

**The 24th ifva Awards
Youth Category Jury Meeting Transcript**

Jury Members: Serrini (S), Andrew Choi (Choi), Adam Wong (Wong), Wong Chun (Chun), May Fung (Fung)

Organizer representative: Kattie Fan (Fan)

Fan: Today, our goal is to select the Gold, Silver award winners and 3 Special Mentions among the 10 finalist works. The Gold and Silver award winners will receive HK\$20,000 and HK\$10,000, respectively, while the Special Mentions will receive certificates.

Chun: Last year, there were many one-minute UNICEF shorts among the finalists. Did the number of entries decrease from last year, or did the first-round jury not pick any such works?

Choi: There were a lot of such films, but they were eliminated in the first round.

Fan: We received 83 works this year, from which 10 finalist works were chosen.

Choi: Is the number of works fewer than previous years?

Fan: It's about the same as previous years.

S: How do you feel about comparing the one-minute UNICEF works with the longer shorts?

Chun: I don't think it matters. The length of the works is not a main consideration. Rather, originality, creative ideas and the integrity of the works are more important.

Fan: We invited UNICEF to be our collaborator, but we do not have any creative input into the films.

Choi: In the first round, there were about thirty or forty one-minute films, but their quality vary greatly, so in the end we only included two in the finalist round.

Fan: Perhaps first-round jurors can share their experiences of the selection process?

Choi: We had doubts about whether some of the works were produced by young people. Several works raised this kind of doubt in us.

Fan: Why don't we discuss the works one by one and then nominate works for awards? The first work is *Dear*.

- Fung: We chose this work initially because we think it is interesting and bold. The whole film is made in the Japanese language and captures the grace and stillness of Japanese films. Even though this style of work is not original, the filmmaker captures a certain mood and the work is very touching. Compared with other works, this film makes use of the texture of Japanese film to good effect. However, watching it again today, I wonder if it was made completely by students. It seems that their teachers have a big part in the production, and I have a lot of doubts about its treatment.
- Chun: I think it is hard to judge, and I don't think it is the juror's job to conjecture a film's division of labour. We cannot prove things one way or another, we just have to place our trust in the work, unless it is too over the board.
- S: I feel it is like a piece of homework for a Japanese language course in which the students are tasked with writing the dialogue, which is too difficult, literary and beautiful, especially the soliloquy at the end (derived from Natsume Sōseki's *The moon is beautiful tonight*), which is a cliched way of saying I love you. Set in a Hong Kong school using Japanese language, its feeling of innocence does not work well in the Hong Kong context. I expect the basketball playing boys to shove at each other and swear, which would be very typical of Hong Kong. However, speaking in Japanese, the actors fail to deliver. Many edit points are unclear, like going to the sports ground directly after playing the piano, and from the sports ground they go directly into the corridor. The spatial shifts are hard to grasp.
- Chun: I think it is hard to use the term borrowing, it's more like straight out imitation. The director fails to notice or explore the kind of cultural and language clashes that speaking Japanese in Hong Kong would bring. Do they choose to ignore these factors, or pay attention to the clashes these factors bring about in their work?
- Fung: At this point they haven't achieved the latter.
- Chun: If it is just imitation, I don't think it's a worthy creative intention.
- S: It's interesting to put the Japanese language into the Hong Kong context.
- Chun: When watching the work, I expect the creators to expand on the clash of different contexts. Do they point out the incongruities? In the end they did not take them into consideration, and the work lacks a sense of experimentation and tolerance of those incongruities.
- Fung: I agree with Serrini that the work seems like a piece of homework, and they did not think too deeply about issues.
- Chun: In terms of storytelling and the control of sound, this work is relatively more mature among the ten works. The creator's understanding of editing, time and space is more open, whereas other works are more typical and only express what they film.

