The 13th ifva Single-Screen-Based Interactive Media Category Jury Meeting Transcript

Jurors in Attendance: Ellen Pau (PAU), Frederic Lichtenstein(FRED), Draughtzman
(DRAUGHTZMAN), Bryan Chung (CHUNG), Endy Fung (FUNG)
Organizer Representatives: Bobo Lee (LEE), Mickey Choi (CHOI)

LEE: There's some regulation here. For every year, people say that it's quite flexible for
the jury to discuss on the prize for we don't have a strict regulation, just a
framework. You can also be creative on your judgment. Judges should ask the
entrance on content, creativity, form, structure, technical or media application, or
overall fitness for the purpose etc. You can be everything, but of course all should
go back to the objectives if we can't unify our opinons. So we can start our
discussion for the final six selected works. …

PAU: I think we have kicked 9 works out due to their immaturity, mostly on content, that
includes technology too.

LEE :   Why don't we go through the opinions about the works.

Alliance

FRED: I do like *Alliance* very much … . I think it is a real pity that the capture device is not
working too well, clearly two spots, two angles … making it difficult to really …

PAU: I think the space is just too little.)

FRED :   Yes, I think is the lighting, you should look carefully, … there are two spots where
the light is too strong, and the camera is not…. The light … very well picture…. But
that's a technical problem. I think the concept of … I like the first one very much.
Though I cannot read Chinese I can at least understand the concept very well, it
must be fun to place the characters, there's still a linear sentence yet you can place
them with different associations. However, I find the interaction is not very clear
where you can place your character and then press 'enter' and kind of missing this
confirmation [process]?

DRAUGHTZMAN : You are talking about the *Alliance*?

FRED :   Yes, because as you are moving, the characters appear, but you are not sure when

it is going to be fixed, it seems the process is still not totally refined, it is more of a technical issue. On the concept I like it very much.

CHUNG: Regarding concept I have one question about this work: how did the artist come up with those selection of Chinese characters, and under what type of context does that collection of characters be applicable to this piece of work. The second question is the alignment of the two surfaces – the projection which is vertical, and the horizontal movement of the human body on the ground, which is kind of indirect in a sense that it could be better if the projection of those characters is also on the ground of the horizontal surface. And the movement of the audience/visitors would form a very direct correlation between the movement and the appearance of those characters.

And also I agree with Frederic that the confirm[ation] , it is quite difficult to call out from the software, we don't have the kind of visual feedback to identify how long we should wait for the letter to confirm at that particular location. How long we should stand over there for a couple of seconds or how many seconds.

Another suggestion is the messiness of the whole presentation, whether the artist would consider, for a couple of minutes, some of those words can disappear, and just keep some of those most recent ones to make it more tidy for the whole presentation.

DRAUGHTZMAN : I found that to me I don't find the confirmation of the action is a problem, as you can stay there for a little bit longer, and then you can have the letters coming up from your body. This is my impression. Second thing is that when we get away from there for a while, there are just lines, no more words there. You said they are still messy. Do you mean that the lines still give you a messy feeling?

CHUNG: Without much related to the intent, which I'm not sure about the intention of the artist, those messy, zigzagging lines, whether they are intended to be there as something for the visitor to experience without those characters. It's not exactly clear, I'm putting it into the design of the original work, I'd try to keep some of the most recent ones, previous ones or more ancient ones. Or you can change the shade or different transparency to keep the overall presentation more tidy or pleasant.

DRAUGHTZMAN :   First of all I'm not saying I like that piece. But one thing I found, technically, it is much more difficult than *Pixsonic Playground*. *Pixsonic Playground* is very candy sweet. However, when you walk down there your shadow actually is one of the problems. That is why the artist used two projections, one on top one on the horizontal I think he wanted to get rid of the shadow and just wanted to capture the audience's route or movement only. This is my opinion. If he can solve the problem of keeping on the horizontal and also getting rid of the shadow, this will be better.

