

DOK Industry feat. Savina Petkova and Ollie Launspach – “I Is Another: Relational Documentary Practices with Ollie Launspach”

Intro

[00:00:07] Hello, and welcome to DOK Industry Podcast season number seven, your podcast about the creative documentary and animated film industries. It is in collaboration with our dear friends, the Programmers of Colour Collective, What's Up with Docs, and Talking Shorts. Big shout out to our partners, supporters, and contributors. Please check them out. And hey, it's good to have you here again. Thank you for listening and enjoy the conversation. Here is your DOK Industry Podcast season number seven.

Savina Petkova: [00:00:40] Thank you so much for having us. In this episode that I'm very glad to be hosting on behalf of Talking Shorts, an online magazine for short film criticism. It's the second collaboration in podcast form between DOK Industry and Talking Shorts, and me, Savina Petkova, as a commissioning editor for the magazine, we're going to be talking about self-archival practice. A very beautiful way of making documentary films, if you ask me. It's about looking into your life, your personal story, and finding the film within. To explore this topic, I'm going to be looking at a wonderful film in this year's competition called Kiss Kiss Bang Bang. It's a film that I think captures something that is really rare, how to be together with somebody and how to make a film together with somebody. What is most important, I would like to say, is that is a gesture of generosity. [00:01:46] The director, Ollie Launspach, who is a Dutch director based in Amsterdam, and this is his graduation film from the Netherlands Film Academy. And is been showing at festivals from IDFA to DOK Leipzig. For this film, Ollie is joined by his girlfriend, Sterre, and together they share with the audience what it's like to be together in a very important moment of the filmmaker's life. So, I'm very, very happy to be joined here by Ollie himself, and we're going to be talking about what it takes to make a film so vulnerable, what it is like to put it all together, to give it shape and form, to be kind and open, and to make something so beautiful with your closest person. And I'm very, very excited to be talking about an underseen way of documentary filmmaking. [00:02:49] It's very rare to be able to have conversations like these about films like these, so I'm very, very thankful for you joining us, Ollie.

Ollie Launspach: [00:02:59] Thank you for having me.

Savina Petkova: [00:03:03] So, this film was your graduation film from the Netherlands Film Academy, right? From your undergraduate in film directing. That's a very revealing film to go with. I'm wondering about the support you felt and the need to tell your story through the story of your partner as well. How did that journey begin through the institution that you studied in?

Ollie Launspach: [00:03:44] That's a good question. Maybe to start with, they aren't particularly happy about very personal films, because it's, I mean, everybody who went

to film school probably knows how it goes, but you work together with all these other people that are also studying there. And a director that is self-occupied, can be very hard to work with, so they tend to kind of discourage people to do it. But I knew that I needed to make a graduation film, and I was actually researching something else. I was talking to other couples, of which one of the partners was transitioning, and as a matter of research, I asked my girlfriend, Sterre, if she was willing to share her diary entries with me, just for me to kind of get a feeling about how it must be for a partner. [00:04:49] And I read her diary, she sent it to me, which is crazy, in retrospect, that she did that. And I read those diary entries, and as a partner, personally, I was getting pretty scared, because I was reading stuff that I didn't know that was happening within her. But as a filmmaker, I was very, very excited, because I had just found something that was interesting and dramatic, and so at that point, I decided that the film should be about my own partner. And the film school was pretty supportive of that, because they understood that it was important for me, and I think they also saw the potential in the story. Does that make sense?

Savina Petkova: [00:05:38] Absolutely. I was going to ask you about the role of diaries in the film, and also in storytelling, because a diaristic way of looking at the world is very introspective. It's supposedly stuff that people write for themselves only. But everybody who's written down even a page in a diary knows that you're imagining a reader in your head already. So could you talk to me a little bit about that opening of the world, maybe before we get into particulars, in terms of the role of Sterre's diary in your film, just that opening of a dialogue within a documentary kind of filmmaking?

Ollie Launspach: [00:06:31] It resonates with me, what you just said, writing personal stuff down and imagining somebody reading it. I can sometimes think that there's something wrong with me, that I imagine those people, but maybe everybody does. I think so. I think so. You think so?

Savina Petkova: [00:06:51] Yeah, it seems to me that that's what making a film out of nothing is. Turning a personal story or personal introspection and giving it the shape and form of real life through cinema is a bit of a process of opening up, I guess. That comes from nowhere, but it comes also from a deep place inside of you.

