Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) have greatly ad- vanced the state-of-the-art for HDR reconstruction, espe- cially for complex dynamic scenes Addi- tionally, CNNs have opened a new path into single-image HDR imaging thanks to their ability to learn complex and entangled vision tasks seamlessly, e.g. denoising, cam- era response function estimation, image in-painting, high- frequency and detail hallucination [20]. Despite the ill- posed nature of the single-image HDR reconstruction, most current methods obtain plausible results that, if not as accu- rate as those reconstructed from multiframe LDR images, can be a good alternative when multiple frames are not available or can not be captured due to time constrains.Both training and evaluation of HDR imaging algorithms require high quality annotated datasets. Specially for deep learning methods, the number of training examples and their diversity in terms of e.g. scene and camera motion, exposure values, textures, semantic content, is of crucial importance for the model performance and generalization capabilities. Creating a high quality HDR dataset with such features still poses several challenges. Current HDR datasets are gen- erally captured using static image bracketing, with some efforts towards controlling the scene motion so that stop- motion dynamic scenes can be assembled: In the work of Kalantari et al. [15] a subject is asked to stay still in order to capture three bracketed exposure images on a tripod used to generate ground-truth, and afterwards two additional im- ages are captured while the subject is asked to move, ob- taining therefore a input LDR triplet with inter-frame mo- tion and a reference HDR ground-truth image aligned to the central frame. Such capturing approaches are normally lim- ited to small datasets, as this type of capturing is time con- suming, and additionally it constrains the motions that can be captured while misalignment might still happen if the subject is not completely still. For this challenge we introduce a newly curated HDR dataset. This dataset is composed of approximately 1500 training, 60 validation and 201 testing examples. Each ex- ample in the dataset is in turn composed of three input LDR images, i.e. short, medium and long exposures, and a related ground-truth HDR image aligned with the central medium frame. The images are collected from the work of Froelich et al. [11], where they capture an extensive set of HDR videos using a professional two-camera rig with a semitransparent mirror for the purpose of HDR display evaluation. The contents of those videos include naturally challenging HDR scenes: e.g. moving light sources, bright- ness changes over time, high contrast skin tones, specular highlights and bright, saturated colors. As these images lack the necessary LDR input images, similarly to [16], we syn- thetically generate the respective LDR counterparts by fol- lowing accurate image formation models that include sev- eral noise sources [13]. provide training, testing and validation data splits. With our synthetically processed set, we man- ually discard images to balance the number of frames per scene and to remove undesirable frames, mostly due to e.g. dominant presence of lights, lack of inter-frame motion, ex- cessive presence of noise in the HDR image. This leads to roughly 1750 frames within 29 different scenes. The vali- dation and testing splits are obtained randomly from 4 dif- ferent scenes (carousel fireworks 02, fireplace 02, fishing longshot, poker travelling slowmotion) while the other 25 scenes are used for the training set, ensuring that there is no scene overlap between training and testing/validation. This results on a training set short of 1500 examples, and a vali- dation and testing set of 60 and 201 examples respectively. This track evaluates the HDR reconstruction for three dif- ferently exposed LDR images (i.e. short, medium, long) with diverse motion between the respective frames, includ- ing camera motion, non-rigid scene motion with an empha- sis on complex moving and changing light sources. The bracketed input frames were separated by steps of 2 or 3 EV between them, similarly to other existing datasets [15]. In order to enable direct comparison between both tracks, the medium LDR frame in Track 2 corresponds to the single- frame LDR input on Track 1 and thus both tracks share the same ground-truth data.From 120 registered participants in Track 1, 16 teams participated during the development phase and finally 7 teams entered the final testing phase and submitted results and fact sheets. As for Track 2, from 126 registered partic- ipants, 28 teams participated during the development phase and finally 6 teams entered the final testing phase and sub- mitted results and fact sheets. We report the final test phase results in Table 1 and 2 for track 1 and 2 respectively. A vi- sualization of both metrics for each track separately can be found in Figure 2 and 3, and all the results from both tracks are aggregated in Figure 4. The methods and the teams that entered the final phase are described in Section 4, more de- tailed information about each team and their member’s af- filiation can be found in Appendix A.