

25th ifva Awards Media Art Category Jury Meeting Transcript

Jury Members : Bryan Chung (Chung), Tamás Waliczky (Tamas), Kingsley Ng (Ng), Joseph Cutts (Cutts), Takahashi Mizuki (Mizuki)

Organizer representatives : Kattie Fan (Fan)

Fan: Due to the COVID-19, we are not able to stage our exhibition this year. This is the first time we use this way to assess the artworks, through mainly the documents and the materials that you received. Hopefully we can get to the point and understand about the artworks without seeing its presence in the exhibition space. Today, our mission is to select the awards. The awards for the Media Arts category include one Gold Award, one Silver Award and one Special Mention. The 10 finalist works were selected by Bryan, Tamas and Ip Yuk Yiu earlier this year.

We will begin with the first artwork, *As You Were Here*. I would like to invite Tamas or Bryan to take the lead, because you chose the 10 finalists in the first round.

Chung: I chose this in the first round as one of the ten finalists because it is not common to have wearable technology or wearable artwork, especially in Hong Kong. In a lot of media art festivals, we usually see installation or screen-based material. I am interested in the link between the artist and her mother, and also the use of very everyday-life routines and interactions between mother and daughter, and how that could be packaged into some wearable technology that helps her to keep the memory of the interaction between herself and her mother. The downside of this work is that because of the budgeting and DIY approach, the knitwear is not wearable and sometimes too bulky because it needs to incorporate those motor or other devices inside the knitwear, and because of the DIY production, it is not very functional. I like the idea about using the everyday-life interactions in this piece of work.

Tamas: I also like this work. I agree that this is quite a unique piece. Most of the time I see works in media art exhibitions that are screen-based or electronics device-based. It is quite rare that you see some interactive type of textile. Also, it's very feminine, I also like the whole point of view of a young girl, the personal connection with her mother and the remembrance of the mother. I think the whole piece has a very charming humor, it's funny how that knitwear reacts to the movements of the girl. I really like this work, and from my point of view, I can imagine it as one of the winners. For me, it's quite unique.

Cutts: I would echo that. Although it was one of the first works that I went through, it was one of the strongest for me. One of the reasons being how heart-warming it felt, even though I am only reading and seeing imagery about it. Not just the relationship between the mother and the daughter, but the impact you felt afterwards. Not being in the room with it, but just seeing the video aspect of it and seeing the materials, and understanding that it's not a giant technological conglomerate that we need to get our

heads around, impact played the biggest role for me. It really got to the point in a very basic way, and that left me the most powerful message. I didn't have to try very hard to understand what was going on, and therefore my level of participation, or lack thereof, was really cemented with this. You can feel something that is so subjective, the relationship between the artist and her mother, that it opens outwards and you can feel how that resonated with you, so I started to feel how I was as a child, having my mother say certain things to me. The work is very well-conceived from a technological and textile point of view. For me, it was one of the highlights of the 10 finalists.

Ng: I agree with most of the comments. The work is warm, touching and original. Because I'm with the Academy and we have a lot of youngsters. Many of them like to deal with family subjects, so this way of thinking is not too new because I see students tap into this often, with different approaches, such as jewelry or ceramics. The juxtaposition of technologies in this work is interesting, however I also echo Bryan's point a little bit that there is a kind of clumsiness in the work and an unfinished DIY quality, maybe it's something the artist intended, but I had just seen Mizuki's exhibition which was very well curated. While this work is still somewhat wearable, we should take into consideration the attention paid to the materials of the textile. I think it's an excellent work, but it is still for me a little bit like a student project, and I can see great potential in furthering her endeavor. Works don't have to deal with big issues like climate change or politics, rather, something that is so close to you and sincere, about your own human relationships, this is something we highly value at the Academy.

Mizuki: When I saw this work, I thought I was invited as a juror because of this work, since I work in the Centre for Heritage, Arts and Textile. This is also one of my favorite works, because there are many points that allow the audience to engage in the artwork. In fashion and media arts, there are many wearables today, but you don't know why these artworks need to be wearable, but in this work, there is a very strong reason. It's for the artist to physically sense her mother, which makes sense for me. I also quite like the bulky finishing, it successfully imparts the sense of tactility of this work, and that's also justifies why she needs to use knitting.

Cutts: The video aspect that we see in the application, is that part of the installation as well, or is it primarily the material tools? Is the video an instructional narrative that comes with it? Is it part of the artwork, or is it purely for jury purposes?

Fan: She has the little screen to showcase with the artwork.

Cutts: I recognize the video quite well, and saw it as the two-layer aspect of the work. Not that I thought it needed instructions, but the level of editing involved in how you're wearing certain things, the relationship between your body and the putting on of those materials was quite important.

Fan: Let's move on to the next work, *Bystander*.

Tamas: I think it's a nice work, mostly based on photogrammetry technology. It's quite poetic and has a strong visual impression. I also liked the personal connection between the topic and the artist's own self-healing idea. My problem is I learned photogrammetry by myself, and in the past few years, I have seen a few works based on photogrammetry technology, and my problem with most of these works is they concentrate on the problems of photogrammetry, instead of trying to make it professional and using the technology on a high level, they concentrate on the failures of this technology. Sometimes this can be nice, and sometimes it can be well-connected with the message of the work, but here for me it's a bit weak to only see the point cloud of these objects instead of the real photogrammetry surfaces. But still it's a nice, poetic work. It's well-made and interesting.

