

Minutes of the IOC meeting, 2017-07-12 to 2017-07-13, Singapore

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**

Each item on the agenda includes the allotted time budget in parenthesis and the start time.

1) Opening (15min)

July 12th, 10:00, Singapore

Minute keeper: Timotheus Hell

Keeper of the list of speakers: Samuel Byland

Chair of the meeting: Martin Plesch

Control of presence

MP starts the meeting by discussing the issue of guests at the IOC meeting. They are invited to stay in the room, but should only listen unless invited to speak.

IMO: IOC Member

1. Australia: Philip O'Neill (PON)
2. Austria: Ulrike Regner (UR)
3. Belarus: Aliaksandr Mamoika (AM)
4. Brazil: Thiago Frigerio de Carvalho Serra (TS)
5. Bulgaria: not present
6. Canada: Ryan Lin (present only after vote on agenda) (RL)
7. China: Li ChuanYong (LC)
8. Chinese Taipei: Yung-Yuan Hsu (YH)
9. Czech Republic: Stanislav Panos (SP)
10. Georgia: Juansher Jejelava (JuJe)
11. Germany: Florian Ostermaier (FO)
12. Hungary: Mihály Hömöstrei (MH)
13. Iran: Dina Izadi (DI)
14. Korea: Hong Jung (HJ)
15. Macao: Iat-Neng Chan (INC)
16. New Zealand: Gavin Jennings (GJ)
17. Nigeria: not present
18. Pakistan: Farida Tahir (FT)
19. Poland: Leszek Gladczuk (LG)
20. Romania: Victor Paunescu (VP)
21. Russia: Olga Inisheva (OI)
22. Serbia: Aleksandra Aloric (AA)
23. Singapore: Teck Seng Koh (TSK)
24. Slovakia: Frantisek Kundracik (FK)
25. Sweden: Mattias Andersson (MA)
26. Switzerland: Eric Schertenleib (ES)
27. Thailand: Wittaya Kanchanapusakit (WK)
28. Ukraine: Volodymyr Kulinskyi (VK)
29. United Kingdom: John Balcombe (JB)
30. USA: Andrei Klishin (AK)

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

After item 2, there is 1 more voting IOC member (Azerbaijan) for a total of 29.

EC Members:

President: Martin Plesch (MP)
Secretary General: Timotheus Hell (TH)
Treasurer: Ilya Martchenko (IM)
Member: Samuel Byland (SB)
Member: Qian Sun (QS)
Member (LOC 2018): Chen Xi and Jichao Hu (CX, JH)
Member (LOC 2017): Yeo Ye (YY)
Member (LOC 2016): Olga Inisheva (OI)

Representatives of IMO applicants / new IMOs

Azerbaijan: Jeyhun Jabarov (JeJa)
India: not present

Other:

Assen Kyuldjiev, Member of the Jury Committee (AsKy)
Natalia Ruzickova, Assistant (NR)
Jan Binder and Felix Engelmann, Tournament IT (JB, FE)

Guests by IOC/EC members:

Jan Slavík (JS)
Tahir Khan (TK)
Adam Roul (AR)
Julia Plesch (JP)
Chrisy Du (CD)
Nona Izadipanah (NI)
Valentin Lobyshev (VL)
Evgeny Yunosov (EY)
Sandu Golcea: 12th July 10:48 (SG) - to 13:10, head of LOC 2020

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." No such announcements were made.

Approval of the agenda

The agenda is approved by the IOC by acclamation.

This item of the agenda ends at 10:15.

2) Applications for IMO status (10min)

Since the past IOC meeting, we have received applications for IMO status from organizations wishing to represent Azerbaijan and India.

Jeyhun Jabarov (IOC member candidate for Azerbaijan) introduces himself. Next year a national tournament will be organized in Azerbaijan with all schools invited. About 10 teams are

expected to participate. As the annex to the application is still missing, SB suggests to apply for recognition as IMO for only 1 year.

Motion: IOC recognizes the application for IMO status for Azerbaijan for 1 year.

Valid: 28

Pro: 28

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

The IOC welcomes their new member from Azerbaijan.

From now on therefore there is one more voting IOC member present, for a total of 29.

