The 27th ifva Awards
Media Art Category Jury Meeting Transcript

Jury Members: Bryan Chung (Chung), GayBird Leung (Leung), Mizuki Takahashi (Mizuki), Lai Chiu-han Linda (Lai), Yuen Cheuk-wa (Yuen)

Organizer representatives: Kattie Fan (Fan), Sandy Lai, Kate Lau, Helen Lam

---

Fan: Due to the novel coronavirus outbreak and venue closure, it is a pity that this year we are unable to have the exhibition, which jurors can see and feel the actual artworks in the gallery. For Media Art category, we had an additional Q&A session, so that our 10 finalists could further explain and elaborate their artwork to you directly. Hopefully this allowed jurors to have better understanding on these works. We will then begin the discussion; you can add your remarks to each artwork. After we go through the 10 works, we will nominate the prizes. If there are no further questions, we'll start with the first artwork, ***Ether - liquid mirror -***. I would like to invite Bryan to begin first because you are one of the jurors in the first round.

Chung: After I went through the documentation and video after the selection, I will not put this as one of my favorites at the moment. It's a bit site-specific and also if you put a single individual audience member to interact with the heartbeat, it will lose some of the impact of that circular piece of metal plate vibrating according to some sound in the location. I will not go for that work for my shortlist.

Lai: My first impression is that it is very neat. It looks to be a nice artwork that invites me to want to be there. The explanation [on the roundness of the mirror] kind of destroys the work a little bit. I remember in the documents submitted, it doesn't have to be round, it could be rectangular, so the symbolism seems to fall apart. In terms of technical details, the heartbeat could have been something else. For some reason, I cannot respond to heartbeat because it's everywhere in media art and cinema. There is also a chance to turn that into an interesting sound work, but now the chance is a bit lost, the potential of the elements is not really fully deployed.

Leung: For me, this is not on my shortlist either. The artist uses the heartbeat as the main interactive element, but in my understanding, it can only sense the heart rate, it cannot sense the velocity of the heartbeat. For normal adults, the heart

rate is similar, so each person's feeling of the piece is almost the same. So the heartbeat is just a symbolic thing, it doesn't really interact with the audience.

Yuen: I tend to agree with all of you. I'd expect the work to be more multi-dimensional in terms of making use of the heartbeat, even if you agree with using the heartbeat as an interactive element. It seems not to be working in depth in terms of how the audience would go in an interaction with the space. Ideally, I'd see if participants would be in that space for a length of time, then he'd be able to make use of this heartbeat interaction to feel the change of emotions, if the space and experience is meditative enough, you'd be able to experience the journey. But currently, the set-up and explanation are not leading us to that level of interactivity.

Mizuki: I can't agree with you more. I don't have any additional comments to add. I think the idea has lack of depth, I cannot see the connections between the idea and his decisions in shape. His appropriations of a Shinto symbolims is very typical.

Fan: The next one is ***Forgetter***.

Chung: I like this piece of work and even though it has the potential to go a little bit further. It is an interesting idea to engage the player with the insider story of the psycho-experience of the artists creating famous artworks in the museum. I consider it as an art game or art-related game. For me, I'd like it to go a bit further in a certain direction. It seems it is still a single player work, in which participants have emotional exchanges with those selection of artwork and environment created by the game scene, but if there was a bit more social interactions among different players who share the experience of playing the game or in different museums or collections of artworks, that can be a bit more engaging. I'd consider it as one of my shortlisted items because of the sophistication and the quality of work. I can notice the creative efforts from this team of artists.

Mizuki: It's a provocative piece. I agree with Bryan, it'd be nice if the game can be played with multiple players, and incorporate the discussion process to navigate the players' decisions to destroy or not. I wish they have the imagination of the idea of destruction, that they have the psychological impact to navigate the players in that direction.

Leung: At the beginning, I didn't know how to judge this work because it is a game and I cannot really play the game. After watching the video, I added points for this work because I can feel the game more. I am impressed by the graphic

design, scene design and image design, it is well integrated and professional. This is on my shortlist. I can see they put a lot of effort to try to explore more possibilities on the game design and artwork.