FUNG: For *Alliance*, technologically I'm not very clear about it, but I think about concept maybe he got a very good concept, but as a user, just a normal user, I just experience the work.   Actually I can't find the logic or what he wants or what I can get from it … cos the Chinese characters, whenever I jump or move, the characters seems to be theirs characters … I can't follow the logic about when this character will be here or another group will be … he said is construct of this construction, but I can't see the logic within it. Or just for a few minutes I play around it … I think it is not just a matter of confine making of this model, just the overall experience, I can't get what he wants me to take away.   I think this is my opinion about the work.

FRED :   In fact for me it's not the first time that we encounter this kind of problem. Last year we had a piece you had a lady in a shower, and through the white steam out of the glass the naked body is revealed, it is a Peeping Tom kind of process revealing the image very interestingly. The concept was right, but the motion tracking was totally faulty, it was detrimental to the viewer's experience.

So we had been devising if there was a possibility for IFVA to give technical support on the motion tracking. However it seems that many of the projects are developed within an academic framework, and that often means that the teachers encourage the students to develop their own tracking system… That is very valuable from and academic standpoint, but ultimately I don't care whatever tracking system was selected, I just want it to work well! It seems that it is a repetitive pattern. I even suggest that next year there should be a budget allocated to help improving the pieces technically All pieces using motion-tracking device should be carefully evaluated, and sometimes another device proposed just for the exhibition. Because on the perspective of user experience, even if the concept is right, you as an audience get very little out of it.

FUNG: I don't know if it is just a matter of motion-tracking, or also the logic behind, how he came up with the words.

PAU: Just want to make a conclusion.   Conceptually we appreciate the concept of the work, but there's one quite important thing that the artist may not indicate well, is where the text comes from. That also affects the concept, but still I think we are very loose or generous, we still think that the concept is quite outstanding. About the technology, from the written description of the work, and with the interactive experience of the work, we can see that the interaction logic is really very blurred. We cannot really identify how the interaction makes sense to us as an audience, and there are a lot of problems with how we stand in front of the work, that means how the motion-tracking technology is being used, how it is being fully utilized. And then the third thing we discussed is about the aesthetic point of this work. Basically it is a black and white projected screen-based work, and aesthetically it is really minimal, and because it's minimal, the lines are really dominant, but the indication of why the lines are there is not so prominent, and because it is black and white, it is not as sweet or attractive as other works. So this is the conclusion that I draw, And I totally agree with you.

FRED :   I think it's better to go through the works and then give marks …

LEE :   If we do not have further comments on *Alliance*, then we can go to Colour Trend.

Color Trend

CHUNG: Maybe I try to compare this with, and I also mixed it up with the *Pixsonic Playground*. Why because both of them tend to obtain the content from figure or from online material. In terms of this particular aspect I think this one is a bit better than *Pixsonic Playground* in terms of using figure as the source of content and material because in *Pixsonic Playground*, the user is to type the name of the tag, I think it's more artificial action or gesture in order to access the content, but this one it tries to pick up the colour of the clothings from the audience, which interpreting the colour coding and then uses it as a key or tag to locate material from figure. It is more, not exactly intuitive, but is more subtle than typing the names in the tag fields. And the problem I tried to look into this piece of work is, whether this work is suitable for gallery display or not, and also whether it is suitable for just one single display or whether it will be better, for example, if it is an online work, which the user

can just stay at home, and [people from] different geographic locations in the world can interact through the colours in front of the webcam, and at a particular locations it will make more sense to try to look for the colour similarity across different geographic locations and cultural backgrounds. Because I read the material provided by the artist in the first round of assessment, she mentions some sort of more GPS related information, location related information in terms of usage of colours in different locations in the world or different cultural backgrounds. I can't see this type of material reflected in just one single installation location in a gallery but if it turns into a more online material can be much more interesting in this sense.

PAU: I'm a bit disappointed with this work. If it is a network, I always envision a work that plays with the internet should play around with all the data that is happening in real time and usually that will be massive [amount of] data, but now this work only deals with a tiny volume of data, comparing the tiny volume of data that is collected on the exhibition site with the massive volume of data online. In this comparison, I can't find any meaning for comparing these two databases together. I'm disappointed with the lack of visual indication of the real time happenings. I agree that the work could be better displayed as an online work, but still this quietness of the visuals seems to be not very attractive, but at the same time, I don't see the meaning of doing this, why it has to be so quiet, and I can't dig up any meaning from the interface design. Conceptually, I also see no meaning in interpreting or relating colours to adopting a topography of colour use in different locations or online virtually and in real space. I don't see the reason in doing this. So conceptually I also feel some sort of incompleteness in it.