Chung: I echo what Tamas mentioned. I also like the work and the connection with the dramatic experience of the artist's childhood. I particularly like the sound design of the work, compared with what Tamas mentioned about the glitch of the photogrammetry technology. One thing that gave me a bit of hesitation is the use of the images of Hong Kong, and those Hong Kong settings are quite tongue-in-cheek in a sense, like when we are referring to come exotic location, we always show those areas of Mong Kok and those kinds of neon lights. In this case, I'm not particularly sure whether her own traumatic experiences were related to those contextual settings of those real or virtual locations in Hong Kong. This is one thing I am not so sure about the work.

Cutts: Going from the first project that we talked about, which is basic in its methodology and the narrative it is trying to put out, this work deals with a serious subject matter and a difficult one to get across because it uses many different elements, with VR and wider audio projection. The work suggests what is the relationship between those two elements, the VR and the wider impact of the audio aspect, which may have been lost to me as a participant because we're talking about something that is so mind-rooted, and not presented as a physical thing in front of you. In terms of the impact of audio and projection, it resonated with me quite a lot, it kept me there for some time. I feel the work could have impact primarily from the audio projection-based work as well.

Ng: I don't have much to say about the work because for me, the documentation was not sufficient for a VR work. I understand the constraints, but seeing that the artist said this was about her own traumatic experiences, this narrative was a little hard for me to understand. I don't know if it's because I don't have a full picture of the work, or if this is what one would see when engaging with the VR work. That's why my comments were not so much about the VR work itself, but I appreciate that the artist was thinking about the physical exhibition space and to link the physical and the virtual, I find that thoughtful. For the VR work itself, from the video it's hard for me

to put a critique on it because I don't think I have enough information.

Mizuki: I'm impressed with the visuals, but I am confused about the objectives of this work, because in some parts, she says she wants to use this work to heal the traumatized memories that other people may have, but in other parts she says she just wants to present her traumatized memories. I wonder which her key objective in making this artwork is. If she wants to use this artwork for healing purpose to help others, she needs to involve professional art therapists to seek for the proper advice in making this artwork. She also needs to be a bit more sensitive about using VR technology because it can be manipulative. The immersive experience will give a psychological impact on the viewer. Does she use VR technology for the viewer to simulate the traumatic experience? I am not sure.

Fan: Is there anything else? If not, we can move on to *Connection Disturbance*.

Tamas: I've seen this work at the School of Creative Media, at the graduation show. The artist is not my student, but since the artist was a student at SCM, I have a certain connection to him, even though I don't know him personally. When I saw the work, my impression was that it was very professionally made, all the elements such as the metal parts, the movements of these elements, the painting, the installation, sound level were all clean and perfectly made. The black and white contrasting forms and how they divided the space were all very aesthetic. The music or the noise generated was not my cup of tea, but I'm not a musician. It was a very professionally made work.

Chung: The work is extremely neat, tidy and clean. In the House Programme, I also wrote about the work's similarities with other artists who create mechanical reproductions of sound in this situation. The forms and shapes of those objects, the majority of them are quite geometric and simple, to the extent that it is too minimal that I cannot get any contextual ideas about the work. If I also read the description, and I sense the discrepancies between what the artist wrote in the artist statement and the work in front of me. I did not see it in the SCM show, just in the documentation and the video.

Cutts: This work is one where you have to be there in the space and it responds to the surroundings. It's very gorgeous and beautiful in its form, it resembles a lot of sculpture-based works here in the UK. The materials are essential to the output of the sounds in relations to the space, and there is a beautiful algorithmic process, or whatever the process is. I felt the level of impact of the piece with the space, an immediate form of impact; how you feel when you come away from the piece is something that is removed from my responses. I was left with looking at it, the visual aspect of it and what I felt then and there at that time, compared to say the first or second work that we have spoken about, where you come away with additional thoughts about it as well. Maybe the level of participation from the impact and thought process point of view was removed a little bit from it.

- Ng: In this case, it's hard to do justice to a sound work, so I will comment more on the visual presentation. It was also very hard to understand the relationship of the sound broadcasted from the monitor speakers and the sound coming out from the sculpture, from the sound of the recording it is very hard to tell what is going on. I also thought the placement of the work at SCM on the upper floors with the angle of the view of Kowloon gives it an interesting context, the window as a kind of backdrop is interesting, but I don't know how the artist will translate this work into the Arts Centre space, and this may not be the consideration of the awards.
- Mizuki: My comments are based on the short clip provided by the artist. As a kinetic sculpture, this work is very beautiful, but I'm not sure about the sound or noise created by the sculpture. For me, this kind of kinetic sculpture with noise sound is a bit too familiar in recent contemporary art practices. Besides the finishing, the aesthetics of the sculpture I was not too excited about, even though it is beautiful. I wonder if the artist can contextualize this artwork with other kinetic sculptures in art history.
- Fan: We can move on to *Devenir Space*.
- Tamas: This work is not judgable for me based on the video and description, which is clever and the video is quite nice. I try to imagine how this work would look like in an exhibition space, and I'm afraid that this work is nothing more than some plastic sheets hanging from a metal structures with beams projecting on it. If there is a large space with semi-transparent surfaces and some green laser beams on the surface, then it's not really original, new or deep for me. The description suggests something more interesting and deep, I would love to see this work somehow in reality, but based on the video, I can't really judge.
- Cutts: I have a similar thought process here. I projected the video a couple of times around my house, on different walls to try to get a different understanding, and I found it had a lot more to do with the lines potentially creating social spaces within isolated spaces. A lot of artworks like this works in a similar manner, so I was looking for something with a bit more abstract forms and projections. Unless you are deeply rooted within the space, and maybe there's a sound element related to the work which would have to be very ingrained in that environment.
- Chung: The bodily experience in the space is essential in order to feel or understand the work, which is a very immersive experience. I also predict that the navigation of the route the audience is walking around the space is also important and a factor in determining the illusion of that rigid space is transformed into a more fluid, light environment. Without those, it is difficult to imagine, and I just try to imagine from the documentation video, and it is difficult to judge at this moment, especially the projection needs to be bigger than human size in order to create this illusion. At this point, I can't make a very definite judgement about the quality.

