International Organizing Committee

Young Physicists' Tournament

Minutes of the IOC meeting, 2016-07-03 to 2016-07-04, Ekaterinburg, Russia

Each item on the agenda includes the allotted time budget in parenthesis and the start time.
Items on the agenda are divided into three categories according to the IOC rules of procedure:

- Recurring items and Reports
- Motions for specific actions
- General discussions of new ideas and exchange of opinions

1) Opening (15min), 14:00

July 3rd, 2pm, Ramada hotel, Ekaterinburg, Russia
Minute keeper: Timotheus Hell
Keeper of the list of speakers: Samuel Byland
Chair of the meeting: Martin Plesch (any statements not attributed by name to someone were made by the chair)

Control of presence

IOC Members (eligible to vote):
Australia: not present (Kathryn Zealand)
Austria: Ulrike Regner
Belarus: Igor Timoshchenko
Brazil: Thiago Frigerio de Carvalho Serra for Márcio Martino
China: Li ChuanYong for Xuewei Cao
Chinese Taipei: Yung-Yuan Hsu
Czech Republic: Stanislav Panos
Georgia: Grigol Peradze
Germany: Florian Ostermaier for Rainer Reichle
Hungary: Mihály Hömöstrei
Iran: Dina Izadi
Korea: Hong Jung for Myeunghoi Kwon
Macao: Iat-Neng Chan
New Zealand: Gavin Jennings
Nigeria: not present (Kingsley Imade)
Poland: Leszek Gladczuk
Romania: Victor Paunescu for Sandu Golcea
Russia: Valentin Lobyshev
Singapore: Yeo Ye for Theresa Thor
Slovakia: Frantisek Kundracik
Sweden: Mattias Andersson for Kim Freimann
Switzerland: Eric Schertenleib
Thailand: Wittaya Kanchanapusakit for Burin Asavapibhop
Ukraine: Valery Koleboshyn
United Kingdom: John Balcombe

23 voting IOC members are present before item 2 on the agenda.

After item 2, there are five more voting IOC members for a total of 28:

Bulgaria: Oleg Yordanov
Canada: Ryan Lin for Sacha Noukhovitch
Pakistan: Farida Tahir
Serbia: Aleksandra Aloric
USA: Andrei Klishin

EC Members:
President: Martin Plesch
Secretary General: Timotheus Hell
Treasurer: Ilya Martchenko
Member: Samuel Byland
Member: Qian Sun
Member (LOC 2017): Yeo Ye
Member (LOC 2016): Olga Inisheva
Member (LOC 2015): Nirut Pussadee for Prapun Manyum

Representatives of IMO applicants
France (IMO applicant): not present
Bulgaria (IMO applicant): Oleg Yordanov
Canada (IMO applicant): Ryan Lin for Sacha Noukhovitch
India (IMO applicant): not present
Kenya (IMO applicant): not present
Pakistan (IMO applicant): Farida Tahir and Tahir Khan
Serbia (IMO applicant): Aleksandra Aloric and Jelena Pajovic
USA (IMO applicant): Andrei Klishin

Other:
Assen Kyuldjiev (Jury Committee Member)
Dagmar Panosova
Evgeny Yunosov

According to the IOC RoP, "any IOC member who leaves the room during the course of the meeting announces their leaving and their return to the keeper of the minutes." As however most IOC members decided not to announce their (short) breaks from the meeting, the following list of participants leaving the meeting is incomplete:

Day 1:
Valentin Lobyshev 14:00 - 14:15
Valery Koleboshyn 14:00 - 14:30
Leszek Gladczuk 14:15 - 14:25
Samuel Byland 14:55 - 15:00
Ulrike Regner 15:55 - 16:05

Day 2:
Wittaya Kanchanapusakit 10:35 - 17:15 (end of meeting)
Nirut Pussadee 10:35 - 17:15 (end of meeting)
John Balcombe 16:20 - 16:40
Samuel Byland 16:20 - 16:40
Ilya Martchenko 16:20 - 16:40
Andrei Klishin 16:20 - 16:40
Aleksandra Aloric (not present on day 2)

Approval of the agenda
The agenda is approved by the IOC by acclamation.