Ollie Launspach: [00:07:16] Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm. Do you mean the desire of, what do you mean with opening up, the desire for a story to be told or to share something?

Savina Petkova: [00:07:28] Yeah, both. I think because telling and sharing go very much hand in hand, especially in your film. It's so much about articulating the inarticulable, in a way.

Ollie Launspach: [00:07:45] Yes. It's a good question. And I, I don't know, I don't know the answer because I, honestly, I don't know why I, why I do it or why Sterre does it.

Um, I think that... that at some point in my life, I have decided to kind of live through the making of films. So I use a camera as a way to ask questions or connect or kind of understand myself and the world around me, I guess. And I think that writing in a diary serves the same purpose. Um, and the funny thing about Sterre's diary is that it's a diary, but it's not really a diary. I mean, it's too pretty to be a diary. Mm-hmm. She's writing too, it's not chaotic enough. [00:08:48] Um, so she herself has the same, um, the same desire to use text as a way to kind of get a hold on her life or her thoughts. And does that make sense?

Savina Petkova: [00:09:08] In a way, it feels to me that filmmaking in your practice has something to do with bringing order into chaos.

Ollie Launsbach: [00:09:19] Mm-hmm.

Savina Petkova: [00:09:19] And before we get into talking about the editing and how that put an order, a very beautiful kind of order in your storytelling, I want to ask you about the process of filming. Because, as you said, the camera is there as a companion, as a tool to figure things out. But how does the camera come into the scene from the very beginning? I guess with all these intimate moments and the intimacy shared in the sequences, can you tell us the practical hurdles and circumstances that were needed to capture all these moments on camera?

Ollie Launsbach: [00:10:05] It's very strange to do. It really is very strange. And I wouldn't recommend it because it's, um, okay, so the practical circumstances. The film is made up of both kind of interview kind of conversations, but also diary entries, like we just said, and home videos. And these home videos and audio recordings. And these home videos, we had kind of, I had filmed already. I had been together with Sterre for four years when we started making the film and we had filmed each other already. So, and that is, I mean, it's, I, I feel like it's a crazy thing to do to, at some point, grab a camera and start recording. And she did when I was drawing a mustache for the first time. Um, she started recording and, uh, when I came back after my surgery and she needed to kind of check my chest if everything was okay. [00:11:07] I started recording. Um, that's a strange thing to do, but in this intimate setting, it was kind of all right because it was still just the two of us, but the conversations we had, the white wall conversations, I call them, she in front of a white wall, a whole camera crew was here in my house. And we had kind of built this set where she could sit and they were downstairs in my hallway, listening to our conversations. And, uh, I'm not sure if it helped us to understand each other, honestly, but one thing is sure. And that's that a camera kind of forces you to do something, to say something. Um, so that's what happened.

Savina Petkova: [00:12:05] Yeah, what you say, I find really profound. It speaks to the nature of cinema and to documentary, of course, that the camera is never a fly on the

wall. It actually exacerbates and intensifies the situation that you find yourselves in. But how do you make the call of what is ultimately good for you in a scene? In that case, for example, in these conversations, what's good for the film? And what may be good for your conversations? I feel like that's, um, that's a part of personal filmmaking that is very hard to give advice on or pin down. But I guess it has to do with the way that you would process these scenes that are maybe different from what we see as viewers.

Ollie Launspach: [00:13:00] Um, let me think, because this has been the question, I think, while making this film, figuring out which role to play when. And the idea that those conversations I had with Sterre, with the hallway full of crew, were intimate, that's a false notion already. Um, I was a filmmaker during those conversations. And as a filmmaker, and she was kind of, she was the protagonist and she knew that she was.

Savina Petkova: [00:13:37] The question is, how in those moments of intimate conversation, you make the call, what's good for the film? And what's good for the conversation that you're having then and there with your partner? That seems almost impossible to figure out in the moment.

Ollie Launspach: [00:13:59] Well, I chose the film every single time, I think. And I think she did too. But it's good for the film to be sincere and vulnerable and authentic. So I was trying to be, and she was too. But in that way, it's a sort of performative authenticity. Is that something that resonates with you?