- Ng: Likewise, I think it's very hard to judge through the video, but like Tamas was saying, from the plans and the documentation, I would guess it's something like Anthony McCall's works. It deals with something that has been explored by many others, it's not something totally new.
- Mizuki: My views are the same. I am also very careful about videos capturing an exhibition. The artist says he will use a metal mesh as a screen to project the video, I try to understand and simulate in my brain. I think this work is a very beautiful and artistic piece but I can't see the artist tries to introduce any critical comments about the dichotomy between real space and virtual space, as he says in the descriptions.
- Fan: A note to everyone. We wanted to review all the artworks in the exhibition space. For some of the artworks like this one, you have to experience it and feel what it is, that's why we always invite jurors to come to the exhibition before jury meeting, except this year. We asked the finalists to resubmit all the material, hopefully to let you understand what it would look like in a real space. You may also find some of the works have extra supporting materials while others only have the initial applications. For this jury meeting, we have to judge based on the documentations. The next work is *InkFlux – Freeland*.
- Tamas: For me, it's a nice, aesthetical work. I appreciate that the artist sent some extra supporting material, and it's very interesting, but for me the work is rather simple.
- Chung: The extra materials helped quite a lot. Without it, it's quite difficult to understand the contextual information related to it. I don't have too much comments, apparently it is related to the use of tear gas in different geographical locations in Hong Kong. Since it is related to geographical locations, the use of the map is quite natural. According to the documentation, the locations on the map have some sort of zoom-in effect to some particular geographical location, I'm not sure whether it will happen in the real exhibition, I suspect because of the resolution limitation in the temperature changing images, it may need to have this zoom in effect in order to have the higher resolutions of the streets. The surface is a little bit rough and I think the artist is trying to create the illusion of showing a piece of painting work, and so the choice of texture can be some other one than the existing one.
- Cutts: The work is about stillness and movement, and you're looking at something that appears to be still in its form, like a photograph, is actually transcends over a period of time so it questions the form and output. As we say in the UK, how long does it take for you to watch a video work before you tune out and decide to go and get a cup of tea. Usually it's 6-10 seconds before we start to question something, so there's a very strong ethics of participation that impacts the direct relationship with something that's concrete and flat or something that is a moveable item, and it's important to understand how that provokes you.

Ng: I agree with Tamas and Bryan that the supporting material provides the context to the work that transforms how one reads the work. So, for me that video stream is important. For those who are connected with the social movements of Hong Kong in the past months, the work may resonate with them or it may not. The work is open enough for multiple readings, and I appreciate a work like that.

Mizuki: I also like this work. He appropriates the ink painting and tries to interweave the different subject matter into the simple format. I can see that he studied about ink painting and its philosophy, and connecting it to contemporary social awareness.

Tamas: I also appreciate that he changed the original work of ink painting and tried to connect it to the protest movement in Hong Kong, and I would be very happy to see a good, interesting work about the protest that happened. But for me, this is a bit too simple to show the points where the police used water cannons or I don't know what. It doesn't tell you anything about the movement, it just tells where tear gas was used, but why it was used, whether it was used well or not well, who used it for whom, what was the background? For me there was not enough information. I would like a more complex opinion or visualization or impression from an artwork. Still, it was a very nice artwork, nice in a minimalist way, but for me, it was not complex enough, technically and artistically as well.

Fan: The next work is *Life/Time* .

Tamas: This is another one of my favorite works out of the 10 works. It's not really new, it uses zoetrope and these old animation equipment or movie devices, and it uses or refers to them in a unique, poetic and professionally-made way with these glassworks and lighting and shadow. Based on the video, the movements are really nicely animated, the whole work has a very strong atmosphere, it's really is a bit magical. As I can judge based on the video, it's really well-made, every detail is well-thought. This is one of my favorite works and I would suggest it for one of the prizes.

Chung: I think this is a very good piece of work. It is an application of early cinema device into a more complex and participatory form. The audience has to do something in order to generate sound. The only comment I have is about the animals and those figures running in the animated images. It seems to me they are like demonstrations rather than the artist wanting to talk about something related to a zoo or some type of performance related to animals. I don't know whether there's any narrative that the artist wants to communicate to us through those moving figures or animals, so this is the only one point I want to make. In general, this is a very well-made piece of work.

Cutts: I love this work. We're judging something in a media art category, but what I'm taken with this work that feels more like early cinema of the late 19th century. It felt less to do with something technological and more to do with what you can do with basic appliances, with objects and a form of light rotation and position them all in the right

ways to make maximum impact. I actually desire to be in this room; instead of wishing there was more information to go on, I can visualize what it would be like to be in that room and see that basic elements and symbols create a maximum impact-based installation. For me there's a nice harmony that comes with that, it made me feel quite happy to see it, it's very child-like as well because it is very experiential, without the severity of an intense subject matter that you may think about. With this work, the impact was immediate. I resonated with a very positive feeling towards the super basic forms. For me this ranks the second.