2) Applications for IMO status (30min), 14:10
Attachment: IMO_applications_2016.zip

Since the past IOC meeting, we have received applications for IMO status from organizations wishing to represent the following countries:

France	Croatia	Pakistan
Bulgaria	India	Serbia
Canada	Kenya	USA

Until the beginning of the IOC meeting we have received IMO signed applications from USA, Canada and Serbia.
Croatia has withdrawn their application.
Bulgaria has not yet sent or brought the original files.
Ryan Lin explains how Canada worked with a 'local endorser' who helped the team remotely. For the next year they have more support, and there is another former PYPT participant that helps. Martin Plesch proposes to wait for another year until we give IMO status to Canada. The team was not fully informed about the IYPT rules, e.g. that they must not use the internet during the fight.
There is no one here to support the applications we have received from France, India or Kenya.
Tahir Khan explains that there was a misunderstanding about having to bring the originals. He explains about the organization that is applying for Pakistan. Also Pakistan worked with a local former IYPT participant from Ekaterinburg, who also joined the team in Pakistan.
Gavin Jennings asks about how students can actually participate in their selection process. This should be in the application, but most of the applicants did not submit such an annex.
Serbia did not bring a team, but their application and organization looks very good.
The application from the US is for one year only. It's not fully clear what organization is applying - the university or just a department, and who can actually sign for them.

Andrei Klishin explains that Jay Jennings, who was here last year, and he are working with an organization that is expected to become the IOC member in the future. They brought a team from 3 schools this year.
Aleksandra Aloric asks about the suggestion on guest teams. It will be discussed in detail later.
Ryan Lin has prepared a presentation on the organization that is applying, the "STEM Fellowship".
Aleksandra Aloric explains about their organization, which has a lot of experience and the necessary funding for becoming an IMO.
Tahir Khan also gives some more information about their organization, which exists already since 1998.
Martin Plesch again sums up the information we have on the candidates and explains how the vote works.
Gavin Jennings and Mihály Hömöstrei are chosen as scrutineers by acclamation.

Representatives of IMOs that successfully applied will immediately be part of the IOC and therefore eligible to vote during the rest of the meeting, including the elections.

There is a 10-minute break for counting from 15:00 - 15:10.

The result of the vote (bold indicating that the IMO application was successful):

Motion: IOC recognizes the application for IMO status for France for 5 years.
Valid: 22
Pro: 3
Against: 14
Abstain: 5

Motion: IOC recognizes the application for IMO status for **Bulgaria** for 5 years.
Valid: 21
Pro: 20
Against: 0
Abstain: 1

Motion: IOC recognizes the application for IMO status for **Canada** for 5 years.
Valid: 23
Pro: 22
Against: 1
Abstain: 0

Motion: IOC recognizes the application for IMO status for India for 5 years.
Valid: 21
Pro: 0
Against: 20
Abstain: 1

Motion: IOC recognizes the application for IMO status for Kenya for 5 years.
Valid: 21
Pro: 10
Against: 4
Abstain: 7

Motion: IOC recognizes the application for IMO status for **Pakistan** for 5 years.
Valid: 22
Pro: 20
Against: 2
Abstain: 0

Motion: IOC recognizes the application for IMO status for **Serbia** for 5 years.
Valid: 23
Pro: 21
Against: 2
Abstain: 0

Motion: IOC recognizes the application for IMO status for **USA** for 1 year.
Valid: 22
Pro: 12
Against: 6
Abstain: 4

The IOC welcomes their new members from Bulgaria, Canada, Pakistan, Serbia and the USA. From now on therefore there are 5 more IOC members present, for a total of 28, all of which are eligible to vote in the upcoming elections.

3) Elections (2h), 15:17
Chaired by the head of the Election Committee Samuel Byland
Presentation of Candidates for the President of IYPT (45 min)
There are two candidates for President of IYPT: Martin Plesch and Qian Sun.

Martin Plesch gives his presentation.

Questions:
By Andrei Klishin:

Q: Worldwide coverage - what can be credited to you? Personally?
A: Writing papers, visit local competitions. None of the outreach on social media.

Q: ICPE medal - has someone seen it?

A: We have a scan.