Lai: I haven't decided yet whether I'd shortlist this. However, I find this artwork has the best written proposal. I'm not just giving merit to the writing itself. To me, it's very important in media art for the plan to be conceptually comprehensive and technically informative. This is the only artwork [in this batch] that has achieved that. This is a reason for me to shortlist it. The same well-written proposal gave me a bit of disappointment, though, when I went through the actual audio-visual material. If I can accept that this is an advanced prototype of the plan, then I would definitely give it full support. There are things that are a bit excessive for me, such as the psychological experience we're supposed to have and a sense of destruction and all of that, which I do not experience. When we make an artwork, we all have such kinds of meanings, but it does not always go into the actual phenomenology of the playing process. So this is where I am at this point.

Yuen: It's an interesting intervention of game as a medium, so the concept of turning it into a meta-art experience is a good attempt. I want to declare that because Alan Kwan is now a colleague of mine, I've known this work before this competition. I was able to understand the background of this work. The late submission of that 30-minute video clip, that's quite a game-changing for me. Before the 30-minute clip, I had very weak grasp of this work. After watching this 30-minute experience, I was able to comprehend the entire experience. That changed the perception of the whole piece. When I coupled this experience with other entries, it might not be fair to other works because I was not able to at least spend more than 15 minutes to immerse in the other works, which are also demanding participants to engage for a certain period of time before you can actually experience them. I just want to point out this is the only piece we have the opportunity to engage for 20-30 minutes. That changed a lot of my perception of this work.

Lai: I didn't get the chance to view the 30-minute video because it came too late. I was working the whole morning and I did not notice it until right before the meeting. Everything I had said was about the material submitted that I had reviewed. I think there is a question of fairness, too, because there are several other works that are suffering from not being able to be physically presented. Maybe at the end of this discussion we can factor in that reality.

Fan: The next work is ***"I am like sea waves, going up and down."***

Chung: For this work I try not to comment too much because he was my student and I was assessing this piece of work as a final year project of his MA study. I had a chance to listen to the full soundtrack that he didn't have the chance to send it to ifva, and I also had the chance to view physically be on site and sat on one of the rocking chairs to experience the illusion of sea waves. My comment is on the completed work with a connection to the personal story and also some of the urban landscape. He is referring actually to the North Point ferry pier and how the older generation experience that particular ferry pier. I'd like to put it in my shortlist, but because he was my student, I am hesitant and I'm still struggling at this moment. I experienced a very completed work with a sophistication in craftsmanship of the material. He explained the use of the white wall as a counter-immersive way, but I don't have a problem with the white wall, because the way I sit over there, it's actually more like a prop for theatre rather than an immersive experience. I'd speculate that his original purpose is not to create this immersiveness by having an additional thing on the white wall. The whole environment is more like a theatre set compared with a regular immersive environment like VR.

Lai: Bryan, can I ask you a technical question? When you were sitting there and the so-called waves were moving, did you hear any sound?

Chung: There is some machine noise coming from the moving tiles. They are not too distracting but you can hear the continuous moving sound of the tiles.

Mizuki: I appreciate his effort to recreate kinetic work for mimicking the sea wave movement. It is difficult to judge without experiencing it through the earpiece, but I'm not sure if that's the best way to stage his memory. I'm just not sure. Just listening to the sounds from the cassette recorder and standing on the boardwalk across Victoria Harbor might be the best experience. I cannot see the advantage of recreating this kinetic floor.

Leung: I don' have a lot of comments about this work. The work has very personal emotion, I cannot imagine what the emotion is. I like the mechanical installation. I like the choice of material, I like the installation design.

Yuen: I agree with Mizuki that the remembrance layer is not detailed, not mature enough on a metaphorical level, it is like putting together bridges of memory and connecting them together. It's a little bit weak in that sense. If I was able to sit in that rocking chair, it reminds me of a late 80s Nintendo pixelized experience with the mosaic speckles of sea waves. That's a cute way of looking into the past. That's the fun part that connected me.

Lai: I just want to make one more point which you can say is quite subjective. This is an impression I had after viewing all the works about what media art is up to this moment and what we are expecting supposedly. When I saw the variety of ways to deploy machine learning, AI and similar stuff, it suddenly occurred to me that I would prefer works that are lighter, more mobile, and more machine handy rather than works that rely a lot on mechanical construction. This is my problem with the VR work (below) and with this work, both of which require a lot of gears to be put together, to be assembled on site. This may not be fair, but after looking at all the works, I want works that are very handy, that you can just pick up and go and install it as you go. That's my current hesitation about this work. I know the North Point ferry pier very well, I don't think I can share the sentiments of the work fully yet because I am not able to rock myself in the chair. It would be unfair to take my words to be comprehensive judgement about this work.