As we have not received the original application from India, there is no vote on an application for IMO from India.

3) Renewal of IMO Status (5min)

IMOs were introduced in 2011 and a large number of countries handed in their applications in 2012. As recognitions were given for 5 years, the following IMOs were to re-apply in order to keep their status: Austria, Belarus, Brazil, China, Czech Republic, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iran, Korea, New Zealand, Poland, Russia, Slovakia, Switzerland, Thailand, United Kingdom and USA.

Until the meeting we have received scans of re-applications from 16 countries, which were all distributed to the IOC. Only UK decided not to reapply at this time: JB was working on getting an application from Institute of Physics, as the current IMO is JB's school. The Institute fears that the IYPT is an elitist competition, which it does not want to support in its current form. Therefore there will not be an application for IMO for UK this year.

AK explains that the US application is again for a single year. MP agrees that this is the right way to do it - if there is an intermediate solution, the application should only be for a shorter time.

All other applications are for 5 years.

MP closes the discussion at 10:30 to have time to prepare ballots and to give the IOC members from Thailand, Georgia and Brazil time to hand in their applications, as we require the originals.

4) Future IYPTs (2h)

IYPT 2018 - updates by the head of LOC China

Chen Xi of the RDFZ high school introduces the IOC to the host of 2018.

Questions by the IOC:

JeJa: Will there be different types of food?

CX: Yes, here will be different styles of food available.

AK: Are there any plans for website and local contact person, e.g. for helping with visa?

CX: The website is under construction.

CX comments that the school where tournament will be held has free wifi.

MP: To all IOC members - please send us further questions which we can ask at the EC meeting this autumn.

SB: Are there places where participants can meet?

CX: More than 50 classrooms, some can be used.

MH: The proposed schedule shows fights 4 and 5 on one day?

MP: What parts of the schedule are fixed already?

CX: The excursion is still under planning.

MH: Please make sure that PF 4 and 5 are not on the same day.

The IOC votes on asking LOC 2018 to not schedule both the 4th and 5th fight on the same day. All IOC members are in favour.

TSK: Can the excursion be held after the final fight?

PON: In the past, the finalists always missed out on the excursion, therefore it's better to have it after the finals, where there is no more tension and stress.

TS: Not everyone participates at the excursion if it is after the closing ceremony and final.

JeJa: The excursion is quite tiring, it should be at the end (after the final).

JB: The arrangement worked well this year, but the dinner felt a bit misplaced.

MP: It's a very dense schedule for the organisers, a day off before the final is a plus for the organisers as there is much work to be done after the selective fights, the same goes for jurors.

AK: Excursion could be after 4th fight, last fight would then in the afternoon.

MP: We tried this in 2006, but it turned out that the IOC was not happy with this schedule.

AK: Can we agree on two possible options for the schedule and have a vote?

MP: We should not make this binding for the LOC so early.

JeJa: I suggest to do the final, then have the special dinner, excursion and award ceremony.

MP: We have to discuss with the LOC.

MP summarizes the schedule options as preferred by the IOC:

Having the excursion after the final and people get the chance to say goodbye at a formal dinner which will be scheduled afterwards (in the end of competition).

If this is not possible, we'll try to find the best solution in autumn 2017 at the EC meeting.

JuJe: The IYPT's schedule overlaps with the IPhO.

MP: I have contacted IPhO organisers to ask them for their plans, but got no reply. There seems to be a group of IPhO organisers, which sees IYPT as a competing competition, so they publish their dates very late, when ours are already fixed.

JeJa: Will registration fees remain the same?

JH: Yes, for the teams, possibly it will be increased for visitors.

The presentation and questions session ends at 11:10.

IYPT 2019 - presentation of host candidate Poland, vote on host

Leszek Gladczuk presents his updated plans for IYPT 2019 in Poland.

Questions:

AK: What is the financial situation? Is there funding?

LG: Will be answered next year, support from Warsaw technical university is promised, however it is not known yet how much support can be provided.

MP: Is the tournament itself secured?

LG: Yes. More updates in November 2017 at the EC meeting.

The presentation and questions session ends at 11:20.