Savina Petkova: [00:14:28] I think there's a very beautiful nuance difference between the performative authenticity that you term and maybe artificiality. Because we're used to talking about authenticity in terms of documentary, but it's all controlled. It's a controlled environment, even when it's not. There's the presence of the camera and the crew and the recordings that leave a mark. Let's put it that way. But it's also true that having that intensity brought in by the equipment and by the notion that this is a film can also liberate one to say things that they wouldn't say. And I can see that in the film, where there's pauses, surprises, doubts, resistance, all these very authentic parts of human conversation that are captured in the scenes. [00:15:34] I can only imagine this was a one take thing, the whole film. I cannot imagine it being a take after take. So can you let me behind the scenes a little bit?

Ollie Launspach: [00:15:47] Behind the scenes of those conversations, you mean?

Savina Petkova: [00:15:48] Yeah. I guess what I'm trying to ask you is whether there's been any script or scripted moments or take one, take two, let's do it again. Behind the scenes, whether this kind of conventional way of making a film applies at all to what we've been talking about.

Ollie Launspach: [00:16:14] Okay, I understand your question now. Um, no, not during the conversations. I think all of that happens before and after shooting. Um, all the kind of, let's do it this, this way, let's do it this way. But during those conversations, Sterre and I, I wasn't asking her to say anything. And I wasn't repeating a question because I thought that I should repeat the question for the film. Um, but there were points, moments that I was really just done with talking to her. And I would walk downstairs to the producers there and I would say, I can't anymore. I want to quit now. And then they would say, breathe, go back and try again. So, in that sense, there was a second take, another, giving it another chance. I mean, we had constructed the environment for things to happen and then the things happened. [00:17:15] Uh, the first day of shooting, it was actually a test day. We still needed to convince the kind of board at the film academy that we, that we, uh, we still needed to get permission to make this film. And we were testing and she was in front of the white wall, Sterre, and we were talking and it wasn't going anywhere. It was just, we were only fighting basically. And then I got a call and it was the gender clinic that was calling to make an appointment with me. And I was waiting for that phone call for, I don't know, six, seven, eight months. Um, that wasn't scripted. Uh, I think God exists now because that happened, but, uh, no, that wasn't scripted. Does that answer your question?

Savina Petkova: [00:18:06] Yes. Thank you. It makes me want to ask you about the formal aspects of the film and the aesthetics because it is made out of collage, photos, diaries, written text, typography, home video footage. That is a very different kind of quality than the scenes that we were just discussing, different aspect ratios as well. But yet it all feels very uniform moving with the feelings as they are arising and are being processed. Did the variety of aesthetics come into your mind at some point as, as an obstacle or it just came out, came up together naturally? What do you think?

Ollie Launspach: [00:18:58] I like ugly stuff. So for a very long time, I thought that the film was going to be very ugly because of the, you know, the variety of material you just named. But then I started working together with a very amazing cinematographer, Tarzan Rutgers, and he was able to, in the visual language, kind of create this overlapping aesthetic. And the film has this analog tactility. Is that an English word? Tactility.

Savina Petkova: [00:19:38] Tactility. Yeah. And texture as well. It is very textured.

Ollie Launspach: [00:19:42] And texture as well. Yes. And I think, I think that's the thing that kind of visually brings everything together. Those home videos, for example, some of them were filmed on an iPhone and some of them were filmed on this digital handycam I had. And we kind of all, we made it this, it was looking back a very strange way of doing it. We should have done it in the grading, I think, but we projected all the home video material on this television and then we filmed it with this VHS camera to

kind of give it the same sort of, I'm not sure if it worked out that way. I think we still kind of matched everything in the grading, but it was a way of thinking about how to piece together all these different sorts of material. And, of course, the diary entries, we didn't open up our diaries and kind of filmed everything we saw. [00:20:45] We took the time to think about how to visualize it. So I think that makes the film, in the end, aesthetically pleasing instead of very chaotic and ugly. But I really have to thank Tarzan for that because I wouldn't have done it.

Savina Petkova: [00:21:06] It's so funny to me that you use the word ugly at any point in the process, thinking about it. But it makes me also think about the qualities that we ascribe to prettiness and beautiful and how gender coded it is and how sociologically dull these aesthetic adjectives could be. So, in a way, ugly means just not your usual way of seeing pretty things, I would say. That said, I think your film is very beautiful in all its shapes and forms. I think it goes without saying. I don't know if we even need to mention this, but still. But my point here that I was trying to make was about the diaries and the writing. How exactly did you externalize them? Because you said we didn't open up our diaries, we didn't just shoot as it is. [00:22:08] What was the process like? Did you rewrite things? Did it help to see them out of the context of a diary? What was the process like and what did the process feel? Because these are intimate personal words. Of course, you've shared between yourselves. But this was for the film, in a way, bringing them to new light. Did it feel therapeutic or did it feel scary?