Ng: I agree with Bryan, this piece works for me as well, I was hoping the illustrations that go with the work could provide a more coexistence of readings. On one hand it is very playful and everyone can engage with the logical aspects of the work, but maybe the selection of the animated objects—I was hoping to get a little bit more on why certain things were chosen so that there can be more complex readings to the work. I am thinking of William Kentridge's work on shadows, which are very beautiful on its own and also tell much more.

Mizuki: It's interesting to hear Bryan and Kingsley's comments. I agree with them, it'd be better if the artist can justify the use of this motif to be animated in this work. I am still intrigued with the well-balanced beauty of the technology and the quality aspect in the artwork. Sometimes, it is not easy to engage in so-called media artworks. In this regard, this artwork is very open to everyone, and it successfully stimulate interest in the origin of animation.

Fan: Next one, *Mind Cut*.

Tamas: It is the third work I like from the 10 selected work. It is very well-made technically and aesthetically, and I really appreciate that the artist sent us some supporting material, because from one of the videos, we can see how precisely the work was designed. In the video we can see how he recorded with eight cameras around the face of somebody. It's a very professionally-made work, although it's very technical and one can see the naked screens and cables and all these metal and electronic elements, it's surprisingly poetic with the shadowy faces that appear on the screen and the rotations of the screen that go from one element to another. I think it's a good work.

- Chung: For me, it's a very good representation of the persistence of vision, and also precisely designed and engineered into this version. I like the work and I saw it at a real exhibition last year. I like the preciseness and I like the two images coming together with the rotation. One thing I'd like to artist is that according to the documentation, he set it up so that the majority of the machinery, the connection of the cables and those parts are visible. I wonder if the work will be more powerful with those parts carefully hidden away from the audience so that we are just left with the images and rotating parts and LED lights, it would leave more room for the audience to experience, rather than having to pay attention to the cables connecting the motors, etc.
- Cutts: I find this project to be the most technically savvy out of all the projects. It's very well executed and very minimal but contains a lot of sophistication in trying to get to the point. For me, its gorgeousness lies in its structure, by that I mean the rotation of lights surrounding it; there are two layers, the internal and external lights which also play a key role. As a participant, your level of involvement of thought is "blink and you miss it", like having a thought, but it's too fast and the moment is gone and you have lost the concept of what is happening, versus how long you are given to retain a thought. The piece kept me questioning and remembering quite some time afterwards, after the experience of what a thought could be and how long it remains. For me this is one of the more powerful pieces of works; I would love to have experienced it.
- Ng: I also agree with most of the comments. I think the work is very well-made. I know the artist, I am not close with him but I have known his works for a good number of years, and I can see this as a continuation of many of the things he has been exploring. When I compare this work with *Connection Disturbance* or *As You Were Here*, this level of finishing and rigor is certainly much stronger. The level of seriousness, craftsmanship and level of attention is something we should promote. This work is certainly a good candidate for awards.
- Mizuki: The comments of other jurors really help me understand this work, which is the most difficult one for me to understand without looking at the real work. I like the aesthetic beauty of work and complicated structure but it's just hard to imagine and understand complicated engineering of this work without real experience.
- Fan: Let's move to the next one, *RUINLIZATION I: Signal 2.0*.
- Tamas: I've seen this work at the School of Creative Media graduation show, I was very impressed with the work. It's nicely made. The artist is again not my student, but he came from our school. The work has some kind of strong presence, it is heavy and with the noise that it makes. It's not a bothering noise, it's really basic noise, and the materials are beautiful, these old, rusty materials, and the whole installation is well-made.

- Chung: I wish I could have a chance to feel or experience the work, but unfortunately, I didn't go to the School of Creative Media graduation show. I also consider it a good piece of immersive sound or audio work, the sound making devices of the metal and the ruins remind me of the industrial era. The only thing that I find annoying at this moment is the pair of speakers, they seem to be quite good-looking, sleek and brand new, which stands out from the rest of the installation.
- Cutts: I think the installation is very beautiful, and in a similar manner to the third project, it's very well made in terms of the use of objects. It's the first project today that responds to the surroundings, the heritage and history association with that. It's down to not being in the room with it to feel the maximum impact, but I have enough of an understanding of what it would be about, and it's got to do with the impact of sound in relation to the building or territory you are in. In that way, it becomes a social experiment as well as an architectural one. In terms of participation, it's quite key for this work. I think it's beautiful, I just wish I was there to dissect the sound further and understand what it would be like if it was in a different space as well.
- Ng: I agree that it is a little hard for me to judge when I'm not there. I would look forward to a version in which the speakers are more deconstructed and incorporated into the setting. Acoustically, it would also be more integrated in that regard. Now, there seems to be a disconnection between the speakers and the so-called ruin, so I look forward to a version 3.0.
- Mizuki: My comments focus more on the subject matter addressed by the work. Ruin has been popular, significant subject matter especially in paintings and photography in art. Therefore I wonder what his motivation to address the ruin today is. It would be nice if the artwork can justify why the subject of ruin is the matter today.
- Fan: *The Dream Machine.*
- Tamas: I've seen this work in an exhibition, and it is a very impressive and interesting work. I think it is the only one of the selected works that is made by a group of artists and not just one. I think this is a very interesting, active and good artist group. It's a complex installation using many complex machines, there are lots of video and audio materials. In the exhibition, it was really good to walk around and listen and watch the different materials in the space. This is the interesting and unique aspect of the work, but for me this is also the weakness of the work, that perhaps there are too many things put together in one complex installation.
- Chung: I saw the installation last year at City Hall, I also tried out different patchings of the video cable. It's a good piece of work with a good level of sophistication in terms of the collection of the old monitors, the design of the patch panel and also the cabling system. The only thing I'd like to see a bit more is the viewer experience. This is an installation work, and when we enter and leave, it does not make that much difference

no matter how you engage with the work. I would like to see an orientation area where the audience can better prepare themselves before they enter into the main area, and if they decide to leave, what kind of concluding remark can the installation provide. This is one of my suggestions.