Motion: Accept the bid from Poland to host IYPT 2019.

Valid: 29

Pro: 27

Against: 0

Abstain: 2

IYPT 2020 - updates by the head of LOC Romania

SG invites all of IOC members to bring a team to Romania (5 students and 2 TL) for a training of local jury members. All costs except for travel will be covered by Romanian Ministry of Education (demonstration fight, accommodation, excursion, meals). The number of fights will depend on the number of participating teams. The event will be repeated in the following years.

This years' schedule:

22.9.2017 Arrival

23.9.2017 PFs

24.9.2017 Excursion

25.9.2017 Departure

Questions:

JuJe: Is there any limitation on number of participating teams?

SG: No.

LG: Will problems from IYPT 2017 be the competition problems?

SG: Yes. It is just training.

AK: Is this an invitation for teams as well?

SG: This year there are two kinds of invitations: formal invitation for teams and TL and personal invitation for 15 extra IOC members.

Furthermore, the WFPPhC will take place in Romania throughout the competition period.

DI: What about visas?

SG: There is not a dedicated team for helping with visas this year, but in the coming years there will be help with getting visas.

There are no further updates on IYPT 2020.

AK: Can we have more detailed presentation on IYPT 2020 next November?

SG: Yes, more technical details will be provided.

The presentation and questions session ends at 11:40.

MP announces a 10 minute coffee break.

IYPT 2021 - presentation of host candidates

AK presents the prospective hosting of IYPT 2021 at the University of the Sciences in Philadelphia, PA, USA on behalf of Elia Eschenazi.

DI: Is it possible to get strong support for getting visas?

AK: We can provide supporting documents.

AM: Will the fee be increased?

AK: It is not intended to be changed.

MP: In 2018 USA will state whether they can for sure host IYPT 2021.

JuJe: Georgia would like to make a proposal for 2021 too, is that possible?

MP: We make hosting IYPT by USA a binding proposal for one year. If USA guarantees to host IYPT 2021, the proposal will be approved. If not, other IMO's can also present their proposals.

***Motion:** The International Organizing Committee of the IYPT via public vote makes a decision to accept the preliminary proposal of the University of the Sciences to host the IYPT 2021 in Philadelphia, PA, USA and encourages a duly appointed representative of the University of the Sciences to present a more detailed bid in the future. In case the US cannot guarantee their hosting by the IOC Meeting 2018, other IMO's are invited to also bring their proposals for hosting IYPT 2021.*

Valid: 29

Pro: 29

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

The presentation and questions session ends at 12:10

IYPT 2022 - updates from host candidate Czech Republic

Stanislav Panos starts his presentation on Czech Republic as candidate to host IYPT 2022

Questions:

MP: Is the proposal binding now?

SP: We have an estimate on budget, cooperation with university, we are preparing a grant as well.

MP: How binding is your bid? When can you say whether you can guarantee your hosting?

SP: In two years.

MP: What is the maximum number of teams China and Poland can host?

CX: 40.

LG: The same, no problem with 40 teams.

AK: 37 Teams was an estimate for IYPT 2021.

SG: Georgia can host 40 teams as well.

There is no vote on the proposal for IYPT 2022.

The presentation and questions session ends at 12:25

5) Executive Committee: (3h)

Rules of Procedure for EC (10min)

The 'collegiality principle' was added to the RoP for EC in order to avoid having EC discussions during the IOC meeting.

Tasks within the EC (10min)

Tasks in the EC were redistributed:

MP: President, Jury Committee

TH: Secretary General, IT

IM: Treasurer, Connection to IYPT Archive

SB: Problem Committee, PR

QS: Disciplinary Committee, Fundraising

YY: IYPT 2017, LOC

QM: IYPT 2018, LOC

General Budget Guidelines (10min)

The EC decided changes to the Budget Guidelines.

UR: Changing a budget once it is approved by the responsible body is highly unusual.

ES: Will IOC be informed about budget changes?

MP: Yes, certainly, after the EC meeting there will be a report to the IOC.

TH: Asking the IOC to make changes to the budget isn't an option, as the whole IOC would have to meet and approve it. We get new information after the IOC has approved the budget, that's why we do an update in autumn. Is there a better way to handle this? We'll otherwise always deviate much more than allowed in our guidelines, as we plan the budget with limited information.