- Wong: The shots of flowers at the beginning led me to expect something more layered in this work, but after a few minutes my expectations began to fade. The work is cliched, but I appreciate that they are not burdened in using this way of expression, they don't need to think about the meaning behind it. I think they don't go far enough, it should be even more cliched. The shots of blue skies remind me of Makoto Shinkai, which brings out the sense of literary work. I am glad that young people are still into this kind of feeling. This has nothing to do with whether the work is good or not, but at least the creators are not chasing current fads. This kind of simplicity is worth encouraging.
- Chun: I am still trying to calibrate what aesthetics standards to apply to this work. Should I appreciate its wholehearted imitation, or insist that this kind of imitation is not very creative?
- Choi: When I saw it the first time, we discussed whether some of the shots imitate certain Japanese films. Watching it again this time, I feel a sense of incongruity. Just as Serrini said, the characters are in Hong Kong but they speak in Japanese, which seems pretentious and makes it hard to get into the story. It seems as though they want to show that they know Japanese, and so they made the film in Japanese.
- Fung: I feel touched seeing the film this time. Some of the shots are typical of Japanese literary films, which contrast with shots they come up with themselves. It's obvious that they must have done a lot of homework to be able to imitate this style.
- Choi: It would be better if they had gone deeper.
- Chun: I think they are genuine and honest in their presentation of this romantic style rather than trying to imitate others. They are able to use visual language to tell their story in a smooth way, which is a rare achievement.
- S: It's hard to imagine whether they can achieve this sense of purity if it was filmed in Cantonese, and what the effect will be.
- Chun: If it was in Cantonese, it would be something else entirely.
- Fung: The whole work is very detailed, but when watching it on the big screen, I can see that the piano scene is out of focus.
- Fan: The next work is *Speechless*.
- Chun: This is similar to the documentary last year that talks about life. The intentions behind the work is benevolent and commendable, but it suffers from the same problem as the other documentary, which is that it is too direct and filled with information. It is more appropriate to call this a reporting documentary. The film starts off with an animation, which is interesting. I expected the filmmaker to go deeper in terms of the expression or put more thought into the creative elements, but in the end, it is just straight-forward reportage. The thinking behind the work is not comprehensive but the intention is good.

- Wong: On the whole, the work is relatively mediocre not just in terms of the technique, but also the problems that it explores is superficial. The images do not capture the suffering of animals and the content does not fully explore the mindset of people who mistreat animals. Is the opening animation interesting? I can only say they put in some effort, but it does not chime well with the rest of the film. The animation can only be seen as decoration in an otherwise ordinary work. The incident had been reported in the media and many Hong Kong people know about it, but for those who don't, the animation only shows the experience of a Japanese Spitz, but the expression is vague and weak. The whole work uses a singular and ordinary piece of music and the effect is monotonous.
- Chun: Many works from the Youth Category this year use music to drive the whole piece.
- Choi: The structure is comparatively straightforward. It gives viewers a lot of information but it is not deep and reflective enough. It is a worthy attempt in terms of the research and the animation at the beginning, but it does not reach a higher level.
- Fung: The animation is interesting and gives people a happy feeling, but later the tone shifts to become more realistic. I agree with you that aside from this part, the work lacks creativity. As secondary school students, it's good that they react to current affairs. It is not an outstanding work, but it's commendable.
- S: I agree that it's good that they care about society, but as the film progresses, it seems like a promotion video for Roy Kwong Chun-yu, and argument is not too effective or sufficient. For example, he mentions there will be greater penalty, but does not explain how to achieve the end result. The interview with the institution staff is also vague. Why pick this institution? The owner keeps a lot of dogs in a tenement flat, but the film never explains his background. Also, the filmmaker includes many shots of small animals to show their pitiable state, but the effect is not pitiable. If that is something the filmmaker tries to get across, the film does not quite achieve it.
- Fan: The next work is *See Me Fly*.
- Chun: The plot is easy to guess. I basically was able to guess after the first five seconds what the first-round juror Amos Why called suspenseful. The film shows a girl erasing something on a blackboard but does not show what the blackboard says until the end, yet the whole thing is expected.
- Wong: It'd be better if she simply opened the window and let the camera capture the outside world instead of showing the pictures on the blackboard. Now everything is too neat.
- S: I don't see how unhappy the girl is under the exam system. It seems as though she is just melancholic when she just goes into the classroom and opens the window. I don't know what her intentions are.