Cutts: I have mixed feelings about this work, on the one hand because of the complexity of it, and on the other hand because it doesn't try too hard in its form to look too pretty. They sent a wealth of documentation and supporting materials to go along with it, which is always beneficial, but at the same time, is it necessary to send so much because it's such a complex installation, it warrants participation and support from the artists in order to drive it. The second point is that it doesn't try too hard to fit into a white wall gallery space, with the cables everywhere, it lends itself to a more relaxed approach to making a piece of work; it's got less to do with what a piece of work look like than to your level of engagement with the content on the screens and the other components as well. It looks like a performative piece of work that desires, wants and instigates your participation to be a part of it. It's hard to understand where the beginning, middle and end is, and it would benefit from some documentation regarding user experience. It is performative in the sense that it wants you to be there to get some form of output, and it's very much a time-based work, and the complexity I can't doubt for scientific purposes, and coupled with the surreal purpose, it creates something very unique. I think abstract is the appropriate word to use.

Ng: I also echo Joseph's point on this work's performative aspect, which could be further explored. It's hard to understand the participation in a work like that. I didn't see the work first hand, so I can only read from the documentation

Mizuki: Whenever I encounter the participatory work, I cannot stop asking why the participation is necessarily to complete the work. Sometimes the participatory works just consume the time and energy of the participants but give very small return to the participants. What can the audience gain through the participation? Or what does the participation contribute to the artwork? I admit the visual of this work is very strong but I'm wondering if this artwork is something beyond the prop of Dream Machine, as inspired by the novel.

Fan: The last one, *Vacuum Cleaners*.

Tamas: This is a game. The concept is interesting, and of course, it is important to think about such environmental problems. The game is quite well-made, although quite simple. I'm not sure as a game, it's really interesting enough for the audience to play for a long time. My problem with the work is that it seems to me a bit didactic and not really exciting or artistic enough. Maybe I need to play with it to judge it better to see if it is playful, or if it has any humor or irony in it, or just this very simple connection that if I see there is big smoke or dirt, I can turn on my vacuum cleaner and clean the

air around me. It's an interesting work, and I appreciate someone sent us such a video game, because it's not so easy to produce such an interactive video game.

Chung: This work is a well-designed and well-made VR game. I enjoyed the seriousness of the artist and designer, and in the video, they looked very serious and acted in a serious way. I'm not sure if they intended to have this kind of seriousness as a performative element.

Cutts: For me this work is something produced for educational purposes and raising awareness, but the severity of its subject matter and its execution is the antithesis to that. It's more to do with the setting that the work is put in, and that plays a big role in it as well, because in a similar context to contemporary and media art and other forms, then we question our level of engagement with something like a really complex video art. I watch a lot of VR work as well, and we must ask ourselves how much do you need to watch something before you get the point, and therefore duration within this game will play one of the biggest aspects for me, because if you can convey the same thing in 40 seconds that you can convey in 10 minutes and it's doing the same thing, unless there is substantial change for the game in terms of the levels or something serious happens, or it's really related to what's happening in that territory on a daily basis. Because we're judging the work based on the narrative, it is the biggest aspect for me, and has less to do with the form.

Ng: You have all spoken about what I wanted to say. Compared with the awardees over the last 25 years, the layering of meanings and poetry is not what the creators wanted to put together.

Mizuki: I agree with most of the jurors. I am wondering, in the game, the player needs to people suffering from polluted air and after rescuing those people, the text and voice-over coming out. But the video doesn't show what happen after rescuing. I am also curious about what would be the ending of the game. Does anything big happen? Does Mother Earth become clean again?

Fan: If there is no more to add to the comments, we have already walked through the 10 works. Let's move on to talking about the prizes. I see that some of you have already have ideas about prize nomination.

Cutts: Shall we say our top three each and see if we have any correlation? I had a pre-understanding before this deliberation, and now I have a different one. In no order, I have *As You Were Here*, *Mind Cut*. and *Life/Time*.

Tamas: My favorite three in no order are *As You Were Here*, *Life/Time* and *Mind Cut*.

Chung: For me, I have three selections but I don't have the order: *As You Were Here*, *Life/Time* and *RUINLIZATION I: Signal 2.0*.

Ng: For me, I would pick *Mind Cut* and *InkFlux – Freeland*, just two.

Mizuki: I pick *As You Were Here*, *InkFlux – Freeland* and *Life/Time*.

Fan: Four of you have selected *As You Were Here*, two of you picked *InkFlux – Freeland*, four selected *Life/Time*, three selected *Mind Cut* and one for *RUINLIZATION I: Signal 2.0*. We can narrow down our discussion on these five works. The works with most votes is not necessarily the best, so hopefully you can talk about that. *As You Were Here* and *Life/Time* both received four votes, so maybe you can begin with these two works?