AK: What kind of budget change can be made between July and November?

MP: EC meeting travel expenses for example.

New Tournament Software (30min)

Report on the new software used for IYPT 2017, request for comments and plans for a new, integrated registration system to be used for IYPT 2018 (replacement for CURIIIE).

TH introduces FE and JB, who have implemented IYPT CC (cc.iypt.org), which has already replaced NEWTOON and the Jury Planner this year and will furthermore replace CURIIIE next year.

Discussion:

FE: Names and their spelling are an issue. What symbols for names should be 'allowed'? How about any letters that 'resemble' latin letters, so that everyone involved can read them?

No objections from the IOC.

AK: Some people do not want to use their legal names (as they are stated in their passport). Do we need legal names in the system? There could be an option to enter legal and 'preferred' names.

MP: We first have to agree if we want to allow this.

FE: This is not a technical problem, the IOC has to decide how it wants the issue to be handled, then we can implement it in any desired way.

JB: There is a difference between inviting nicknames and having the possibility of a preferred name. This system works in schools in England, especially for overseas students.

TS: Team leaders should be responsible for the preferred names.

JB: On the badge they should have a name by which they want to be called.

MP: The certificate is signed, so it should be the real (legal) name.

PON: We can put both the legal name and the preferred name on the certificate.

AK: Not having a legal name on the certificate is a problem of that particular student.

MP: I don't want to sign such certificate with an unreasonable preferred name.

FE: On the certificate there should be their legal name.

AK: There is also the issue of transgender participants for whom a different name should be used if their passport still shows a name of a different gender.

MP: Can there be both their legal and preferred name on the certificate? The certificate is a legal document which can be attached to the CV. There should therefore be the person's legal name on the certificate. I am not ok with signing a certificate without the legal name.

PON: I agree with legal name being on the certificate. There can be the preferred name in brackets.

Motion by POH: There should be a possibility for each IYPT participant to enter their preferred name in the registration system. This preferred name will be shown in parentheses on name tags as well as on official certificates.

Vote on motion by PON to have the preferred name entered in the system too and show it on the name tag and the certificate in parentheses.

Valid: 28

For: 20

Against: 5

Abstain: 3

GJ: Do we need all their names? Some people have many.

FE: If it's on the passport - yes.

FE: What if there is a name in a non latin alphabet?

DI: There must be an english spelling in the passport.

VL: As an official organisation we should use official names.

TH: We'll only allow Latin Extended-A as symbols. It will be implemented this way in the new system. According to several IOC members, all passports also include the name transcribed to that alphabet, so this should work.

AK: Conflicts of interest should be stated by the juror and should not automatically include the nationality. It should be based on where one lives and works with a team.

MP: It can easily be seen by others as a conflict of interest if they know you have the same nationality as a team you are asked to judge and this is to be avoided. So nationality should always be on that list. There should be an option to add other conflicts of interest as well.

FE: So there will also be a list of nationalities and of personal further biases.

POH congratulates the IT on managing technical support.

TH: There will be a new registration system and all users will have to enter their information again. They can not be transferred from CURIE.

AK: Will the old results stay available on results.iypt.org indefinitely?

TH: The plan is for the results to be available there in the future, the URLs will continue to be valid. New results are available on cc.iypt.org.

JuJe: Is it possible to have on-line payment in the system?

IM: No, that's not practical.

TS: Will there be fight rooms of particular teams and jurors in the system?

FE: Yes.

MP: IYPT has a contract with FE which is signed for 5 years.

MP ends the first part of the meeting at 13:10.

Lunch break is scheduled until 14:00.

Relationship with the IYPT Archive (30min)

TH reports on the negotiations with IM that started at the EC meeting in autumn. An agreement was worked on, but IM has not yet finished his proposal.

As the IYPT Archive is a personal initiative and not part of IYPT, its budget chapter was removed from the budget guidelines. That does not forbid IYPT from making contributions to the project, but it neither requires IYPT to do so. Currently for any copyrightable parts in the archive where the copyright does not belong to a third party, it belongs to IM. IYPT itself does not have any rights, so if IM decided to close the IYPT Archive, it would no longer be usable by IYPT. TH therefore suggested that IM adds an adequate license to these parts of the archive, so that IYPT can protect its investment.