Q: As chair of juror committee - how is the analysis done?
A: There is the open source code for the jury planner[1]. All available data is put there, some manual changes might be needed (e.g. if a juror does not show up). The individual feedback for jurors is not to be made public, last year each juror got an email with feedback. Those with not so good feedback were contacted individually.

By Gavin Jennings:
Q: Are there any problems (you know of) that might stop you from fulfilling this position?
A: At the academy there is full support from the department head, but not from the director. For the past seven years this worked fine.

No further questions.

Qian Sun gives his presentation.

Questions:
By Eric Schertenleib:
Q: How would your work differ from the other candidate's?
A: Hard to say I would change something; I'd give more focus on physics.

By Andrei Klishin:
Q: Is there a point where you and Martin crucially disagree?
A: During the tournament the most important topic is how to judge, we should focus on the physics, evaluate if the teams have real knowledge.

By Hong Jung:
Q: Do you have an alternative suggestion for the Scoring / for the Scoring Sheet?
A: More points for physics, especially also concerning the discussion.

By Gavin Jennings:
Q: Are there any problems (you know of) that might stop you from fulfilling this position?
A: No, I am now at a permanent position at the university, with enough time, not only focused on research any more.

---

[1] Available at https://github.com/yurloc/iypt-planner

Election of the President of IYPT (15 min)

Gavin Jennings and Mihály Hömöstrei are chosen as scrutineers by acclamation.

We now have 28 IOC members who can vote. A simple majority is to be reached to become President.

Votes for Martin Plesch: 21
Votes for Qian Sun: 7
No invalid votes or abstentions.

Martin Plesch is therefore re-elected as President of the IYPT.

Presentation of Candidates for Treasurer of IYPT (45 min)

There are two candidates for Treasurer of IYPT: John Balcombe and Ilya Martchenko

John Balcombe starts with his presentation.

Questions: none.

Ilya Martchenko gives his presentation.

Questions:

Martin Plesch: How did you distribute your workload?
Ilya Martchenko: First the priorities as treasurer, then other things.

By Gavin Jennings
Q: You are doing many jobs for IYPT, does that at times become too much pressure?
A: No.

Q: Are there any problems (you know of) that might stop you from fulfilling this position?
A: No.

Election of the Treasurer of IYPT (15 min)

Votes for John Balcombe: 13
Votes for Ilya Martchenko: 15
No invalid votes or abstentions.

Ilya Martchenko is therefore re-elected as Treasurer of the IYPT.

The slides are attached to the minutes.

IYPT 2017 - presentation by the head of LOC Singapore, Yeo Ye (10 minutes)
There are only minor changes since last year.
The date is now fixed for July 5th to July 12th (14th for IOC meeting)
All accommodations are booked, so are the venues.
There is already a tentative schedule.
Accommodation for students is 1 min walk from the venues. Others are accommodated at 'Kent Vale', also on campus. There are units with 2 bedrooms and a shared living room, others have 3 bedrooms, as far as possible countries' representatives will stay together.

IYPT 2018 - presentation by the head of LOC China, done by Qian Sun (10 minutes)
Schedule: July 19th to July 26th.

Motion: Accept the bid from China to host IYPT 2018.

Pro: 25
Against: 0
Abstain: 3

Break from 17:10 - 17:30.

IYPT 2019 - presentation of host candidates Iran and Poland, vote on host (20 minutes)
Dina Izadi and Leszek Gladczuk present their bids to host the IYPT in 2019.

Motion: The IOC encourages Iran to present a more detailed bid in the future.
Pro: 9
Against:11
Abstain: 8

Motion: The IOC encourages Poland to present a more detailed bid in the future.
Pro: 23
Against: 5
Abstain: 0

IYPT 2020 - presentation by the head of LOC Romania (10 minutes)
Victor Paunescu explains that there is support from the ministry, Martin Plesch has already visited in the past, there are no important updates.

IYPT 2021 - presentation of host candidate Czech Republic & vote on host (10 minutes)

Stanislav Panos gives a presentation on their bid.

Motion: The IOC encourages Czech Republic to present a more detailed bid for hosting in **2022** in the future.
Pro: 27
Against: 0
Abstain: 1

Pakistan expresses interest in hosting in 2021.
Georgia expresses interest in hosting in the future as well.
Iran expresses interest in hosting in 2023.