Cutts: Even the two have very different outputs, the synonymous thing with these works that they have basic narratives and basic intentions, but they really get to the point. They have very mixed variables involved in both of them, but I have a clear understanding, and it's not just because of the documentation and supporting materials, but because I really could understand and resonate with what is going on. There was a level of strong engagement through simplistic forms, not necessarily simplistic in how they were made, but simplistic in terms of their arrangements. For me, those are the relationships between the two works.

Chung: *Life/Time* is very sophisticatedly made, and is a good candidate for exhibition as well. Imagine you have a space it can occupy and with a target area for performance. *As You Were Here* is not easy to exhibit, as was my experience with wearing the wearable, in a lot of cases it's not easy to manage. The video documentation is also a nice piece of work. The two works are equally good, for *Life/Time*, I have one hesitation, which is about the selection of those images and I still have some query about it. With *As You Were Here*, I don't have any queries about her intentions or implementation.

Ng: Is there any possibility of awarding more than three works?

Fan: Yes, but it depends on the reasons. We have flexibility to rearrange the prizes. It would be good to have the order that we have now. For your information, sometimes we can have two Gold Awards but no Silver if you find two outstanding works that are equally good. Sometimes, we have two Silver and no Gold, as we did just two or three years ago, which is a statement as well. For Special Mention, it is just a certificate without any cash prizes, so for administrative reasons it is easier to grant more than one. I hope that you will give the prizes you want to give. If the works have equal standards, we can give out more than one after discussion, but let's see if it's needed.

Ng: For me, the works are very diverse and so are the media and form. The works all have their merits, I hope that we can award four of them.

Mizuki: I'm not a Media Art specialist, my background is in contemporary art. The question is about whether media art experts want to champion the existing genre of media art or break through the given category. Is the objective of the awards encouraging fresh perspectives, to question what is media art? I chose *As You Were Here*, because for me, this artwork shows me new dimension of media art by integrate tactile textile medium and technology. I also like *InkFlux – Freeland* because the work represents how Hong Kong artists digest their experiences last year in metaphysical way. I like *Life/Time* because it successfully draw the interests into the question of what makes the thing animate with the poetic beauty of work. The work looks simple but pose both philosophical and technical questions about the moving image.

Tamas: For me, it's hard to decide which work out of the three will be first, second and third. As I am listening to the different opinions, I start to think perhaps *As You Were Here* would be my favorite because the other two works that I like or the other works you have suggested, they all used typical forms that you see nowadays in media exhibitions, they are all well-made and have their own personal uniqueness, but they all make use of monitors, projections and sound installations, but *As You Were Here* is different because it is based on this tactile layering of the work, this knitted work really touches the body and makes something with the body, and it doesn't just work with sound and videos. One thing that is important to me is humor, and I really miss humor when an artwork takes itself too seriously. Most of the works, not just here, but in general, mostly takes themselves seriously, maybe there is a serious message or aesthetic view, but this work, maybe because it's a little bit like a student work, as Bryan said, has a nice humor. It doesn't just have a poetic background with the personal connection with her mother and remembrance of her, it's also funny. That's why I would honor it by giving it the Gold Award.

Fan: So Tamas nominated *As You Were Here* as Gold Award, and Kingsley also put his vote on this one, so altogether we have 5 votes on this work. Are there other nominations for Gold Award? Or you all agree that *As You Were Here* will be the Gold Award winner?

(Cutts and Mizuki consent)

Fan: Next will be the Silver Award. From the number of votes, it should be *Life/Time*, but let's see if you have other suggestions.

(All the jurors voiced their consent.)

Fan: So *Life/Time* is the Silver Award. Now for Special Mention

Ng: I'd nominate 2 Special Mention, *Mind Cut* and *InkFlux – Freeland*.

Cutts: For me, it's just *Mind Cut*.

Chung: I can also change my vote to *Mind Cut*. The reason I voted for *RUINLIZATION I: Signal 2.0* is because the artist had just graduated from SCM last year, while the artist of *Mind Cut* is more established.

Mizuki: I cannot judge because I don't think my understanding is well enough. I know there are a lot of things the artist needs to consider and input, but I also want to encourage the artist who try to reflect about things going on. I want to vote for *InkFlux – Freeland*, but I don't know how good it'd be from the technical aspect.

Ng: Special Mention is a form of encouragement, and for both *Mind Cut* and *InkFlux – Freeland*, they both deserve encouragement for different reasons, so it is difficult for me to choose just one.

Mizuki: I can see that *Mind Cut* is technically very sophisticated, but for freshness of theme, I want to go for *InkFlux – Freeland*.

Tamas: For me, *Mind Cut* would be the Special Mention, but I don't have any problems if we divide it between *Mind Cut* and *InkFlux – Freeland*. I think it would be a good decision.

Ng: Thank you, Tamas.

Tamas: As you said, Special Mention is a kind of support, so I think it'd be good to divide it.

Mizuki: I think it's a good decision to encourage both ways.

Chung: I'm also fine with including *InkFlux – Freeland*, my hesitation is because I was his teacher, and he's a very established artist at this moment, I expect a little bit more from him compared with others. But in terms of the work, it's okay.

Fan: To round, up, that means we are still going to give out 2 Special Mentions.

Fan: One additional note, when you talked about *Life/Time* earlier, you asked about the reason for using the animals. My colleagues have just pointed out that in some supplementary material that we have, he had explained it. The elephant represents energy, and the tiger is the king. I will show you the powerpoint.

Mizuki: So, it's Thai symbolism.