FUNG: I quite like the concept itself. I see some potential in it, but actually I think that the execution is bad, it can't bring out what it can do or the potential it has. I think checking the colours and then find the internet base and get some photos should have a better way to present and to lead the audience to a further experience. Maybe if you are going to check the colours of my clothes, maybe it is something about trend or fashion, so the relationship about two databases should be stronger in this kind of sense. Also I think now the experience of the interface as we see now is too static, it doesn't have the meaning of why we got some not so related photos in the scene. So what I want to say about this concept is I think it is better than that *Pixsonic Playground* in the thinking of using the internet database, but the execution is too bad and just let the good potential go.

DRAUGHTZMAN :   Personally I took sometime to understand the work, trying to figure out

what is happening, because I didn't know what was happening, when I stood in front of it and see nothing happens, and eventually I discovered the camera. And as a user, the computer took some time to scan the colours, and it took a lot of time to download some images. And then I found some wordings like… actually I was wearing black, but it's something related to white, and I tried to relate that it's working with the opposite colour. Then the things displayed are not related to white either. Therefore I was just figuring, and thinking what is the logic behind and how the artist grabbed or analysed images that related to the colour scanned, I couldn't find the strong relationship, and even from the visual being displayed, It was quite difficult, maybe the message was quite hidden that I can't really relate the statement above and the visual display. And then I tried again and this time was black! Then the visual images displayed was actually very close to the previous one, and I don't see what is the difference between the first white part, and then suddenly the same scanned pattern, same black and grey thing, and then it was related to black the second time. I think over half of the images are overlapping. Maybe the source of the images is limited so they sought out the similar thing. Therefore to me I don't quite understand… I think I understand her intention, but from the work I can't really depict the intention. It is not being carried out.

FRED :   Personally I don't have anything to add, you have said exactly what I think in Colour Trend and I had exactly the same experience.

LEE :   Shall we move on the *Fingering*?

Fingering

DRAUGHTZMAN :   Ok, the concept behind is interesting, however, I think technically, first of all, when you got there, the motion tracking was not working. Mickey tried to fix it and I think it was fixed, but I found that what I was expecting is, I don't know whether you have this experience or not, the guys or the ladies just points like this and this [from left to right horizontally and via], but when I get down [shooting downwards], she cannot get this, and cannot get this [shooting upwards]. What I expect is more in-depth of a 3 dimensional enhancement of the motion, and I don't have it. Second

thing is that I waited for a long time and a long time, then BANG! And that's it.

LEE :   Then why didn't you try to escape?

DRAUGHTZMAN :   I think also we have a problem when three of us just stand [separately] here and there, it crashed and could not work! To me I understand his or her intention which is quite interesting when we look into the HK kung fu movies you find these things which are most dynamic and energetic, but I found nothing here. If the artist wants to express this to me, then I cannot catch it. What I can catch is when I read this [the work description and artist statement]. To me personally I don't like this work.

FUNG: I don't have much to say about this work, It is simple enough to understand, but is too simple for me. And this type of stuff doesn't have new execution or new way to present. Personally I don't think this is a good work.

FRED :   I have a similar experience of finding the motion-tracking erratic.. and then when it eventually worked it was very disappointing in the sense that it has no depth neither up and down, nor front and back. But I think it also echoes in the content itself, because it is very aggressive. But you don't get much more than that, what I understand in the end, she gets kill . But what I would expect is something slightly more sophisticated into the message. And not only the interface was flat, but the content behind is very mono-dimensional, there's nothing else, so it doesn't give me desire to play with it. I think it is aesthetically disappointing since an aggressive behaviour has so many different origins and so many different outcomes as well. You might be aggressive because of your parents and social pressure or maybe you are like that, maybe you are medically sick, there are different backgrounds of it. Also the way you express that violence can also go into shooting people or going suicidal etc. There are so many things to say about violence than just having these point finger and, boom! It is very flat.