- Chun: The works from secondary school students in the past few years are almost always about pressure from school work and exams, with few exceptions.
- Fan: The next work is *Zero*.
- S: The story is very personal.
- Chun: I think it's taken from incidents in real life. This is typical of works on campus TV.
- S: Because the end credits show the names of the bully and victim.
- Wong: These kinds of topics appear every year. I call them campus purgatory films, because they make school life look hellish. The biggest problem is that the director put in a lot of effort but shows no restraint. Basically, the director uses every means at their disposal, such as transitions and texts. Sometimes the work is like a silent film but sometimes not, and adds clever twists with the text sometimes but at other times the text is normal. The transitions are not clean and look fragmented and messy. The director's handling of the form and process of film production is relatively weak.
- Chun: At the end when he is questioned by the police, he feels regretful that his friend died because of his bullying. His punishment is to raise a chair in the air, which I don't understand.
- Fung: This part is very vague. Perhaps he had been punished this way in the past. On the whole, the work is vague in how it depicts time.
- Wong: That place does not look like a police station.
- Chun: I am not sure if it is a substitution technique.
- Wong: It is apparent that the director has a lot to say and tries hard, but the execution is not rigorous enough.
- Choi: I agree with Adam that the work does not come together well enough. Why does the middle part involving dodge balls have to be so long?
- Fung: The treatment is strange and the teacher character is also weird.
- Wong: The character is played by a secondary school student.
- Chun: I don't mind his handling methods or technical problems. I just think that he has no unique opinions on this subject. The film simply expresses what everyone already understands and knows. If the director had observed bullying up close or experienced it personally and have something to say about it, he would have something unique to offer even if his technique is not good. However, I don't see it in this work.

- S: The filmmaker wants to express a very direct message, that is, "the person who hurts me will receive retribution." His work description says that in the film, evil people come to bad ends, but this is not necessarily true in reality. The message he wants to bring out is a cry of protest that "bullying is wrong." In the film, there are many characters who hurt others, but they are very flat characters who merely injure people while the victims do not get help from others and there is no one to speak up for them. The victim's acting is good. On the whole, the work brings out the message on campus TV that "hurting other people is wrong."
- Fan: The next work is *Run of My Life*.
- Chun: From my perspective, this is the best film. Even though it is not too long, I knew that the director had thought about his way of expression deeply from the first few shots. The use of sound, visuals and control over time and space are good. Some of the synecdoche is also interesting, and I can accept the low-fi nature of the work. The pixilated quick zoom close up is also coherent. In the Youth Category, our focus is not on technique, but the potential of the creators. Judging from the director's creativity, one can see a lot of potential. This is an artist with good potential.
- S: Is the camera he uses of higher quality than the other entrants?
- Chun: This is considered basic filming equipment. I guess it was filmed in 60 frames per second.
- Fung: He put that to good use.
- S: He is able to capture facial expressions well.
- Wong: I am not happy with the beginning and end credits. He obviously put a lot of thought into translating that philosophy into a short and concise work, but the trademark at the beginning and the making-of footage at the end ruined the conciseness of the work.
- Chun: For a short film, that part takes up a relatively long time.
- Wong: He is not rigorous enough.
- Fan: The next work is *LIFE Limited*.
- S: The story is interesting, but I don't understand the ending.
- Fung: What does the elevator at the end mean?
- Chun: That person is the replacement.
- Wong: I guess that he wants to bring out the message that people should be themselves.