25th ifva Awards Media Arts Category Award Winners

Gold Award

As You Were Here

Pan I-an

Taiwan

Silver Award

Life/Time

Witaya Junma

Thailand

Special Mention

Mind Cut

Tung Wing-hong

Hong Kong

InkFlux – Freeland

Chris Cheung (h0nh1m)

Hong Kong

25th ifva Awards Media Art Category Juror's Comment

As You Were Here

Tamás Waliczky: Charming, nice project, it has a personal background, it has nice humour. It is quite unique, I appreciate the fact it is different from most of the media artworks. Feminine, too. One of my favourites.

Bryan Chung: It is a very personal piece of work using wearable technology and knitting as a bridge to communicate the love between the artist and her mother. The devices do not serve any important functions but everyday life mundane interaction among family members. Owing to the form factor of the LilyPad and the associated sensors and actuators, the devices are a bit bulky.

Joseph Cutts: The project holds a strong sentiment to upbringing, personal relations and intimacy in material. I find it to be very heartwarming through the narrative and material/audio aspect and yet it manages to be less personal and general through the participatory aspect. It therefore breaks a barrier of being too subjective and is opened out. From the material I have seen I find this to be a well-rounded multidisciplinary installation.

Kingsley Ng: Witty, sincere and highly personal. Somewhat falls under field of speculative design.

Mizuki Takahashi: Interesting to use e-textile as props in the short film. Bridging digital and analogue technique in knitting, artist metaphorically imply the cross-generational relationship between her mother and herself.

Bystander

Tamás Waliczky: Nice work, based on photogrammetry technology. It has a strong atmosphere, an artistic vision, which I like. Technically it's not so unique, even at ifva we had a few artworks based on the artistic failures of photogrammetry.

Bryan Chung: It is a very good attempt to relate the artist's childhood traumatic experience in the artwork as a form of reconciliation and therapy. The sound design can be a very crucial factor in the artwork and which is effective as demonstrated in the video clip. The use of the local Hong Kong 3D scan images seems to carry too much contextual information about the places. I am not sure if it helps to associate with her personal experience.

Joseph Cutts: The project holds many layers to its overall installation and is rich within content. I found the audio/projection aspect to be extremely provocative in my role as a participant, the timing was perfect. Due to the fact that there are a number of immersive layers involved and judging it by the whole artwork, the relationship between the VR aspect and the audio/projection I find to be a lost one in terms of user experience. I feel the work could benefit even without the VR element involved. However the overall subject matter in terms of subconsciousness is not an easy one to convey in a linear manner.

Kingsley Ng: Thoughtful consideration of the exhibition's physical space, despite it is in principle a VR work.

Mizuki Takahashi: The graphic looks very beautiful and powerful. However, I wonder if the work is made for traumatised people to heal, or for general public to enhance their understanding of trauma of child abuse, or to represent the artist's inner states coming from traumatised past.

Connection Disturbance

Tamás Waliczky: I've seen this installation at SCM. Professionally made, very aesthetical. Strong visual composition based on black-and-white forms. The audio part is not my cup of tea, but it's a well-made project.

Bryan Chung: The work is very clean and tidy. It will be suitable for gallery display. It goes with a sense of machine aesthetics as majority of the parts are geometrical forms that detached from all contextual settings.

Joseph Cutts: A wonderful use of innovation within technology and the impact lies there with that and the newly created relation between user and object. However in terms of impact, I find my response to be left with the work at that very moment of interaction (or imagined within the space) and less re-consideration in the narrative once walked away.

Kingsley Ng: Minimalistic and sculptural. The windows in SCM provides a good context for the reading of the work. It is unclear how the artist is thinking of adapting the work for HKAC's space.

Mizuki Takahashi: The installation looks beautiful with minimal aesthetic. But the idea of sculpture making noise is not new. I don't think the works embody the concept that the artist wants to deliver.

Devenir Space

Tamás Waliczky: This is one of the works I would like to see in a real exhibition space. The description and the video seem interesting, but I'm afraid the real installation is simply transparent plastic surfaces on a metal wire mesh, with laser projection on them. If this is the case, for me it is not complex and original enough.

Bryan Chung: I think the work attempted to move from the wireframe striated space into a smooth space, aided by the navigation of the participants. It is not easy to experience just through a documentation video. The embodied experience will be an essential part for this immersive work.

Joseph Cutts: Visually stimulating through testing the boundaries and contours of rigid lines within a special setup. Due to me not being there in person, it is difficult to understand just how immersed I felt however I projected this here and on loop. It also suggests and questions a social space and an isolated individual space.

Kingsley Ng: The work is mesmerizing, while it does not need to rely on very complicated setup and visual effects. It is like an Anthony McCall without the smoke machine and in a narrower space.

Mizuki Takahashi: The artist's understanding about dichotomy between virtual and real space is very simple. The immersive installation will not pose any questions about the border between virtual and real space to the audience.

InkFlux – Freeland

Tamás Waliczky: Aesthetical, well made. Technically it's too simple for me. The extra supporting video is quite impressive.

Bryan Chung: The extra material added more contextual information related to the visualization project. It is not easy to isolate the gradual ink diffusion effect, especially on the rough surface. As the project is now related to geographical data, the use of map is a natural choice. It seems that from the video, there is a zoom-in effect to highlight the geographical regions. I am not sure if it is necessary or primarily due to the resolution limitation of the display surface.

Joseph Cutts: A strong use of Chinese ink making with a contrast of time as an agenda is very key here when bearing witness to something that once may be rigid in its form as a painting but then allows for movement within stillness. Very relatable and enduring in terms of engagement whilst loaded with history in its narrative.