DRAUGHTZMAN :   This reminds me there's some kind of static portrait, when you walk there, it seems that the portrait is looking at you, even it doesn't have that kind of scary feeling.

CHUNG: To me I like the work, but I agree with the deficiency in the technical execution, and also one of the major shortcomings I try to pinpoint from the viewing experience is

the element of kind of missing and disappearance. The reaction of the images is the only reaction, it reacts to the direction you move left or right but I expect if I stand in front of a real human being pointing a finger towards me, there should be some sort of emotional exchange between that guy and myself which could be revealed by people's facial expression or gesture. But somehow I cannot exchange at such kind of emotional exchange because the image is always kind of similar, the only difference is the pointing direction. But I like some of those elements in the way she dresses up or trying to make-up, is kind of ambiguous, similar to be on stage, a stage that is so empty and void. This kind of ambiguity I tried to figure out from the visual images. The other thing is, because the original display was in public space, which she mentioned in her documentation, one question I pose is that the character dies in the end, I am not sure why she can come back to life in a couple of seconds, finger pointing again. I try to make sense of this kind of looping which is very often in these interactive works, and most artists can do this kind of looping to put it into more concrete context, why something can loop, not just because of technical efficiency.

FRED :   I just don't agree on one point, the emotional feeling or feedback, because it is part of the violence when you have a serial killer like what happens in … it is also a fact that you cannot engage in anything. The guy shoots you , you can scream, you can shout, you can beg you do whatever, it's … It doesn't .. engage, that word makes it so scary, so the fact that she is not showing any emotion is didn't go with me at all. I kind of like the setting. Just there's nothing else. But I wouldn't necessary need something else to have an emotional exchange, but more … something more.

PAU: The first time that I saw this work was in San Diego. And I think when I saw it, it was the premiere. I guess the context of the work is to be put in a window in a shop front, the artist expected to see audience or pedestrians walking by on the street, so she expected linear movement of the audience, rather than they stay on and than look at the image. So I guess she hadn't decided on the up and down movement because she didn't expect people to move up and down. And then I first saw it from the other side of the street, so I could see the screen and the pedestrians, the whole environment of the street. I could see [something] very interesting, like a stage performance image to me, because I could see people walking and I could see there's someone dressed up like a clown, someone like a killer in Kubrick film, and [she was] pointing at the pedestrian and never shoot them, and then she died. It seems to be a very funny and entertaining performance when I watched it from the other side of the street. But when I went in, I crossed the street and then

stepped in front of the work, then I came across all the disappointment that you said, that it was not so interactive, what's the point at just pointing at other guys. So I think the context of the work is really important, because my first experience watching the work from the other side of the street is quite entertaining, but when I went to be the audience myself, then it was not so good an experience. So I think this is a very delicate work, the visual image does not give me a lot of reading as the artist statement had said. The artist statement said a lot of things that I don't see on the image or on the context, but because she brings up body and technology, I can relate to performance that I saw including the artist and the pedestrians, that maybe if she turns the tone a little, the whole thing will become more successful. But now it seems that what is successful is just by chance, not really intentional.

DRAUGHTZMAN : I think we agree on a very essential point is that who is going to experience the interaction. Is it the audience, or the artist? Actually we did something [that was a] failure in a place that we had made a lot of lighting, and a lot of people passed by, the lights tried to change. However the pedestrians or audience could not feel it because when you pass by, he couldn't feel the light change. However, the outsider will see the experience. I think this is another interesting point. If you know the context please let us know. Actually I think the work down there is a little bit out of context to us.

PAU: But I think we have to judge the work from its context downstairs rather than from the context we know, because it so happened that I went to the show.

Pixsonic Playground

FRED : At least one interface that is working smoothly! But that makes a big difference because I found the work pretty basic and enjoyable, but still it is too basic in tracking motion, tracking colours, nothing new. I don't think there's anything further than that. It is just the way the pixels move and it has paid attention to a number of details that do make the audience's experience a lot more enjoyable, that deeper work, that would be better from the academic perspective, but I'm not …live up to their expectation in terms of their making. In fact last year we have already been talking about is there any better technical support or …it is often part of the academic syllabus to take away that out of the programme so it is difficult to go any further. However I do worry about what is the future of that category if we are always being pulled back by the same technical problems. In ten years are we going to talk about the same problems?