5) Executive Committee: (2h), 18:10
Attachment: EC_Rules.zip, Motion_guest_teams.pdf, curiie_clock_2016.pdf

Rules of Procedure for EC (15 minutes)
Martin Plesch presents the document which was sent to IOC Members and is already published on the website too. There are no questions.

Rules of Procedure for Elections (15 minutes)
Samuel Byland reports on the document which was sent to IOC Members and is already published on the website too. The elections during this year's meeting were already handled accordingly. The document cannot include any regulations that would be against the statutes, therefore in order to solve such issues - like the president having the final say when there are elections with equal votes - cannot be addressed in this document.

Andrei Klishin asks to have a vote on this document.

Motion: Who is in favor of accepting this document?
Pro: 28
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Rules of Procedure for the Jury Committee (15 minutes)
Martin Plesch explains the document which was sent to IOC Members and is already published on the website too. In the future the criteria will be worked on, as e.g. it is not always clear whether a degree really is in physics.
Ilya Martchenko criticizes that with these criteria, many of the current jurors would not have been able to attend as Independent Jurors as they did in their first IYPT.

Thiago Frigerio de Carvalho Serra suggests that having been a participant (e.g. team member) plus the basic juror qualification should suffice for becoming an Independent Juror.

Ilya Martchenko mentions complaints from persons who wanted to come as Independent Jurors. For most a solution was found, e.g. by appointing them to the local jury.

Gavin Jennings asks if participation in one of the local tournaments should be enough. And asks what the process for finding the jury for the finals is.
The final jury was done manually this year (similar to all past tournaments). We have mostly used chairs and tried to avoid having two from the same country.

Andrei Klishin suggests that there should be a clear and transparent way to increase the pool of Independent Jurors, appointments as Local Juror are a loophole that only some people know about. Furthermore, he complains that there are currently no transparent rules on how to become a chair. Timotheus Hell explains that this year two very experienced jurors who had not been chairs before, were asked to chair some of the fights. There are currently no written rules for how to become chair.

Oleg Yordanov asks about formal complaints on jurors. Last year there were none. This year there was one.

General Budget Guidelines (15 minutes)
Martin Plesch explains the document which was sent to IOC Members and is already published on the website too. The goal was to have rules and to have a budget for the IOC to approve instead of asking them to approve a budget after the money is already spent.

Andrei Klishin asks that this document should have to be approved by the IOC.
Samuel Byland points out, that the budget itself is for the IOC to vote on. So if the IOC does not agree with the budget built according to the rules, then there would have to be changes.

Andrei Klishin continues to ask about the percentages that limit spending in each chapter.
There had been a long discussion on these chapters within the EC, looking at how money was spent in the past. The numbers come from historical spending and defining priorities. The current guidelines are the result of the discussion, there was only one vote against.

Ulrike Regner asks about whether extra spending in one of the non-fixed chapters would increase the others. That's not the case, as the percentages are meant as percentages of the income.

Ilya Martchenko criticises that the guidelines do not allow overspending, as there are overall limits to overspending which are very rigid.

Ulrike Regner suggests to correct some of the wording, like using the term 'actuals' instead of 'budget' where appropriate.

Martin Plesch asks for further feedback.

Ulrike Regner asks about the process for coming up with the budget. Ilya Martchenko explains that it includes lengthy discussions within the EC, changes according to motions, and eventually approval by the EC. The budget for the current year and the next is now done according to the new rules. A forecast of the income is created based on previous years' experience, then chapter owners are asked for suggestions. The forecasts were very accurate this year.

CURIIE Registration System & Clock (15 minutes)

Timotheus Hell presents updates and open feature requests to the CURIIE registration system and asks for further requests for improvements, an updated list is provided as an attachment to the minutes.

New requests:

Leszek Gladczuk: A button to 'cancel', i.e. not save data, just close. (similar to closing the browser window, or hitting the browser's 'back' button).

Florian Ostermaier: Could we change from email based to name based?

Florian Ostermaier: Many teams are now bringing a mascot; it would be nice if they those were added to CURIIE so they can get a badge with no extra work.

Ilya Martchenko: Add read only access.