Kingsley Ng: A subtle and contemplative work with substantial social relevance.

Mizuki Takahashi: I like the artist provides a new way of interpretation of ink painting through his digital image based on his understanding of Zen philosophy, reflecting contemporary social concern. The work looks rather simple but it forms a new style of ink art.

Life/Time

Tamás Waliczky: Very well made, complex, professional work. One of my favourites. The idea of modern zoetrope isn't new, but the realization is original and very high level. It combines *laterna magica*, zoetrope, animation, sound, glasswork into a fascinating installation.

Bryan Chung: It is a creative interpretation of the early cinema devices, such as the praxinoscope, with the combination of the sound making property of the individual glasses functioned as musical instruments. At the moment, the images seem to serve as demonstration show reel similar to the movement studies from Eadweard Muybridge's. It may be better to elaborate the justification of including those running animals in the displays. Are there any narratives to communicate to the audience through playing with various revolving glasses?

Joseph Cutts: Really strong use of participation in body, water and object. Basic in its outline but thorough in its sophistication. Beautiful in its form and resembles imagery of early filmic content from the late 19th century.

Kingsley Ng: The artist adds a bit of twist and delight to the zoetrope. It would be wonderful to see hundreds of these turning objects in a gallery space at once.

Mizuki Takahashi: The artist successfully updated the primitive technique of moving image / animation with poetic manner. The visual effect generated by the shadow shows the artist's insightful understanding of the meaning of "animation".

Mind Cut

Tamás Waliczky: Well made, complex installation. One of my favourites. Aesthetic, technically professional, scientific but poetic at the same time. The extra supporting videos are very impressive, they proof how precisely the work was planned and developed.

Bryan Chung: It is a very good use of the persistence of vision to orchestrate the precise movement of the screens and the LED light. The artist can consider whether to expose the technical details such as the current setup or hide away the machinery and expose only the necessary parts.

Joseph Cutts: A gorgeously created structure, technically savvy and with a basic outline of narrative. The moment of thought disappearing contrasting with the speed of light rapidly creating an unsettling moment of remaining in the moment but questioning holding onto a thought. Very well executed.

Kingsley Ng: The juxtaposition of being graceful and violent at the same time is very powerful.

Mizuki Takahashi: Technically interesting but I cannot see the artist's motivation behind the art work other than his interest in the combination of kinetic movement and digital image.

RUINLIZATION I Signal 2.0

Tamás Waliczky: I've seen the installation at SCM. It gives strong impression. Well made, interesting work.

Bryan Chung: It is a good piece of immersive sound work. The artist found clever ways to generate the sensation of a site of ruin through different sound making devices. There is obviously a distinction between the ruin like metal structure and the sleekness of the speaker system. I wonder if it may be better to consider a whole piece as a sculptural form and appropriate the speaker system to blend with the structure.

Joseph Cutts: An extremely beautifully engineered structure that responds to its physical surroundings and transcends that into an environment of further engagement beyond contours. Due to not being there in person it's hard to understand the level of impact through sounds but I can gain enough of an understanding through the documentation.

Kingsley Ng: It is a work that focuses on materiality of sound and of the associated physical objects. It would be wonderful to see a 3.0 version where the 'ready-made' speakers are further deconstructed, appropriated and incorporated into the ruin itself.

Mizuki Takahashi: In fine art, the subject of ruin has been featured in Romanticism movement in the 19th century. Even today, ruin is preferred subject matter in paintings and photography. It would be more interesting if the artist tries to contextualise his "Ruinlization" in relation with the art presented by his former generations.

The Dream Machine

Tamás Waliczky: I've seen the work at the exhibition. Complex, well made, interesting work. I appreciate the fact it has been made by a young artist collective. The extra supporting materials show how much work included into this installation.

Bryan Chung: It is a good installation artwork using the outdated technology of video cable patching. The space is well designed as a coherent unit. It may be better to consider the ideal viewing experience for the audience, whether it needs preparation/orientation when the audience enter, or if a concluding gesture is needed when the audience leave.

Joseph Cutts: The project contains a multiplicity of properties questioning the relation among art, science and participation. It contains sub genres of moving image and neuroscience along with a dream like surreal setup. Pinning you in the epicentre of the work is a direct but natural request for your involvement. Strong use of contemporary systems with a surreal ideology and a desire for a futuristic output.

Kingsley Ng: The slightly out-of-place, out-of-time aesthetic projects a strong while hidden narrative. It is as if one walks into a science-fiction setting, awaiting for things to unfold. There is great potentials in expanding this work into some kind of immersive theatre or experiential piece.

Mizuki Takahashi: I cannot see how the visitor interact with the work from given concept and description of the work. The work looks interesting but it seems to render the prop of dream machine inspired by the novel “Nebula Suite”.

Vacuum Cleaners

Tamás Waliczky: Nice concept, simple but well-made computer game about environmental damages. For me a bit didactic.

Bryan Chung: It is a well-designed and crafted VR game with educational purpose.

Joseph Cutts: Though a ‘playful’ VR experience in its element of participation and design, it outlines a very serious subject matter and raises awareness, the work therefore holds a great deal of impact and provokes in both its narrative and form.

Kingsley Ng: A no nonsense game about our everyday situation.

Mizuki Takahashi: I like the idea to apply the gamification to enhance the awareness of air pollution. The graphic is also sophisticated. Wondering what the player can learn after rescuing the people from air pollution and the ending of game.