- Chun: Does he want the audience to guess whether that is the replacement or his own self?
- All: That's right.
- Choi: I notice that in the beginning, his clothing is of a different colour.
- Fung: I guess it is to bring out the idea of true self and false self.
- Chun: This work is complete, but there are few surprises. The script and grasp of visuals are quite good, while the plot and story progression effectively express the director's ideas. Having someone replace you can be a very bad thing. How bad? What are the moral implications? This is a common story idea. The female protagonist finds out that the person she is dating is false; this is not a surprising plot point, but an effective one. The production is fine and some of the shots are good attempts. The shot involving the exchange is so-so in terms of execution, some of the storyboarding serves the drama and the storytelling and production compliment each other. This is not a first-rate Youth Category work, but in this edition of **ifva**, this work is complete.
- S: The scene in which the girl students are chatting is the most natural scene set in a school out of the 10 finalists.
- Wong: The script is quite well-written, and I admire the sub-plot of Cherry who was bullied. Finally, the heroine complained that her boyfriend sought a replacement to date her and mentioned this to her close friend. I am not sure what the director wants to convey with this part. Maybe he wants the audience to think about what the purpose of life is. This sub-plot makes us think. Having this appear in the script is well thought-out, and unique. The production is thoughtful, as is the use of jump-cut and time lapse. Even though most people feel that we should not pay too much attention to technique in this category, I still want to mention this film's technique. In the past, many entries can achieve good production standards in terms of character design, performance and set design. Among conventional dramas, *Dear*. is relatively good.
- Fung: This film is the most well-rounded, and all the elements are just right. However, watching it the second time, I did not like it as much. The tone, acting and sets are not realistic, many small details are lacking and only in the story line and the meaning of the story can we detect a little vitality.
- Choi: The filmmaker tried his best and the work is complete.
- Fung: Every part is well-designed.
- Wong: Does it not lack passion?

- Fung: The story is too straightforward. It is not exciting enough and did not inspire me to think deeper.
- S: The suspenseful parts are not well-delineated and there is no follow-up.
- Fan: The next work is *Balance*.
- S: Personally, I like this the best. It is a very mature work. The dialogue between the two boys seems so perverted.
- Fung: It is perverted yet appropriate.
- S: It seems appropriate but not preachy. They seem to talk nonsense but yet it makes sense.
- Chun: His message is simple, very singular and strong, but his idea is not too unique or new. The filmmaker effectively communicated his message, but I did not get much out of it.
- Wong: The police detention room is supposed to be a realistic scene, but they got students to play adults, which I can't accept. It is like watching a children's play.
- Chun: I agree, the two young people don't look like police.
- S: This film is a little different from the others. It wants to communicate some easy to understand message, which is often seen in Japanese comics. The two boys as well as the writing and directing are interesting. Much of the dialogues come out non-stop, which is mostly exposition. I appreciate the actor who plays it like a pervert with his stubbles, obesity and lisp. The film is like a futuristic science fiction film.
- Choi: If you take away the parts about environmental pollution, we are left with only what the two characters talk about. I agree with what Adam said, that the police part is not well done. The fat boy really makes people believe that this world is bad.
- Fan: The next work is *ON*.
- S: This is very interesting.
- Chun: By comparison, this work is more interesting. Is the main character the filmmaker?
- Choi: Yes, I met her at the press conference for the 24th **ifva**, she said she made the film on her cell phone by herself.
- Chun: This is also a case of a child playing an adult, as Adam said, but it gives audiences a context to accept that. The rhythm, acting and the whole visual style is distinctive. Even though it is not ground-breaking, the filmmaker thought about how to express herself, which is better than the more straightforward method that

other people used. I appreciate people who have something to say and think about how best to convey their ideas.

Fung: The film is simple, and this is what short films should be like. She does not have much resources, and is responsible for the lighting and dialogue, which is touching. The film communicates its message in a simple way, and causes audiences to think.

Fan: The next work is *Depression*.

Chun: Is the protagonist the director?

Choi: No.

Wong: The soliloquy is very good.

Fung: It is very real.

Wong: Quite powerful.

Choi: As we discussed in the first round, this shows the state of depression.

Wong: But as the film goes on, I feel the dialogue and visuals lack spark. I think that this kind of stream of consciousness expression can more powerfully depict the world of depression, the perspective of patients and their everyday environment. As it is, the treatment is just superficial. The close-up shots of her taking medicine and on the bed have some power, but with the part about the girl and her tutor, I just assume that it is part of her daily life. However, the film does not talk about what the tutoring has to do with the whole matter, and I don't get it.

Fung: She does not bring out any messages with that, it is just a depiction of a part of her life.

Wong: I like the part at the end about Tin Shui Wai. I like it, but it seems not to match the preceding part and is off topic. I like watching the night scene of Tin Shui Wai.