Fan: The next one is *(in)visible*, a Taiwanese work.

Chung: This is difficult to comment because there are not too many traditional media art elements, I consider it more like a photographic work, but using different machines that go beyond our traditional cameras. The display that they show to us in the diagram, I am not sure if the way they want to show is the perfect way. In the diagram, it hints that there'll be projections in a relatively dark environment, but when I look at those images I also question whether it should be printed into some sort of substantial material rather than light in the dark. The artistic decision to pick up which images to view and whether it's good-looking or pleasurable to look at or if there are any kind of references to existing landscape or other texture-like material that we encounter in everyday life. They didn't do it very well in a sense, it seems they are just picking the good-looking images and assemble them together as a body of work for the display. It's a good piece of work to show, but I'm not sure whether it's a good piece of work in a competition. I'll probably not put it on my shortlist at this moment.

Leung: I agree with Bryan. This work has very good materials, but it isn't complete. They need to go through a few more steps. The images are very impressive and they use high-end technology, but that is only the research and development stages. It still needs more things to make it more complete.

Mizuki: I appreciate the questions and comments to the artist. I struggle to find the critical point in this work. With these new scanning machines, I don't see their artistic technique to realize these images and also their unique point to pick up the images and how they communicate the reasons behind the images to the

audience. My comment may sound really harsh. The installation might help to promote the technology of these scanning machines, how good these machines are. Unfortunately, it fails to present the artistic ideas beyond the technologies and their application.

Yuen: Thanks Linda for the questions, that's spot on.

Fan: Let's move on to the next one, *Lesson*, a Japanese work.

Chung: I try to comment on *Lesson* and *Translated Landscape* together. Their presentation is the most interesting part I found in the dialogue among different artists in the last hour. I enjoyed their presentation and the articulation of the reasons why they are doing such kinds of things. Even though I would not consider their works perfect at this moment, some are at the very early stage of experiment with the use of machine learning tools. I found they have the underlying principles or aesthetics to go in that direction. For *Lesson*, they experiment quite a lot. I remember they didn't directly respond to Linda's questions. They made 200 choices of famous paintings, but the selection of paintings come without any justification at this moment. Because of the technology it tends to be more accurate on figurative paintings rather than Kandinsky or other choices they make like Jackson Pollock because those are not figurative. It's a good approach to fit in something non-figurative for the AI to see what may happen. This approach is what is called lost in translation because there are two phases of translation from image to text and then text to image again. It is a common artistic strategy in working with those technologies. Personally, I'd rate *Lesson* a bit lower and *Translated Landscape* a bit higher, because the latter is more directed in using object detection approach in order to navigate in a cityscape. I think it can be improved in that they have some idea about the location they are going to navigate and why they chose such kinds of art. As I wrote in the catalogue, the impression that came to my mind is Jeffrey Shaw's *Legible City* rather than the concrete poetry in this work. I may shortlist *Translated Landscape* but not *Lesson*.

Lai: I want to follow up on Bryan's comment. I feel the same as you. I like both, and I find *Lesson* a lot of fun but I think *Translated Landscape* is better. The latter has some connection with "concrete poetry", such as works by 20th-century re-inventer Guillaume Apollinaire's Calliqrammes (1918) which construct text into the shape of whatever the poem is about [i.e. linguistic meanings turned into typographical effect]. But that's not the key point here. I like it because it is immediately making the system they're using powerful and communicative and there's a light-heartedness to it. My question, if the artists

were around, would be, "What's next?" You started with the city, the train, what's going to be next? This [generative] learning curve they have experienced is important. As for **Lesson**, they do have a point there to bring in figurative paintings and abstract paintings. Really, they did not answer my question, which was "If you're doing this kind of work, you should have tried out more and more programs because many people are uploading and sharing this kind of system", so the point is they it is a very important decision for them to make. For example, what if they had chosen a state-of-the-art program instead, and were to work with a program that makes minimum mistakes. That could be a very important point to develop, but I didn't hear much about that struggle or decision-making process. Even for the figurative painting, the description is not always correct. Still, I like the work because it communicates with contemporary art, which has seen a lot of works about image-text translation. It communicates not only with media art but also with traditional art in a fun way, and it's educational, except it's a bit simplistic. I'd shortlist **Translated Landscape**.