Ollie Launspach: [00:22:45] Honestly, nothing during the making of the film felt like either, for me. I think the scary part, I only started feeling scared about it when other people were about to watch the film or watching the film. But the diary entries, Sterne writes to be read, I think. I haven't read all her diary entries, so I can't say for sure, but everything I've read is beautiful. I write very chaotically, and I think when I watch the film, now I find my diary entries a bit cringey. They are too... We didn't change anything about them. And maybe that's a good thing, but now I look at them and I feel like they are too raw in the sense of there wasn't a... [00:23:51] I'm not sure if I succeeded in telling a very good story with them, because I didn't change them. Does that make sense? Hmm.

Savina Petkova: [00:24:01] I wonder whether this may be a natural consequence of working with yourself as primary material, though. That with time you would come back and be more critical about it, because you said it's not changed, it was raw.

Ollie Launspach: [00:24:22] Mm-hmm. I think it's just a bit dramatic now. When I read those diary entries, I'm like, oh man, it's so dramatic. And... But maybe, maybe you're right. Maybe that's because they are my diary entries. Maybe I'm so critical because I wrote them myself. But they are, in that sense, very authentic. Even the diary entries of

Sterre that are very curated, in a sense, they are still very authentic because that's the way she writes.

Savina Petkova: [00:25:00] To pivot from the diaries into dialogue, I think I see the film very easily described as a dialogue film. With the voiceover at the beginning introducing Sterre first. So the film begins by you introducing her. And by the end, we have the reverse shot of sorts, where her diaries talk about you. It's a very beautiful and gentle way to frame a film that is about a relationship. So, yeah, I wanted to ask you about the reasoning behind that framework and gesture of seeing oneself through the other's eyes in such a tactile way. Not only through the images that you take of each other, the diary entries, and the dialogues that are there. [00:26:01] What was that decision like to see through each other's eyes?

Ollie Launspach: [00:26:11] Beautifully put. Other people are much better talking about this film than I am. You should talk for the upcoming minutes. I think multiple things played a role in that decision. And I think the most honest answer is, when you talk about the sequence in the end, when she is talking about my life, I would have never talked about my own life that way. I'm the filmmaker. That's not my role. I don't want to share stuff like that myself. So, that was, it's not a very heroic way to put it, but it was, at first, because of this very practical reason. And the other thing that played a role was that I, at that point, when I started making the film, I really thought that there was something there. That there was something that I didn't know about how Sterre was feeling, and that she was the one that needed to be investigated. [00:27:24] She knew all this time that it was me, I think. I think she knew from the very beginning that I was making something about myself. She's clever like that. So, it really happened, the thing that happens in the film, me getting kind of stuck in my storytelling because I don't know where the story is going or what the actual problem is. She was telling me what the problem was. So, it made a lot of sense for her to do that in the film as well. And then, to add, she is a fantastic writer and creator. So, I would be crazy to not use her creative mind to make something, to write something for the film. So, that's what we did.

Savina Petkova: [00:28:19] And I guess that is what is reflected at the end credits as well, a film made together.

Ollie Launspach: [00:28:25] Yes, because we really did. I mean, this film wouldn't have been possible in any way without her. She, I mean, in any way. She is so, so very important to the film and to me. Yeah.

Savina Petkova: [00:28:45] And I guess what really struck me in the film is the way that it presents storytelling as a collective endeavor. And being together with someone in a relationship is also a similarly collective endeavor, obviously. And it's never easy, and it's really beautiful to see a relationship put at the center of a film, not as a narrative drive or something that we, as viewers, are voyeuristically part of. In fact, would you say

that having this radical intimacy approach by showing all of this with the audience is actually a gesture of inviting us in?

Ollie Launspach: [00:29:38] I'm not sure.

Savina Petkova: [00:29:40] Yeah, because that might mean something that is rather invasive as well. All my questions are from the point of view of curiosity and seeing how this act of bravery, because making films from such a personal standpoint, whether it's a relationship in your body, your transition, your moments that are going to live forever in this film, is brave. So I'm very happy when you're hesitating in how to answer.