PAU: I feel that if we could give more support to the artists technically then we will have better works. We would still be discussing the technical part, because we are looking for innovative technology. Right now we are in the stage of – I think a lot of things are very immature, the technical part is still exploring things that have been done in foreign places.

FRED : Even in Hong Kong….

PAU: But they are all students …

FRED : Exploring motion-tracking is .. should not be even be exploring!

PAU: They are students. To them it's totally new. If we expect to see artists with 5 or 6 years experience in motion-tracking, I don't think you'll find the technology problems. But now all these entries came from students. I think the biggest technical support is from their school, which is the City University.

FRED : They arrive pretty late in the making.

PAU: I agree that we should give more technical support to all these entries to the competition, one sources is from the school, the other, not really support, but another thing I would like to see is to have more experienced people to join the competition rather than just students. This will be much more important than just asking the Arts Centre which does not know how to help in terms of technology while asking them to do the technical support for the work. If they can do a lot, maybe in some special marketing strategy in order to draw attention to people who are already in the industry and people who have been doing digital work for some time, then we will see more mature work.

FRED : I think your concern in marketing will be much appreciated, I'm sure.

LEE : We do like to hear more comments on the development of the category…

PAU: Originally, I tried to write the essay [for ifva], but I couldn't finish it as I was too ill before… the main point of the essay that I was trying to write is about the Single Screen Based Interactive Media Category, the Category should be reformed, we should really think about reform the term "Single Screen Based" in future, because

when we think of this term "Single Screen Based" like 5 years ago, that was where the CD Rom was more popular, the whole work could be really appreciated from just one single screen, but now it is not a single screen work, it is an installation with other material outside the screen. So it is a different consideration. There is motion-tracking, meaning you have to give them a really decent space for the camera to capture the motion, a well-lit room, at least, for example, in order to capture the colour right. The colour as captured now I don't see it's right because, as in Colour Trend, the colour that is captured is a bit dark. I give them my t shirt [a white t shirt], that is not white, but is grey.

FRED :   You should have washed it better…

PAU: I know the white balance should be checked, but I expect the room is really a room without any disturbance and the light source should be enough so that we can really know whether the interface has any problem or whether the camera is pointing at the right direction or whatever. There are a lot of problems with this sort of installation based work, rather than a being single- screen based, it's more than a single screen now. Of course I still stress on the interactive media. If we just ignore the single screen based, if we just look at all these work as interactive media, there's some sort of interaction using the mouse and keyboard, that you know that you are controlling something. Now there is a lot of control is not so… now the control is, you pass by, and control part has a new definition.

LEE :   As a consultant, we care much about the development of the awards, and we all know why we have this category. You can refer to the title of the award, which is Film and Video, starting from like 15 yrs ago, it used to be just film and video, and it has a lot of room to improve and also I would suggest to have another meeting to talk about it, e.g. there are a lot of aspect, like marketing.

FRED :   [on *Pixsonic Playground*] It is enjoyable …

PAU: Actually when I first saw the written artist statement, I really doubt about the sound whether it is interesting, and whether the interface is clean and meaningful. The only thing that I don't know how to interpret is why there is a 3 D frame doing this and that, I just don't understand why there are some images like that on the interface. Because if it is an interface, I would appreciate a clean one, but if it is a screensaver doing this and that, but then I was interacting with it and I hear music, and then I suddenly see this …I just don't know why. Is it supposed to… because it

is not entertaining enough in the interface so they put on those things? I just don't understand. Maybe it is more than just music and colour and interactive, there is some comment on other things, maybe visuals, but I just don't understand.