Leung: The work **Lesson** reminds me a long time ago attending Linda and Hector's class, which was called generative art. Linda taught me something like this, about how to generate something that becomes art. This work tries to make something indirect, but for art people, it's kind of direct to translate some medium into another medium and becoming a more interesting thing. This point is also to their advantage because being simple and direct makes this work more enjoyable for me. If we are to compare these two works, **Lesson** and **Translated Landscape**, I prefer **Translated Landscape** too because this work makes better use of AI and machine learning, and turns this technique into a visually more impactful work. For the work **Lesson**, it's simple and not more integrated than the other work.

Yuen: I like **Lesson** a bit more than **Translated Landscape**. To me, there's a layer of what we can call artistic judgement or aesthetics in the use of backward translation, from visual to text and back to visual. That's the interesting part because if you ask my parents or grandparents to look at contemporary art, they would relate figuratively. They'd have a hard time understanding Pollock and Kandinsky. In their heads, they are transforming contemporary art in a literal sense. That's a kind of perspective that I find interesting. But this is entirely not the artist's intention, but that's the way it worked for me. By contrasting the result of this backward translation, we immediately feel that different people having different artistic context would make different meanings. AI most of the time becomes a stupid artistic interpreter that tells a different side of human story. That's why I like **Lesson** more than the other one, but that's my personal take. But if we were to look at what relates to the

artist's own statement, then ***Lesson*** is a little weak. That's the part that I find engaging if we don't look at the background description of the work.

Mizuki: To be frank, I don't like either works, both use AI technology in a too straightforward way. It's too obvious to let AI translate the abstract paintings to navigate wrong translation, we knew it cannot do it. It's very predictable, in a way. It doesn't give me an eye-opening experience though these art works. ***Translated Landscape*** in terms of design, the black and white using Chinese characters is quite a straightforward application of concrete poetry or other past examples. Both lean on AI technology naively. That's my comment.

Fan: The next work is ***Petri.Vista***.

Chung: This one I also wouldn't comment too much because he is now my student. When he was doing this work, he was a student in City University of Hong Kong. The work is yet to be developed into a sophisticated work. At this moment, it is more like a demonstration of the evolution of the growth of some organism simulated in a computer environment. Apparently, there is no interaction, it's a bit generative. It relies on self-reproduction and keeping a distance between two organisms to define the growing pattern. In my comment in the catalogue, I also questioned about the metal plate and the screen display, which is working on the idea of the petri dish that we use in biological labs. It could be more strongly related to the context. I'm not sure what sensation it's trying to arouse. It's a bit too distant and calm between me as an audience and also the flashing light on the screen. I haven't seen the real work; I imagine from the video it'd be difficult to engage with what's happening on the screen and the metal plate. I'll probably not put this in my shortlist. I'll wait to see if the artist has more development in terms of the emotional exchange between the work and the audience.

Leung: For me, the form and visual outcome of this work is very media art friendly and stylish. As an audience, I can see the visual development, but I can't really understand the formation and progress of the work. The work seems to emphasize on the form and visual impact. It is not easy to learn deeper the idea.

Lai: My comment is more or less the same. I really like the work's point of departure, which is addressing something around us. But the artist didn't really take that idea any further down the road. It becomes a big jump from thinking about how virus multiply and take that idea just to show what beautiful images it produces and stops there. Everything about how many metal plates and screens, why that number -- I don't think they are defensible at this point.

Mizuki: I agree with Linda. The layers in the concept are very thin. The application of the technique and visual images are too straightforward. I cannot see how the artist has a unique the way of interpretation or have artistic digestion of our environment through this work.

Lai: I want to add one short comment. Looking at this work, I demand a more organic relation between the scientific image and the aesthetic image – and this I do not request from other works in this batch, but for this particular work, I demand that. And I don't find it.
.

Yuen: This work is a little weak. Even if we talk about a simulation of virus or bacteria proliferation, there's a lot more to be researched. There is not one single way of bacteria population development, so even in terms of bringing over a direct simulation of virus growth, there's still a longer journey to go through.

Fan: The next work is ***The Cave with a Wheeze***.

Chung: I have seen this work on display at the Arts Centre. I like the work and I think it's a powerful work. The other point I also raised in the last section of the jury panel is whether it should be in animation or media arts section. That's one debatable categorization of this piece of work. If we put it in media arts section, I enjoy the work. I like the simplicity of the engagement of the bodily activities, especially after the explanation from Jess and also from the documentation. I am happy to shortlist this work, but I'm not sure whether as an animation work or media arts work.