Timotheus Hell will discuss all new and old requests with Georg Hofferek and try to implement as many as possible. A 'cancel' button is easy to implement, but so is hitting the browser's back button. As names, unlike email addresses, are not unique, they will not work. Furthermore, the system cannot provide its users a list of possible candidates or a search function for data privacy reasons. The option for more granular access, including read-only, is already on the wish list. Mascots could be handled easily, which would certainly be appreciated by the teams. However, Martin Plesch points out that it might lead to confusion and is an extra burden on the LOC, therefore it should be discussed in detail before implementation.

Timotheus Hell shows a slightly updated version of the clock that's already available at clock.iypt.org and gets approval from IOC to integrate the changes in NEWTOON too.

End of day one at 19:35, 2016-07-04
Start of day two at 09:10, 2016-07-05

The EC and 27 IOC members are present, the IOC representative from Serbia had to leave already.

EC Motion to change the Regulations: Introduction of Guest Teams (30min)

Samuel Byland introduces the EC's motion. The intent is to make it easier for new countries to attend the IYPT. We currently have rules and a process, but experience shows that it's hard for new countries to fulfill all of our requirements. Therefore, the EC proposes to add a new way to allow for teams to participate as 'guest teams'. It's easier for observers to attend if they can come with a team instead of travelling on their own just to observe the tournament. The motion would introduce the option to have guest teams, but it's the LOC's decision if they want to allow for this possibility.

The motion to update the wording accordingly is introduced, adding: "EC in cooperation with LOC can invite a team from a country that is not represented by a National team. Guest teams do not take part on the competition according to these regulations. Depending on the number of the guest teams present, EC in cooperation with LOC prepares a simplified competition among them."

Comments, questions and answers:

Dina Izadi	It's for new teams? And it's still possible for teams to participate e.g. in the APYT.	Yes.
Valentin Lobyshev	Why do they not get the possibility to participate in the real tournament? Or if they cannot do that, come as visitors?	Those who are eligible can still come and participate as in the past. Those who want to observe / come as visitors can do so too. There is no new restriction, we would be adding a new possibility how to participate - based on experiences made in the past. It would be very expensive for a team to come as visitors.
Leszek Gladczuk	Why can't they first participate in a local competition, like the AYPT?	Not all local competitions are run similar to the IYPT. The AYPT might change its regulations any time, and cannot guarantee to allow as many foreign teams in the future.
Oleg Yordanov	Why can't all teams come as full members?	We had issues with teams not knowing the rules before and want to avoid those situations as much as we can. Therefore, we have the rule now, that new teams need to have someone who is experienced, but it turns out that this is hard for some teams.
John Balcombe	UAE back in 2014 had satisfied our criteria, but had no idea how the tournament works. But that wouldn't change, as the team	

	that then arrives next year does not have to be the same. We are making the assumption here, that experienced teams are good teams, but that's not necessarily the case. Those new teams would not understand why they could not participate. All teams are here for the first time. Why not try to help the new teams that want to participate?	
Valentin Lobyshev	The team from Korea also participated for the first time at some point.	With our current rules we would need them to first send an observer.
Ilya Martchenko	To the teams from Pakistan and Canada: This year, would you have preferred to come as 'guest teams' or as 'qualified teams' (as you actually came) - what choice is preferable to you, and how were your experiences as fully participating teams?	
Ryan Lin	To come as a fully qualified team is a better experience. We had help, and this, even over the internet, was actually a very good experience. Actual participation is important for the student's experience.	

Samuel Byland	It's clear that it works in some cases, but that does not mean we shouldn't open up another road. In Switzerland we had the possibility to send a teacher to an IYPT first, but that might be hard for other countries, to send an observer without a team.	
Timotheus Hell	Currently we do not have a process that guarantees we get teams that know the rules well. If we comply strictly with our current regulations, there will be no new teams, and there would have been no new teams this year. Either we keep bending the rules - which isn't transparent and unfair - or we comply with them and add new possibilities to allow for new teams. We were lucky that it worked well with the new teams that participated.	
Martin Plesch	It was suggested to do this change without changing the regulations, but I would not be happy about this - if it is an option IOC agrees with, let's have it in the rules, if not, we shouldn't do it.	
Farida Tahir	If a team participates as a guest team, funding might become harder to get for them.	
Martin Plesch	We now discuss only within those who have made it here. But what about other teams, that aren't. For example, there's	