CHUNG: I try to approach it in a number of ways. The impression is they tried to integrate a lot of stuff into one single piece of work. They work on the motion detection and interactive music making. And also some sort of network media by using Flickr as the source of the image to locate, and I can't see the reason why they tried to put in different types of material in one single piece of work, and the other thing is I try to approach it is whether this is a piece of art work or a game like toy, or something like a software tool, I tried to approach it from different directions. And for example I tried to approach it as an interactive art, it is quite difficult for me to understand why or how they would like to convert the images into music notes by something like a formula. And how come this particular formula is related to the agenda they put forward as something intergated or arbitrary. It is difficult to tell whether this is arbitrary, just mapping one piece of images by analyzing the pixel information, and immediately convert it into another number such as the MIDI notes or something like that. There is quite a lot of those mapping like creative or art works that may not make sense to the audience. The other thing is, if I try to approach it as a game or a toy, it is quite successful as it can deliver some music making or noise making tools or toy, and if I approach it as a software tool to create music, or a software to generate images, I'll try to look into the purpose of making this software and why this is different from those in the market or in the art scene to create images or music. Because I do not have a judgment on how to develop a software as a piece of art, in this particular context, so I try to drop this notion or this way to consider it as a software, but the overall impression is that they have great technical competency in terms of integrating everything together, but as a piece of work or something they put in an art context, I do not think it is a very mature way to consider a piece of art work.

PAU: Actually when I experienced the work I really see it as a game. I don't think there is any higher content of the work. I simply see… because the artist statement states very clearly that they want to deal with the visual and the audio, and interchange more way between these two data. And how we can interact with this relationship. I think they have done it quite successfully as a game. But as a game I don't understand why those images come in. So there is still something that we cannot solve.

FUNG: I think it is relatively a more enjoyable experience with this work. I agree if this is a game, I can make my standard a bit lower… not too emphasis on the communication why they are doing. But I think the reason why they put all the things together is they are too ambitious, they want to show that can do all these, I think this is the only reason they are doing this kind of integration, and also the question Ellen said about that flying graphics is also another way of seeing they are too ambitious to make the visuals like that. Actually if I don't question about the intended communication it wants to have, I don't have too much question about the work. It's just another not new stuff, enjoyable interaction, just sort of a game.

DRAUGHTZMAN :. I agree that they are ambitious. They want to do a lot of interaction. However I found that just randomly throw out the data, a kind of random reaction to the human body, like I hear no music, I just see noise, although this is music. Noise can be music, but music can't be noise, I found it right here. And I think this kind of interaction technology is quite common nowadays. However, what kind of reaction we throw out is kind of design which they can think about. Although they can use this kind of much more easy techniques to do so. I found that they just randomly throw out, not in-depthly think of the way they present, going to you and they are just going to have a series of pictures going from here to there, they just want to make it interesting. Although technically I like this work because this is the most successful, however if you ask me to give the Gold award, this could not be the one.

FRED : I would go even further. The artist submitting works should really question himself about what is the minimum level of requirement because now you see in shopping malls pretty amazing things, very good working, well-thought, attractive pieces. They are working on the same model line, like an indication of similar way of thinking … [they can be changed into] fish, footballs, basketballs, but they work very well, kids love it and play with it. If you ever take the train to Guangzhou, and in the platform there is such thing. What is the difference, what is it that the artist wants to raise the level of self-expectation. I don't think he lives up to that.

Rubbing Tool

PAU: We go to **Rubbing Tool**. The Chinese title is totally different from the English.

DRAUGHTZMAN : The Chinese characters are "meaning of insects".

LEE :   They chopped up the word. If they are put together it should be "ant". But if you separate them into 2 individual characters it is "insect", and "meaning".

PAU: I couldn't play with this, but I understand them when I read their documentation, but when I came here I couldn't play it. I don't know whether you [Mickey] have fixed it, But I still understand the work. If the documentation was done in a comic book then I think I'll appreciate more than the real interaction. Actually I appreciate how they built the low-tech touch screen.   All these handmade screen thing along the frame which I think they have done a lot of work. But conceptually I think the work is quite … it's real comical, and I really think that the idea should be more like a comic book rather than an interactive work because it's kind of stupid for the audience to see the ants have bubbles saying things to you. The whole thing is comical and funny. But it is kind of stupid to do this sort of interaction.