Ollie Launspach: [00:30:16] Yes.

Savina Petkova: [00:30:16] It's, I think it's a beautiful thing to capture on a podcast.

Ollie Launspach: [00:30:20] Oh, really? Okay.

Savina Petkova: [00:30:21] Because it's really, it's good to say, well, I don't know if I want that.

Ollie Launspach: [00:30:27] Hmm. Yes, I think that all the things that you're saying now, I, we, I think we kind of forgot to take it into account while making the film. So I'm not sure I wouldn't, I wouldn't say the film is radical. There's this radical honesty in there because I wasn't really thinking about being very honest to other people. I was really only thinking about the relationship with Sterre and of course making the best film possible. But during the making of the film, I, I wasn't thinking about other people watching the film. And in that sense, I'm not sure if radical honesty applies to me in this case, because it didn't feel very radical. I was just making something together with my partner and a lot of other amazing people. [00:31:33] So I'm curious what, because you, you just, you just said something about radical honesty. Is it really that intimate to you, the film?

Savina Petkova: [00:31:45] Yeah, but not in a voyeuristic way. It seems to me, and it felt like it, when watching it, and I bet it feels like this when you're showing it and watching it in a cinema, in a room full of people, where you have this collective experience of participating in both of your stories for a little while. I think just being afforded as a viewer to be there for those moments of coming back from surgery, of taking the binder out, of silences of uncertainty of, do you hate me? I think you hate yourself. These moments that we, as people in our daily lives, when we're not working in cinema, when we're not film critics or programmers or cinema goers, [00:32:49] some of us have first-hand experience, some of us don't, but there's a lot to connect to in many ways. But we don't think about them until we see them on the screen. That's what I mean. It kind of, it brings up the reality that you feel recognized. And this is, of course, very different for cis people in relationships and with trans people in relationships. So it's

going to be like watching maybe two different films, depending on who's watching them. But I'm curious, the conversations that you've been having with people after the screenings, I bet they've been very interesting and intimate as well. Yes. Do you feel like people have been coming forward encouraged by the form of the film? And I mean, it being intimate to share with you.

Ollie Launspach: [00:33:47] Yes, for sure. It took us a while to find the right audience for the film or the right audience, an audience that it resonated with so deeply that, I mean, the stories I've heard, people are very, people, I mean, it's weird to say about my own film, but people are touched. And especially trans people and their partners, they see something of themselves reflected on the screen. And I think that something about the giving the doubt space, the doubt whether transitioning is the right thing to do. And I think people find it very comforting to see that because it's something that is not often talked about in my experience.

Savina Petkova: [00:34:51] Yeah, I can certainly imagine that. And in one of your interviews, you had said that there was an explicit move away from body centered imagery when it comes to transition. So I want to ask you because all the process seems very intuitive, the way that the film evolved. But can you elaborate on this particular decision? Because that seems like it was something that you wanted to move away from intentionally.

Ollie Launspach: [00:35:24] Yes, that's true. I'm not sure if I succeeded. But I really wanted to make a film about my relationship and how hard it is to communicate when the big things in life happen. And me transitioning in my head was always this secondary storyline. The thing that was moving the story forward that wasn't in focus all the time. And again, I'm not sure if I succeeded because my body still really is a very central theme in the film. But it's, I hope, not the central theme in the film. So most films I've encountered in my life about trans people are really focused on the bodily transition, the before and after picture. [00:36:24] And that wasn't interesting to me at all. Maybe it wasn't in that way a very conscious decision. I just wasn't interested. I didn't want to make a film about my transition. So I think it kind of happened intuitively. Do you recognize that desire I had to not focus on the body too much?