Mizuki: I like this artwork the most. The artist knows what she is doing and knows what animation means. It makes sense why she needs to use this stop-motion animation technique to portray the cloud on the wall. It reflects the emotional status of that moment, so that all makes sense for me.

Leung: I like this work the most, because the work uses very simple ideas to express a very strong impression. I especially like the clock installation on the video, it's very powerful for me. It shows the timeline and the physical effort of the artist. She chooses charcoal as the element, which is simple but gives me a very strong impression. I don't know how to categorize media arts but for me, this is a very good work.

Yuen: This is a very compelling work. The emotions are really genuine, very direct and true. The clock installation is a good choice of using the clock in place of the artist herself. That is a very distinguishing element in this piece of work.

Not sure if the mechanism of the clock would justify it as media art, but if we talk about the depth of artistic expression this piece is really great. I'm glad she shared with us the duration she spent on this piece of work. That shows how powerful an artist could be when the devotion is there.

Lai: I prefer to speak last because I know this person really well. I know this work and was at her studio at one point in the middle of the work's making, and had a long discussion. I appreciate everything that has been said, and I think there is no problem in how to defend this as media art. Media art is the intersection of a lot of things that cannot be named properly including many animation and video pieces. Media art has that position that combines many things. Say, would this work be allowed into the Animation Category? If not, so here we go, we welcome this work. Or, if this would not be accepted in the Open Category, here we have media art. It is not difficult to defend this work because the accent of media art is in the procedural nature of the art process, and this work is the result of very precise procedures [which we call algorithm in computing]. In fact, some aspect of it is almost inhumane rule-based procedures which she confirmed with us. You can say that before we had the computer, the machine was already there, and it was built upon procedures and rules, the small steps amounting to the formation of a system. All of this could be used to describe this work. I read the instructions for the jurors. One critical point must be made about this work's highlight of labor. Labor is a major issue in computational art these days. Artist labor could become so invisible that it'd be nice to see a work in which labor is foregrounded once again. As far as I know, the clock has always been there on that wall, so, the wall is also a part of the documentation of time. I like this work and I do not have any problems thinking that by spirit, action, method and procedure it is a media art piece.

Fan: Just one note from the organizer's point of view. Whether it is media art or animation, we'd leave the decision to the entrants when they submit the artwork to us. Usually, we'd ask the entrants if they'd like to stay in the category that they applied in. We had a similar issue with the Animation Category this year. We had a discussion with one of the experimental animations, whether it was possible to put it in a gallery or a movie theatre. The major difference is the presentation, how they'd like to use or occupy the space as a film or video installation, or they'd like it as a single channel screen space to be shown in a movie theatre. This is the differentiation from the organizer's point of view. The next work is ***Uber Existence***.

Chung: I like this work, but it is difficult to judge or evaluate without the participation into the performance. I try to relate it to some of the older works like locative media artworks that Linda and I had done many years ago.

Lai: ***I See Where You Are in Central***, that one?

Chung: Yes, at the Microwave International New Media Festival. This work is more reflecting the current situation of the reliance on food delivery and these kinds of remote and unnamed labor, rather than just play around with the location of a city. There are some missing things which are reflected in the questions they didn't answer directly, about the Uber business. We heard about in Hong Kong's FoodPanda where they have this labor complaint about the exploitation of delivery workers. In this work I'm not sure where they are foregrounding this key issue, but they highlight some of absurdity of some of the users requesting people to act or perform in different situations. This has to potential to reflect on the exploitation of labor, but that is yet to come in the artwork. This work is not easy to evaluate without evidence of participation in front of us.

Mizuki: I have the same comment as Bryan about the ethical aspect of the Uber business, and how much the artist is aware of it. The artist says he enjoys working with delivery for Uber in Tokyo, he said it's the most enjoyable experience. It reflects the working environment among the younger generation in Japan. I can see there's a lot of potential and pivotal points in this work, like the body hacking, also labor exploitation, the business model of Uber. I don't think the artist is aware of these controversial points in the business. From the artwork, this ***Uber Existence*** is more like a proposal to Uber. As a performance, I wonder how much he understands what he is doing with the performability of his proposal.