FRED :   In 2 or 3 years ago in Microwave Festival, there was a piece where you put down your hand and it would get whipped. [that work is called] Pain Station. It was pretty strong, many people got burned, some got bandaged. I think it is an amazing piece, and because why would the audience interact with that, and yet they did. But I didn't, I used my right not to injure myself. I took great pleasure at seeing the people inflicting pain on themselves just for the sake of experimenting art! But I love the cynicism and very deep understanding of human nature, where the city can be that insane, very ambiguous use of what is the goal of an art piece, what is the motivation of the user trying that. And in here, Ants seems to have this kind of very cynical denotation of the aggressiveness of nature and of human beings killing ants just for the sake of …. Instead of that, we had … Hello Kitty … bubble speech etc! I think he or she missed the point. I even think that the artist has a duty, just taking an aesthetic point of view, if they want to do a bit more than just using colours and shapes. They should be ahead of the audience into that kind of thinking. They should be philosophers instead of worshipping Hello Kitty. So I'm not disappointed but more like a deviant into …motivation… It is ethically questionable.

CHUNG: The only point I like is the directness of the interaction, the finger actually points towards the ant, and this is where the interaction happens. It does not have the problem with the other pieces of work which for example they need to have two interfaces or one on the other side of the projection. I expect them to have a sarcastic way to talk about solving the food problem. I can't see exactly how they question, but they posed the question and what might be the solution in a comical

way. But it is not funny enough or sarcastic enough to make me think more or enjoy besides rubbing my hand on the top of the table. I'm not sure about the roughness of the installation is purposely introduced or they have run out of money.

PAU: But actually one very important thing that suddenly came up to me is the title *Rubbing Tool* is actually one of the computer tool that we found on many interfaces. That finger. So I think the artist has this image of doing this on the screen. I really appreciate the interface of the touch-screen. I only agree with what Bryan said, the interface is simple and is the only work that really thought about how to interact with the artwork without a keyboard or a mouse, and using the body is sometimes difficult in a place like the experimental gallery, but if you stick on the single screen, it can be touch-screen now, which is good in utilizing your category. It fits into this category perfectly. And it's also a handmade touch-screen, which I really appreciate. To do very simple interface that is very intuitive that anybody without the knowledge of using the mouse or keyboard can use, is also the trend in interactive media, secondly it also really makes the line between the virtual screen and real screen start to blur. It is not like controlling through a mouse and a keyboard. So I appreciate this arrangement.

CHUNG: One more thing, if they could have some audio response.

FUNG: I totally agree with Bryan, I think it's the only point that I like. Throughout all the work, it's the only one that when I interact [with it], I get a concrete response and I know what I'm doing. I think is not of a very high level, just a very common or base kind of interaction. …The concept itself. If I don't know that they are students …to me when I read the description, I think they are too pretentious.

PAU: But I really appreciate the broken paper around the edge of the screen.

DRAUGHTZMAN :   Actually we cannot play this so that we don't know … However, only this one arouses me [to think about] whether I am a serial killer. Yes I am a serial killer. According to the ants. And I kept on rubbing them, and to me this is the one work that questions myself to the surrounding, much more than just technically talking about colours, typography etc. But I don't know if they set this title is because they really wanted to shock you or not, but to me this is my impression. This is kind of anti-war statement because if you are going to kill somebody and the food of the world you can have it. This kind of thinking comes to my mind. And I like the

primitive and low-tech feeling, which means that they just want to show, very primitively, just one idea and that's it. I like it.

We Didn't Expect Him

DRAUGHTZMAN : I try to trigger it several times, and I found the opening device is kind of … actually you open this one [door] and this one [another door] you can see the same video, however it just turns up if you trigger each time. Actually I don't get so much feeling on this one, because it is the same thing you have been seeing in a lot of movies before. It just turns out that you can use one view and another view and a third view like this. And I cannot find the meaning behind or if I should stay long enough to see the whole story. This is my feeling. I cannot grab too much.

PAU: I think what upsets me in this piece is that why we have to open the door to peep into a tiny video. If we open all three doors, we see the same video actually. It's really upsetting for me because I don't like peeping.