	other countries that could be here with this rule. There's full agreement, that the best option is for new teams to participate in full. We're not making it harder for those teams. We are opening another door. If the idea doesn't work, it stays as before.	
Mihály Hömöstrei	So if Turkey does what Pakistan did this year, could they participate as a full team?	Yes, but if there's a problem, there then is another way how to participate.
Yung-Yuan Hsu	Should there be a jury for this second kind of participation? That's not a good idea, as jurors have a high workload already.	It would be voluntary for the jurors. To experience a fight, there needs to be a jury. If they come as a regular team, we need a jury for them too.

The IOC votes on the motion by the EC, it needs a ⅔ majority to pass:

Pro: 10
Against: 14
Abstain: 3

The motion is not successful.

Other current EC issues (if any)
No other current issues were discussed.

6) Report of the Treasurer: (1h)

Financial year 2014/2015, endorsement of auditors (15 minutes)
Ilya Martchenko presents the financial report that was sent to IOC.

Motion: Accept the report of the treasurer.
Pro: 27
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Budget 2015/2016, approval (15 minutes)

Ilya Martchenko presents the budget for 2015/16, which was already done in compliance with the new budget rules. There is no spending report prepared. Overall we are underspending and within the limits of the budgets.

Motion: Accept the budget.
Pro: 27
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Budget 2016/2017, amendments, approval (15 minutes)

Ilya Martchenko presents the proposed budget for 2016/17 which will include the IYPT in Singapore.

John Balcombe asks about the increase in the central part - is this a long time plan? Ilya Martchenko explains it was increased by 100 Euro, because travel is expected to be more expensive to Singapore than it was to Russia.

Ulrike Regner asks about the way the rules are set up currently, which incentivizes to underspend even though the reserves are at an all-time high. The flexibility within the current rules obviously does not ameliorate this. Martin Plesch points out that the budget was done 2 weeks before the tournament, so there was no real discussion possible. If it is prepared in time in the future, the situation will improve.

Motion: Accept the budget.
Pro: 27
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Fundraising / alumni (15 minutes)

Ilya Martchenko explains how he was rather successful attracting in-kind contributions but unsuccessful with raising cash and asks for input on how to raise money for the IYPT as an organization.
John Balcombe suggests to try raising funds on something more concrete, like the tournament in one specific year.
Andrei Klishin adds that in '15 the US team raised 15k USD using GoFundMe, but only 40 USD in '16.
Martin Plesch thinks that our alumni are more closely attached to their national competitions.
Gavin Jennings explains how in kind contributions would help a lot, e.g. by working with Singapore Airlines allowing us to book early with no names, that might save a lot of teams a lot of money. Yeo Ye will try to contact the airline via the ministry.

10:35 - 10:50 coffee break

Feedback on Jurors (20 minutes)

Martin Plesch gives a report on the feedback we received last year. The feedback received on chairs was ok. With some of the jurors, teams were unhappier, but as there was only limited feedback, it can't be called significant. Furthermore, many were local jurors. We did not see any correlation between lower marks and worse feedback. Where teams were unhappy, jurors were contacted. Mostly the teams complained about juror's explanations. As there is a very high workload on chairs already, we did not go ahead with the idea of asking chairs to give feedback to the jurors.

Ulrike Regner was unhappy with some aspects of the email sent to jurors, it had some problems, i.e. mixing commas and dots.

Valentin Lobyshev asks about the consequences. Martin Plesch explains that we will adjust the load on chairs. We'll go further next year; it will be a data source for choosing independent jurors next year.

Andrei Klishin wants the aggregated anonymized data to be released. The goal is to answer in an empirically-educated fashion the question "Is the IYPT jury good?". The Jury Committee's position is not to release any data as to protect the teams.

Ilya Martchenko asks about other, possibly better indicators for good jury performance. Besides having the average grade over all of the tournament, there are other criteria, like how on average a juror misses the average grade in their room. If we look at the spread between the juror's grade and the average grade of the others.