S: It's like going out to society to take a look. I like the line of dialogue that says, "What do you want me to say? I may not say what you want to hear, because I don't know what I am doing..." I think the room is messy and has a lot of stuff, but the film never explains it. It could have explained more.

Fan: The last work is *Alert*.

Wong: This entrant seems to have participated in **ifva** competition two years ago. I know her and know that she likes filmmaking. I know a little about her background, so it is easier for me to identify with her reflection about her work. If you don't know her and watch this work, you may find the work too personal.

- Fung: Did she win any awards two years ago?
- Wong: She was among the ten finalists.
- Fan: The work won Special Mention.
- Wong: I personally like it. I can understand that she seems to have let go of her work. In the end, the work turns from colour to black and white, and the person changes from black and white to colour. Although this intention is very straightforward by comparing the fake created world with the character's life, which becomes more colourful. I find this realization touching.
- Choi: I agree. After talking to her, I watched the film again. I realize that she had tried different kinds of artistic creations, and I understand her struggle with her art.
- S: I think her ego is very big. It seems that she wants everyone to understand her personal struggles and put creation in a somewhat awkward position. When you (the audience) have not talked to her, you will not understand. Her emotions are handled very well, like a person talking to herself.
- Fung: I think she has great potential. The second time watching this film, I feel that she is very reflective and this is an experimental work. I began to wonder what she wanted to do, but slowly began to understand. I hope she will continue to work hard. Her facial expressions are unique and deliberate, and I accept this coherence and experimentation. But this is a gamble and many people may not understand what she is doing.
- Chun: I agree. For the general public, the (message) may be hard to get, but for us artists, the message is effective. The director turned her frustration or self-reflection into a creation, which is very smart and honest. Typical of many artists, she is torn between feeling inferior and arrogant. She has potential, and I appreciate her autobiographical introspection.
- Fung: It is interesting to note that basically the film does not say anything, but just relies on visuals to get across its point of view.
- Chun: For a person of this age, she has a lot of potential in that she has the ability to be introspective and self-aware and become dissatisfied with her own work. The only thing I didn't like was that she relies too much on music in her work. If you take the music away, the whole thing will not work, which is a pity. This is a "coming out of the closet" (honestly facing your own shortcomings) story, right? She is so courageous and credible, yet fails to find a way to reach a conclusion at the end or expand on the latter part, which seems a waste.
- Fung: She did not completely abandon music. Sound is very important and can help advance the film, and she uses different music in different parts. I guess that she likes music, so she cannot give that up because it would be too challenging.

Perhaps she could have used some sound that is detached from the visuals, but I think she is not bold enough to do so.

Chun: What is the next agenda?

Fan: Do you have any work that you want to nominate? Do you already have Gold, Silver and three Special Mention awards in mind?

Chun: Do we only have three Special Mentions, or is it up for discussion?

Fan: I lean toward only having three, since only the Youth Category have three while other categories have just one Special Mention. This category aims to encourage artists, and we have had 4 Special Mentions in the past. If you think the works are not up to standard, you can omit some awards.

Chun: I understand. Based on previous years' experience, shall we discuss whether to omit prizes?

Wong: On the whole, the quality of works is not good. It is the worst in years.

Chun: Do you think we should omit Gold Award?

Wong: We can consider it.

Chun: I also think it is worth discussing.

Fung: I have also had experience with other competitions. I don't think we need to omit prizes. Why don't we each nominate 5 films for discussion? I suggest *Alert*, *ON*, *Balance.*, *Run of My Life* and *Dear*.

S: My choices are the same.

Chun: I choose *Run of My Life*, *LIFE Limited*, *ON* and *Alert*. That's it for now.

Wong: *Dear*. and *Alert*.

Choi: *Alert*, *LIFE Limited*, *Run of My Life*, *Dear*. and *ON*.

Wong: I am adding *Depression*.

Fan: So far, *Alert* got the most votes, even though that does not mean it's the best film. We can discuss that later. Five people voted for *Alert*. *Run of My Life* and *Dear*. each got 4 votes.

S: I don't think *Dear*. deserves the Gold Award.

Fung: I agree, otherwise, people will think that the award is based on technique alone.