FRED : Generally the indication of someone who likes peeping is to deny it. [Laugh]

PAU: I tried to watch the one minute video and I think it's not really telling me a lot about the relationship as said in the artist statement. I guess it is just a one-minute video of many people, I can't figure out the relationship. I only see people come in and sit there, maybe motionless, maybe just doing things that I don't understand. So it's not really absurd, but it's just things that I cannot interpret from such little information provided.   And so the peeping becomes the major interaction and the major thing in my memory. I think peeping is the main part of this work, then I really … forget it then. If peeping is the main trunk of the reason for doing this installation rather than giving me 3 one-minute works on a DVD, because the DVD can also provide me with different angles and all the information. If you talk about relationship, you can just give me a DVD, I can still choose my angle. But if you need me to peep into a tiny door and then see the same moving image, then I think there's a problem.

LEE : It reminds me of a work by Anson Mak …called "din gei ham lan"… it provides a series of tapes, the viewer has to pick up the tapes by himself or herself, there's no order, a very low-tech interactive. It's a very different work …

FUNG: The movie itself is not exciting, is quite boring. Maybe they got some concept, they just want a simple installation and then you can see three angles of the story. It's simple enough to understand, but actually I agree with you is that why don't you give me a DVD. One simple suggestion is that they can put three holes in three different positions, that you can see different things from different angles, not three side by side. A very simple and low-level suggestion.

CHUNG: My question is in what way did the artist try to question the role of the audience or the participants and why or how she can anticipate the reaction of the audience as part of the installation work, because it is not just a single channel view of the three different clips of video. According to the documentation, the doors are separated in a bigger distance, they were not put together in one tiny box, and they happened to be in different corners in a room the size of this panel. And the viewers cannot see two holes together at the same time. You need to peep at one and then close it and go to the other one to peep the other, which maybe different from the settings downstairs, which you open three of them at the same time and you found they are just the same image and same screen. My problem is the role of the audience. Are they going to have some intimate [contact] as mentioned by the artist relation in the story or related to someone else in some of those characters or situation in the video? I found that it is quite difficult, because you peep through the hole as an outsider trying to understand or to comprehend what is going on within the video clips, but it fails most of the time because they don't have those information as to what was going on in the story, so it is quite difficult to make those comment according to content and context material, the only way I try to relate it is how I can relate myself with the way of interacting with the 3 doors and also the peeping actions which is something quite detached from the content material.

FRED : I was really looking forward to experience the installation and I had a lot of expectations because, from what I had read about it, and previewed in the DVD that was provided, it seemed a lot more interesting. It would have been a very good example of something between the film and video sides of this festival: on one side a lot of talented directors, and on the other side talented interactive artists. Until now it seems that there are virtually no bridges between the two different worlds. I was also looking forward to experience the installation because it had good references to previous artists: Marcel Duchamp, Kieslowski . This is where it fails … flat, it does not have the extension of movie making, very short, very basic. It showed me exactly the same thing three times in just three different angles. While I would be a lot more interested to see three different variations, or every time I

open the same door I see something slightly different versions of the same angle, and exploring what is the truth and from different angles, the subjectivity of the camera and using the interaction to explore. I was very disappointed from a cinematic perspective, … the three doors that are so close to each other, the simple fact of having distributing the view points a lot more, also introduce the idea of many scenes slightly different, but here is the same screen, and the characters didn't work so well, they were just doing the same thing. ..You had a lot of good promises, but it falls short of expectation.

That's a pity because; frankly there is a lot more interest in the potential of a work like that rather than in motion tracking. That's my personal view.

[voting]

1st round voting:

	Gold	Silver	Special Mention
Ailliance	1	2	1
Color Trend	--	--	2
Fingering	--	--	2
Paxonic Playground	1	2	1
Rubbling Tool	--	3	1
We Didn't Expect Him	--	--	--

[Jury decided not to present Gold award for this year and took the 2nd round voting for Silver Award among the top 3 works: *Alliance*, "Panoxic Playground" and *Rubbing Tool* .]

	Silver
Ailliance	3
Pixsonic Playground	2
Rubbing Tool	3

Single-Screen-Based Interactive Media Category

Gold Award

Nil

Silver Award

Alliance

Wing-fat WONG

Silver Award

Rubbing Tool

Yu-ho KWOK, Wai-yu CHAN

Special Mention

Pixsonic Playground

Hon-him CHEUNG, Jason Chi-fai LAM