Juror Selection Process (20 minutes)

We have a contract with the LOC, in the past it was for 30 Independent Jurors, but we got fewer applications, therefore all who fulfilled the criteria were accepted.

Scoring Guidelines / Scoresheet (20 minutes)

There was a minor change for the scoresheet for this year.
We tested a new scoresheet during this tournament and are collecting feedback on it.

Valentin Lobyshev expresses his rejection of the current grading scheme. It's the worst of a lot of different schemes that he has had experience with. The starting point is 5, but it is absolutely undefined. Giving a 2 or 3 is absolutely not acceptable at the international competition. This update is even worse. We shall have the maximum points for physics, 6 or more. For presentation there should only be 0-1, and 3 points for discussion etc. - that's simple, clear, also for newcomers. The more questions we put, the higher the error will be. The questions are ok, but they should be given as instructions. However, the problems are quite different - maybe we would need different questions for each problem, which isn't possible. We should therefore come back to an earlier, simpler version.

Oleg Yordanov points out that whether we start at 5 or at 0 is just a change of the origin.

Martin Plesch explains that based on the feedback there will be an update. It's a work in progress. Feedback is always welcome, but obviously we cannot please everyone. Please share your ideas and we will try to find a reasonable version.

8) Disciplinary Committee: (30min)
No one from the Committee is here. Martin Plesch explains that there was a complaint from Sweden about how the team from Germany reported on the tournament on facebook.

Mattias Andersson: It was unclear if this was a recurring thing, were there complaints about similar issues in the past?
Ulrike Regner: I heard about this from other teams as well.
Samuel Byland: There was no formal complaint last year.
John Balcombe: What was the complaint?
Martin Plesch: It was about how they reported on fights.
Florian Ostermaier: We asked for a formal complaint, because what is being stated now is not true.
Samuel Byland: There was a complaint, then an informal discussion between Kent Hogan and the Team Leaders.
Florian Ostermaier: We currently have nothing to discuss as a common ground.
Martin Plesch: All I know is that it was somehow handled.
Florian Ostermaier: We do not seem to agree; so how should we continue?
Martin Plesch: If more discussion is needed, please talk to the committee again.
Mattias Andersson: I do not feel like it was handled properly.
Martin Plesch: Currently the Disciplinary Committee does not have rules of procedure, they promised to prepare them but did not, we will again ask them to submit their rules so we can publish them and have a clear procedure. It was the first formal complaint.
Florian Ostermaier: I'm unsure how to handle this - first it had the label of being unofficial, but now it is brought to the IOC as a case that was handled officially.
Martin Plesch: As I understood from Kent, he spoke with both teams.
Samuel Byland: We should ask for a report from Kent.
Martin Plesch: We hope Alan will return next year. If some members do not, we need new ones.
Gavin Jennings: So are we saying that teams should not make comments?
Martin Plesch: No.
Gavin Jennings: So we're discussing something that might or might not have happened?
Martin Plesch: Are there any other comments?

There were no other comments.

9) Committee for Problems Selection: (30min), 11:20
Report on the selection process (15 minutes)
Ilya Martchenko reports that 106 proposals for new problems were submitted for IYPT 2017.

A report of 85 pages was sent in March. Some proposals were merged, also between different years. In the end a list was prepared and the wording improved. The order, as done in the past, starts with "Invent Yourself" at the top, and has what was considered the most entertaining problem as number 17.

Presentation of the suggested problems (15 minutes), 11:30

Ilya Martchenko comments on each of the problems.

Motion: Accept the problems as they are.

Pro: 12
Against: 14
Abstain: 0

As the motion to accept the list does not pass, we continue with 10) Approval of the set of problems.

10) Approval of the set of problems (4h)

Motion: Who is in favor of looking at problems that ranked high, bud did not make it to the final list?

Pro: 13
Against: 10
Abstain: 3

We look at more problems.

After some discussion we decide to discuss each of the problems individually, and have separate motions, either for accepting or discarding the problem.

Motion to discard Problem 1:
Pro: 4
Against: 22
Abstain: 0

Timotheus Hell points out, that if each of the decisions is done as a motion, then it has to be done according to the RoP, which means that each vote has to be counted so that the result can be minuted. As there is a general feeling, that that might not be appropriate due to the number of motions to be decided on, Martin Plesch goes ahead making the following motion to allow for a deviation from the RoP.