Lai: It is true the work is overtly romantic to me, and that could be a problem. For me, the problem lies more in what to do when taking up locative media as an art form. Now, instead of pushing it forward to explore what it could do for us, it remains just a demo of its capability. It's hard not being part of that and just looking at the documentation. Yet I don't want to rule out the work's chance for its being a piece of documentation because there is no other way this work can be presented to us at this point.

Leung: I don't know how to judge this work also. The idea is very interesting, but I will comment on the presentation. For example, how to choose the labor characters. There are a lot of interesting things they could add in the work. At the moment the work only has a single idea, it still needs a few more steps.

Yuen: To me it brings up the question about finding your remote agent, about experiencing things in the metaverse. Eventually we all stay at home and

experience things elsewhere via a digital avatar, or use the ***Uber Existence*** with a true human body. What could be very interesting to develop this work is how this setting would come back with a question to the audience. Right now, it's more the idea of making fun of such a platform or relationship, but doesn't go further. I think it has a lot of potential, it evokes some questions in me like what is the point of fulfilment and joy by having somebody else to represent you to go worship and fortune telling, that kind of thing. The engagement and participation are what is valued, so that's something very interesting to look at, but this work has not got into that layer yet.

Chung: What I expect is some kind of reflection from the team that they, for example, interviewed those who participated and ask them how they feel when they need to suspend the agency and do whatever they need to do and instructed by an unknown stranger in front of some weird situation. That kind of dialogue may help us to make better judgement in this case.

Yuen: I also want to add one point, if the subjectivity of this work is positioned at the agents, the one who is hired to do things, it will be way more interesting to me.

Fan: The last work is ***N1801***.

Chung: I wouldn't choose this on my shortlist. It's not easy to comment without experiencing the process. From the documentation I understand there is some kind of light and narration and sound, meant to trigger some memory or imagination. How this relates to the story of the grandma and our own background, I cannot see the connection about this work without experiencing it. The format of this work I'm also not very sure about. I imagine I'd be lying on the moving bed and wearing the headset, and being driven around in different locations. There is also documentation of people holding your hand and walking in some location. I am not sure about the navigation and the flow of this experience is, is it like some theme park experience by wearing the headset with flashing lighting? It is rather unknown in the experiential aspect, so I would not consider this work.

Lai: My position has been made quite clear earlier on. I prefer not to choose a work that requires very heavy gears. Bryan pointed out something which I want to respond with another analogy. I felt uncomfortable with works that try to recreate a   psychoanalytic therapy kind of situation, or something like a self-help retreat camp where I have to be "stimulated" in order to think and feel. This is issue that can be broadened to questioning where are we today [with virtual and augmented reality], VR with the headset has been with us for quite a while. How critical can we be about believing in a specific type of immersion

of this kind? What are we supposed to do? How are we going to deal with the passive (-versus-active) role that is prescribed the moment you enter this room? I normally would feel extremely uncomfortable; in cases like that, I usually didn't even want to enter that room. But it does not mean there is no value in wanting to share experiences. I like the point the artist makes about the real-life experience of closing his eyes to experiencing fireworks, which inspired this work, and that is a very good moment. That is how artists start to make things, but the rest of it, about being put on the bed and having to be led by people's hands, I think we can be more critical about immersion.

Leung: I try to stand in the jury position to give more sympathy on this kind of work because we can't actually experience the work and just experience the work based on the documentation. Some works are at an advantage because they are screen-based, but this kind of work we can't really experience it. But I can't give higher marks for it because I can't really understand what's the experience he is trying to create. I can feel that his intention is to try to combine different kinds of VR experience and physical space experience into the work. Based on the documentation I can't get the experience because of the new materials he added.

Mizuki: I don't understand why it is necessary for the audience to walk around the physical space with the gear. They cannot see anything except for the pulse with the closed eyes. I failed to get the point.

Yuen: From a performance perspective, I think there is more to experience aside from the visual part. It is difficult to evaluate at this point. With the VR headset, if you walk around the space with other participants, there is this disorientation that could be interesting. This juxtaposition between the abstract visual and the soundscape could create another layer of story, but we don't have that material to evaluate. I agree this piece of work would be not quite getting us to a destination at all and not strong in terms of making an artistic statement. The only thing I could see is a good attempt is they are not trying to use VR headset to create high-definition recreation of a scene. You use the medium to relate to a real-life experience of abstract color and brightness changes in the surroundings. That's an interesting approach, but that's only a very small part of the experience design. Not particularly intriguing.