- Chun: I agree, we can start the discussion based on this criterion. We can encourage technique but not overly emphasize it.
- Wong: Does *Alert* deserve the Gold Award?
- Fung: Yes.
- Wong: I think it is the only deserving work. However, I also agree that its use of sound is a bit cliched.
- Fung: But this is only in comparison with other works.
- Fan: This far, we all agree that *Alert* can be nominated for Gold Award?
- Chun: I think we can omit Gold Award, and if so, can we give out two Silver Awards? This sends out the message that we want to encourage young artists but we have expectations about **ifva**. On the whole, the standard this year is not high, so I suggest not giving Gold Award and give out two Silver instead.
- Fung: I insist that *Alert* is better than *Run of My Life*.
- Wong and Choi: I agree.
- Fung: So, I disagree with giving out two Silver Awards.
- Choi: I agree.
- Fung: Are you going to raise up *Run of My Life* and put down *Alert*? I don't know about previous years, but there is no reason to make such comparisons.
- Wong: I suggest omitting Gold and give out one Silver and 4 Special Mentions.
- Fung: I don't see any reason for omitting Gold.
- S: If a young artist gets the Gold Award, it is very encouraging for them. If a work that is so personal and questioning of the self ends up getting Gold, it would have an interesting effect.
- Fung: I am looking at the judging criteria: independent spirit, content, creativity and form.
- S: I don't think *Alert* is superior to *Run of My Life*.
- Fung: You think they are the same?
- S: Not really, they are just two very different works.

- Fung: Do you agree with what Adam said about giving one Silver and 4 Special Mentions?
- S: Has **ifva** done that in the past?
- Fan: Yes.
- Wong: We discussed omitting Gold last year and again this year. That means the overall standards has fallen again.
- Fung: We should compare this year's works, and I don't think they are unworthy. I have seen other awards that are really unworthy. Why shouldn't this work get Gold? What's wrong with it?
- Choi: We spoke about the director of *Alert* and agreed that she has a lot of potential in depicting a certain kind of struggle. *Run of My Life* is obviously a young person's point of view. Judging from the creativity of the artist and sense of experimentation, it deserves the Gold Award. Of course, every work has its flaws and could have been better, but putting aside from some cliched elements, it deserves Gold.
- Fung: I think many of the films have potential. I am not sure how good the works were in the past.
- Chun: If we set aside omitting awards for now, what are your nominations for Gold?
- Wong: *Alert*.
- Choi: Me too.
- S: My picks are *Alert* and *Run of My Life*. They are similar in spirit. The former is serious, striving and intense, whereas the latter is lighter.
- Chun: I choose *Run of My Life*, but not for Gold. I would rather give out two Silver. The two works are very different in their intentions, and neither is better than the other, nor are they very outstanding, so I would rather give two Silvers.
- Fung: I do not consider one better than the other, I simply consider which one is the best. *Run of My Life* is good, but it's not the best work, while *Alert* involves more effort and successfully conveys a certain emotion.
- Chun: I think *Alert* is profound and the director has certain expectations about her works, but as a visual creator, her imageries are only so-so. As for *Run of My Life*, it is not very deep but the visuals are handled better. Both elements should be taken into account.
- Wong: I consider *Run of My Life* to be more creative. The artist turns a message into an imagery. *Alert* left a deep impression, but the effect is more emotional. If Gold

Award is a form of encouragement, then it should be based on this emotional impact and that it affected me personally. Some parts are too straightforward and familiar and therefore commonplace, like the imageries about coming out of darkness. I have seen too many student films, and many of them cannot escape such clichés. Also, I agree with Chun's point about the music. I think the subject matter can be sharper.

Chun: I wonder what kind of artist should Youth Category encourage? Of course, we should commend an artist who is self-reflective. However, if she holds herself to such high standards, she should pay more attention to how she treats her visuals. She does not think about that enough. She is merely dissatisfied with her own work but does not consider how to improve it, and in the end settles for a rather ordinary way.

Fung: As long as she can fully express her feelings and I am able to get it, I think that's okay. I appreciate that the filmmaker is able to completely convey her emotions and certain concepts within a short film. I also admire *Run of My Life*, but on the whole, *Alert* is better. However, after listening to what Adam just said, I feel conflicted.