Motion: We will just minute if there is a majority for the following motions on problems so that we do not need to count.

Pro: 26
Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion: Accept Problem 1 with the edits done by Ilya Martchenko during the discussion. The motion is accepted.

Lunch break at 12:23 - 13:36
Control of presence: 26 IOC representatives are present.

Problems 2 and 3 are accepted changing only minor (grammar) errors.

Problem 4 is accepted after minor changes.

Problem 5 is discussed in some detail, as there is already a paper describing the effect. Ilya Martchenko points out that the same is true for most other problems too. We agree that there are ample other aspects yet to be investigated. The problem is accepted.

For Problem 6 IOC agrees that the problem needs a figure and asks Samuel Byland to create one - the decision is postponed until a graphic is ready.

Problem 7 is accepted.

Problem 8 is accepted after changing 'fluid' to 'gas'.

Problem 9 is discarded by IOC.

We continue with Problem 6 and accept it with the inclusion of a sketch by Samuel Byland.

Problem 10 is accepted after agreeing that several directions for separations are possible and considering to allow for other materials as glass might break.

Problem 11 is accepted.

Problem 12 is accepted with changes to the wording.

Problems 13 and 14 are accepted.

Problem 15 is accepted with some changes to the wording.

Problem 16 is discarded by IOC.

Problem 17 is not immediately accepted. After some discussions and changes eventually there is a slight majority to accept.

The IOC starts work on selecting two more problems as replacements for Problems 9 and 16.

IOC decides not to discuss 'Air Dancer' as a possible candidate.

IOC decides to start discussion on 'Metronome Synchronization' and after some changes on the wording accepts the problem as Problem 9.

IOC decides not to discuss a Problem on 'Dielectrophoresis' as Problem 16.

We continue with other points on the agenda while the problem committee works on a further proposal.

We continue at 16:45 after having discussed item 11 on the agenda.

Ilya Martchenko suggests "Ball in a Tube" which was submitted for last year and IOC agrees to discuss it further.

The IOC accepts this final Problem for 2017 at 16:51.

11) Central recording of physics fights (15min), 16:30
Attachment: iypt_recordings.pdf
Florian Ostermaier presents his ideas on central recording of physics fights, the slides are attached.
There is a general consensus on this being a good idea, with some IOC members suggesting to go even further - live streaming of the final and of fights. Copyright should not be an issue if all teams are informed that by participating they agree to their presentations being filmed.
Martin Plesch agrees to put it on the agenda for discussion with the next LOCs, especially for the finals it's a really good idea.

12) Use of well-known physics websites (15min), 16:52
Gavin Jennings explains how various websites use our problems and suggests we could ask them not to publish about them before the IYPT.
Timotheus Hell thinks that we can't really call them 'our' problems, Florian Ostermaier suggests to rather work with them, maybe ask them to include our logo.

13) Various issues (if any), 16:57
Mihály Hömöstrei: A small group should make suggestions on improving the jury, like asking them to make notes, or to allow discussion within the jury, e.g. for 5-10 minutes before they give their individual points. It is a physics fight, at an international level, it should not happen that we give above average grades for someone who lacks fundamentals. In a discussion this could have been pointed out. Figuring out a way will take time, but please come up with a proposal.
Farida Tahir: Jurors should discuss on issues like if dimensions are correct.
Martin Plesch: The scoring sheets should serve this purpose of providing notes.

Assen Kyuldjiev: If we look at the jurors as independent measurements we should not make them correlated, results would get worse.

Ulrike Regner: There should be a detailed proposal on how this would work, pointing out the advantages and disadvantages.

There is a clear majority against allowing any discussion within a jury, therefore no detailed proposal will be worked on.

Ulrike Regner suggests to ban all electronic communication devices, because as a chair, it's hard to control if teams e.g. communicate with their team leaders.

Valentin Lobyshev introduces Olga Inisheva as Russia's future IOC representative as this will be his last time in the IOC. Martin Plesch thanks him on behalf of the IYPT for his many years with the IYPT.

Martin Plesch closes the IOC meeting at 17:15