Fan: We have gone through discussion on the 10 works. Now we've come to the most exciting part, the prizes. There are a few ways to do this. One option is you can nominate the Gold Award, or you may shortlist some works so that we can narrow down the discussion.

Mizuki: I know who I'm going to give the Gold Award to. My Gold Award nominee is *The Cave with a Wheeze*.

Leung: Me too.

Yuen: This piece gets straight in. I vote this work for the Gold Award as well.

Chung: I am not totally sure. I need to look at the innovation of technology and other elements. In terms of a piece of artwork and its emotional engagement and power, this is worth Gold. But not in terms of innovative use of technology. The ones I shortlisted are *Forgetter, The Cave with a Wheeze* and *Translated Landscape*. These three works I'd like to highlight. If a lot of jury members consider *The Cave with a Wheeze* for Gold, I'm also fine.

Lai: I also want to nominate three shortlisted works. *Forgetter, The Cave with a Wheeze* and *Translated Landscape*.

Fan: For Linda and Bryan, do you have any Gold Award nominations?

Chung: For me, there are only two choices for Gold, *Forgetter* and *The Cave with a Wheeze*. For a more holistic way of looking at works, *The Cave with a Wheeze* is better.

Fan: That means you also pick *The Cave with a Wheeze* as Gold?

Chung: Yes.

Fan: Linda, what do you think?

Lai: I have no objections. I just highlighted works we should discuss. I have no problem if that is the Gold and everybody agrees. Do we want to decide so fast? I'm okay with it.

Fan: Usually the Gold Award is less difficult to decide. If you all agree that *The Cave with a Wheeze* is the Gold Award, we have one work decided. The winner will get $30,000 cash prize, and also a separate prize for this artist. Every year we have a collaboration with Goethe-Institut Hongkong to host a solo exhibition for the selected finalist. This year, we have selected Lau Ching-wa (*The Cave with a Wheeze*) as the artist to do the solo exhibition next year during the festival. Now we move on to Silver Award.

Yuen: Let us cast the vote for *Forgetter*?

Mizuki: *Forgetter* is my second place.

Leung: Me too.

Fan: Are you all saying that the Silver should go to *Forgetter*?

Chung: That is my vote for Silver, *Forgetter*.

Fan: Linda?

Linda: Ok.

Fan: So everyone is okay with *Forgetter* getting Silver?

(The jurors agreed.)

Fan: Now for Special Mention. We don't have a Bronze Award but have a Special Mention instead. You can easily consider the Gold and Silver the best and second best. For Special Mention, sometimes the jury want to give this award to someone that has something special to mention and highlight. This is the reason why we call this award Special Mention. So you may shortlist something as rank number 3, or nominate some works that have some special quality that you like to recognize and highlight.

Lai: I propose *Translated Landscape* because it's a lot of fun. It is wholesome on its own, although it's not very sophisticated.

Chung: I agree.

Mizuki: Do I have to select?

Fan: Do you want to withdraw this prize?

Chung: Do you have other choices?

Leung: I choose *Translated Landscape* for Special Mention.

Yuen: If I were to choose works for Special Mention, I'd choose 3. I like *"I am like sea waves, going up and down."*, *Lesson* and *Translated Landscape*.

Fan: It is not so often we withdraw the Special Mention. if you find the 10 finalist

artworks are not up to standard, that's okay too.

Lai: I don't think of *Translated Landscape* as the third. I chose it because it'd be good to include a work that's deploying AI -machine learning. Even *Lesson* is a lot of fun, and I already declared I like *Translated Landscape* more. This is another observation for this year, many of the works seem incomplete because of the circumstances. Whatever seems complete, I want to support it, and that's *Translated Landscape*.

Mizuki: I don't have any strong objections to giving *Translated Landscape* Special Mention. I don't cast a vote but I won't stop other jurors giving the Special Mention, that's my stance.

Fan: If we don't object, then we will give *Translated Landscape* the Special Mention. This year. Each of you may have different choices and views of artworks, we have your collective decisions on the prizes, and I hope you are happy with the results.

27th ifva Media Art Category Award Winners

Gold Award

The Cave with a Wheeze

Lau Ching-wa (Hong Kong)

Silver Award

Forgetter

Yang Jing, Kwan Tsz-wai Alan (Hong Kong)

Special Mention

Translated Landscape

Tomoya Ishibashi, Kento Niikura (Japan)