Wong: I like *Run of My Life* and appreciate his clever ideas. His short film is concise but to the point.

Fung: *Alert* is not as clever as *Run of My Life*, but the thinking behind it is better.

Wong: You cannot ignore technique. I cannot accept the hand turning in the background in *Run of My Life*.

Chun: I can accept that, it is effective.

Fung: It is playful. The film is able to communicate the filmmaker's situation and is complete.

Chun: The film does not try to cheat the audience. That hand obviously belongs to him.

Wong: I don't feel the playfulness of the hand part, it is a bit sneaky. By contrast, having the classmate sprinkling paper at the back is obviously deception, I can accept and appreciate this kind of artistic form. I think that secondary school students can have good technique without spending a lot of money on equipment and complicated methods. The most powerful Youth Category works can be done with the simplest equipment such as a tripod and achieve good rhythm and art direction.

Fung: *ON* is able to achieve what you said.

Chun: Why don't we move on with our discussion?

Wong: Should we decide the ranking first before discussing whether to omit awards?

- All: Yes.
- Fung: I don't think comparisons should be made with previous years. Every year, the creative environment is different. Many factors may influence the quality of the works. Andrew and I both feel that we should not omit awards. As a jury member, I support works that I believe in. If we omit Gold, do we give out two Silvers?
- Chun: I think it's feasible to omit Gold this year. We need not have Gold Award winners every year.
- Wong: It's not the first time we omitted Gold Award. In the end, it is a matter of whether a work can move jury members and convince them to give out Gold Awards.
- Chun: Shall we vote on whether to omit Gold?
- Choi: *Alert*'s ideas are more deep and profound than *Run of My Life*, so I give my vote to *Alert*.
- S: Omitting awards is strange. I feel that if we omit Gold, we can consider giving out two Silvers. However, other than these two, I don't think any other works deserve Silver.
- Wong: I have never felt that omitting Gold means we do not encourage artists.
- Chun: If we omit Gold this year, Silver represents a great encouragement, and will spur entrants to examine themselves. This is a kind of encouragement.
- Fung: What do you think, Serrini?
- S: According to what you said just now, we can omit Gold.
- Fung: Will we omit Silver also?
- Chun: No.
- Wong: If we omit Gold, do we give out one or two Silvers? My marks are different for the two works, so we can discuss it. I favor one Silver and 3 Special Mentions.
- Chun: Let's discuss our award list and gain some understanding first.
- Fung: I choose *Alert* as Silver, *Dear.*, *Run of My Life*, *Balance*, and *ON* as Special Mentions.
- Choi: I choose *Alert* as Silver, *Dear.*, *Run of My Life*, *LIFE Limited* and *ON* as Special Mentions.
- Wong: I choose *Alert* as Silver, *Dear.* and *Depression* as Special Mentions.

- S: *Alert* and *Run of My Life* as Silver, *Dear.*, *Balance.* and *ON* as Special Mentions.
- Chun: *Alert* and *Run of My Life* as Silver, *Dear.*, *LIFE Limited* and *ON* as Special Mentions. How do we discuss further?
- Fan: We can narrow down the choices by deciding the Silver. Now there are three votes for Silver Award given to *Alert* and two votes for two Silvers to *Alert* and *Run of My Life*. Do we have other options?
- Fung: No, but I suggest giving *Run of My Life* Special Mention, since it already received 4 votes, some for Silver and some for Special Mention.
- Fan: Yes, if we count the votes, Silver should go to *Alert*, the first place for Special Mention is *Run of My Life*, which received two votes for Silver and two for Special Mention. The second place is *ON*, with four votes for Special Mention, third place is *Dear.*, with four votes for Special Mention.
- All: I agree.

The 24th ifva Awards - Youth Category Award Winners**Gold Award***Nil***Silver Award***Alert*

Fong Ho-ching

Special Mention*Run of My Life*

Tam Tsz-lok Douglas

Dear.

Wong E-ki, Yeung Hoi-tung

ON

Tsang Choi-shu