled all elements well, and he is well in control. Even though there is not too much dialogue, the result is good. This film can only be done by a special type of person.

Tsang: I like this film because the director performed many roles. For example, he is also the actor. Its filmic rhythm is very good and precise. Even though it may be a school production, comparatively speaking, I can see its individuality. Therefore I feel that **Molding** is worthy of the Gold Award.

Wong: I think the director is very talented, and this work is just an initial attempt. I like films in which the director has the passion to go without sleep for 3 months to finish a film. From this work, I sense that the director is very talented, and completed this film with ease. But I don't sense the passion and drive.

Tsang: Which film do you think deserve the Gold Award?

Wong: I don't have a choice for Gold Award. I can't decide.

Tang: I too have difficulty deciding. The Gold Award winner should be the best work among the 9 finalists, and embodies the attitude that ifva represents. The finalist works each has its strengths and flaws. If we cannot agree on a common standard

of judgment and the quality we wish to promote, then we are simply relying on personal taste. Therefore coming up with a consensus is difficult.

Cheuk: Is it possible to give two Silver Awards?

Kwong: Yes. Someone suggested **Red Apple** as Gold Award winner, while someone else suggested **Molding** should win Gold. Someone also suggested two Gold or two Silver awards.

Cheuk: I am quite clear on my choice. **Molding** for Gold Award, and **Red Apple** for Silver, because the two works are different.

Chow: With regards to **Molding**, I quite agree with Adam. It is not up to the standard of a Gold Award winner, and does not quite show the full capacity of the director. The work is only 4 minutes long, and could be longer and explored its theme more deeply. I think the message of the film is too superficial and shallow. It could have been more profound. Judging **Red Apple** by the same standards, it places a pair of eyes in a market and allows me to understand some things I may be interested in and inspired me to think about some issues. However, its technique and intention is lacking. So it is hard to decide.

Cheuk: Are you leaning towards two Silver Awards?

Tsang: My personal view is one Gold and one Silver rather than two Silver Awards.

Wong: I'm leaning towards two Silvers, because the quality of the two films is about the same.

Kwong: I want to clarify. Aside from **Red Apple** and **Molding**, are you not considering other works for Gold and Silver Awards? If not, then we'll concentrate on discussing these two works. We now have three options. Some suggest giving **Molding** the Gold Award and **Red Apple** the Silver, the second option is two Gold Awards, while the third is two Silver Awards.

Tang: I think we can exclude two Gold Awards.

Fan: Now Cheuk Wan-chi and Jessey Tsang are in favor of one Gold and one Silver.

Chow: I support two Silver Awards.

Wong: Me too.

Tang: I am in support of two Silver Awards also.

Kwong: Now there are 3 votes for two Silver Awards, and 2 votes for one Gold and one Silver. So this is our award distribution for this year. **Red Apple** and **Molding** both get Silver Awards. Now there are 4 works left. **Symbiosis** has 3 votes, **Twin Ice** has 2, while **Rainbow** and **Invisible notes** each has 1 vote. Please nominate your special mention works.

Cheuk: I nominate **Invisible notes** for its male lead.

Wong: I nominate **Twin Ice** for its small charms.

Tsang: I nominate **Rainbow** for its director.

Cheuk: We are not giving **The Boy** any encouragement?

Chow: **Symbiosis** doesn't have anything. I nominate **Symbiosis**.

Tang: We have to state the quality that we wish to commend for all the Special Mention Awards?

Lui: At the award ceremony, the jurors will state what quality they want to commend.

Kwong: In the past, some jurors think that they would rather give fewer Special Mentions, but some feel that giving more is okay.

Cheuk: Can we first put **Symbiosis** on the list for Special Mention, because it has received 3 votes already.

Kwong: Can you talk about the special quality about **Symbiosis** that deserves Special Mention?

Cheuk: Experimental spirit.

Chow: Its experimental spirit of expression.

Tang: I continue my support of **Twin Ice**.

Wong: Now we are discussing whether we should give out 4 Special Mentions?

Kwong: That's right.

Wong: I support **Invisible notes**.

Tsang: I support **Rainbow**.

Chow: I also support **Rainbow**.

Wong: I support giving 4 Special Mentions.

Tang: I also don't object to 4 Special Mentions.

Cheuk: I think it's a good thing to offer more encouragement.

Kwong: Okay, let me repeat. We have two Silver Awards: **Red Apple** and **Molding**, and 4 Special Mentions: **Symbiosis**, **Twin Ice**, **Invisible notes** and **Rainbow**.

Youth Category

Gold Award

Withhold

Silver Award

Molding / Ng Chak-hang

Red Apple / Lee Wai-yam, Tang Lok-yiu

Special Mention

Invisible notes / Tang Yik-chi, Tang Lok-yiu, Tse Chun-lai, Kwong Wai-shan, Fung Yee-man, Chan Tsz-him, Cheng Lok-kwan, Cheng Tsz-tim, Wong Wing-chung, Tam Ching-yiu

Rainbow / Law Ho-pui

Symbiosis / Pun Tsz-wai

Twin Ice / Ma Man-ching, Lee Sin-ming, Chan Chun-hong, Chan Leung-yu Kathy, Ho Ka-wai, Gong Ho-ching Rio, Chung Ka-wai, Tsang Ching-yee