Savina Petkova: [00:36:59] Yes. I think because of the... So the body is present through talking about it and through the plans of what the body is going to encounter. Whether it's the hormone therapy, whether it's the operation, but it's not present as a subject for the camera to capture. And I think this is something that really sets it apart. And in a way, it reminds me personally that cinema can be a greedy medium. I mean, just the way that we speak about the camera capturing is it's a certain captivity in the language of cinema that I think comes to the foreground when we're talking about trans narratives being presented on screen after a shamefully long tradition of non-trans

people putting forward trans narratives thinking of the Danish girl and abominable films like these, right? [00:38:07] They are hungry. The camera in these films is hungry for the changes. And that's worlds away from the way that body is present in Kiss Kiss Bang Bang, of course. But I'm also wondering about the relationship between authorship in the film, and I guess I'm going to come back to the collaborative factor as a film about a relationship, by a relationship. Because it seems to me that this deciding not to focus on the body and not to make a film about your transition, but a film that features that part of your life and is documented there, is also choosing a different kind of narrative for yourself. Did you ever feel that way, like the film being really intertwined with where you are, right then, right there, in your life, and how this becomes an archive of your own, too?

Ollie Launspach: [00:39:19] I feel so shallow because, no, I didn't think about that. I was thinking about that when we were making the home videos. I think they've always been a way to archive the important or interesting or kind of vulnerable moments between us. But the film, no, now I can see that this might be a lot of fun to watch in 30 years.

Savina Petkova: [00:39:48] What is it about the home video footage that speaks to archive for you straight away? Is it because it's a nostalgic form?

Ollie Launspach: [00:39:58] I think so, and because it's very private. It makes me think of my dad used to film everything when I was a child. And he still makes, every New Year's, he makes this kind of overview montage of a specific year. So maybe this year we'll watch 2006 or something. And so it's a, it's, I've always understood it as a way to preserve something. It wasn't the reason for me to do it. No, no. I would even say that I'm kind of regretting archiving this particular moment in my life. Because, like I just said, I watched myself and it was such a dramatic moment in my life. And I was, I was feeling a lot of things. And now I don't anymore. And I think I'm a more chill person. [00:41:00] But people will see that version of myself. So, no, I think I'm regretting it more. Yeah.

Savina Petkova: [00:41:10] Um, I'm gonna move to like the, the final bits and questions about it. If, if you're thinking back when you started making the film, um, obviously you'll have thoughts about how you felt, how you decided to do this or that. Um, you look fondly on the collaborations. You may have some ambivalences towards other parts of the process. But if somebody comes up to you and says, hey, I'm really inspired by the way that you approached a personal narrative to tell a story that a lot of people relate to. What advice can you give me, like this very typical young filmmaker comes to you for advice? Or what would you tell your younger self? I'm guessing this kind of filmmaking, especially for you, for your first film to then travel to festivals and make its way to, to Leipzig too... [00:42:12] it teaches you a lot of lessons. So I'm wondering if you want to

share some of them. Um, it's a, it's perhaps a very different kind of lesson than if you had made your first film in a narrative fashion with an animal protagonist, let's say.

Ollie Launspach: [00:42:31] That's a good idea.

Savina Petkova: [00:42:32] So something really, really specific to the form of the film that you would like to pass on to as, as knowledge.

Ollie Launspach: [00:42:43] I'm someone who still needs a lot of advice, so it feels strange to be the one giving it. But the first thing that comes to mind is, um, two teachers at the guest lecturers at the film academy, Albert and Acheny. It's a couple. And they told me to sketch within the medium. And I think that's the most important thing that, I think that's the thing that made this film vulnerable and authentic. Because instead of living life and afterwards trying to make a film out of it, I and the people around me were constantly working on trying to capture what was there. And the diary entries are a good example, writing stuff down when you feel them. It's good for you, I think. But it's also good for you as a filmmaker because it's material that you can use later on. [00:43:43] And those teachers, they told me, when you do it, when you write something down, try to make something out of it, film it, edit it, put some music underneath there, just kind of find out what the story is, instead of sitting down behind your computer and just trying to write it all down. So, I think that would be my advice.

Savina Petkova: [00:44:10] No, that's wonderful. I think it's very well put. And when it comes to your next projects, do you feel like you're more inclined to move away and do something quite different? Or do you think you're still more, or do you think you're more inclined to go deeper into the paths that you're already carving?

Ollie Launspach: [00:44:33] I'm afraid that it's the latter one. I know that it's the latter one, no. For some reason, I'm not done with looking at myself. I say shamefully. But no, I'm working on something. I'm making a film, actually, with Sterre again. And it's becoming a bit personal again. And I'm making something about and together with my father. So, no, it's definitely something that I'm still exploring. And I really hope that it will stay authentic and vulnerable. I really hope so.

Savina Petkova: [00:45:22] Wonderful. I think that's a wonderful way to end. Really, really nice.