IM describes the relationship between IYPT and the Archive as discussed in the past. IM started collecting older materials since 2001 based on his own interest. It's an active, private research project, with no intentions to stop or unpublish information.

MP reads part of EC meeting minutes from November 2016:

“The Archive is a personal initiative by IM, positioned as a retrospective research project. The majority of archived documents are not courtesy of IM or of the Association IYPT. It's formally accredited by the Executive Committee, and receives funding from the IYPT. Such a status gives the project a good combination of research freedom and addressing priorities of the community. The Archive maintains its information webpage at two sites, archive.iypt.org and iypt.ilyam.org, that mirror each other. This situation was always clearly stated on the archive's website and IM has no intention of changing this. TH explains that a collection of facts is copyrightable. Therefore, TH suggests that IM attaches a suitable license to these collections. This will ensure, that the investment made by the IYPT is protected, even in the unlikely case that IM decides to stop his work on the archive. IYPT wants to protect its investment without infringing upon IM's rights. EC agrees to move forward in this direction, TH and IM will discuss further.”

AK: If there is a copyright, who would it belong to?

TH: The licence should guarantee IYPT to use e.g. the IYPT Archive's lists, it could be included in that license that IM should be mentioned by name - the important part is, that it would allow IYPT to continue use these parts of the archive.

IM: The IYPT Archive does not own copyrights. Copyrights belong to authors of the sources.

AK: There can be a copyright to the collection of items, even if the copyright of the items themselves belongs to a third party.

TH agrees.

MP: A deadline should be set to prepare an agreement between the IYPT and IM.

ES: In the archive, names are sometimes linked to their personal FB page. Under some jurisdictions (e.g. that of Switzerland) this would be illegal. The IYPT is certainly allowed to use and process participants' data internally, but if the Archive isn't part of IYPT, then handing data to the Archive is an issue.

MP suggests to have a motion to allow IOC to state its opinion on the matter clearly.

Motion: IYPT/EC represented by TH and IM are asked to reach an agreement that will give IYPT rights to parts of the IYPT Archive until 15th of September 2017. If such an agreement is not reached by that date, IYPT will start plans on creating its own archive.

Valid: 29

For: 29

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

The discussion ends at 14:25.

EC Motion to change the IYPT statutes: Restructuring of the EC (15min)

SB presents the motion that was distributed to the IOC before.

Questions:

AK: What was the motivation for the motion?

MP: It is better to have 5 elected persons, but first there was a suggestion to increase the number of elected EC members, as the tournament has grown. Past, current and future representatives of LOCs would be removed, but are invited to EC meetings as guests. LOC members usually do not participate in EC discussions and it is therefore difficult to reach an agreement.

AK: Do you think that there should be a 'sanity check' in the EC, provided by a good diversity of voices, which is usually increased by having LOC members from several countries?

SB: The sanity check is done by the IOC by electing the EC members. EC is trusted by IOC as it is elected.

AK: EC has wider geographical coverage when it includes LOCs.

MP: People selected to the EC should state their interest and functions that they would take. Distribution of responsibilities should be part of the election process.

Vote on proposed motion to change IYPT statutes by restructuring the EC:

Valid:29

For: 26

Against: 1

Abstain: 2

As this is a change of the IYPT's statutes, a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority (20 votes) is needed. The motion therefore has passed.

Discussion and questions session end at 14:40.

EC Motion to change the IYPT statutes: Direct connections with other competitions (5min)

MP presents the motion that was distributed to the IOC before.

Questions:

PON: Other than IPhO and IYPT, are there any physics competitions of similar size?

MP: Not with as many international teams.

Vote on proposed EC motion to change IYPT statutes:

Valid: 29

For: 29

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

As this is a change of the IYPT's statutes, a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority (20 votes) is needed. The motion therefore has passed.

Discussion and questions session and end at 14:45.

EC Motion to change the IYPT statutes: IMOs (20min)

MP presents the motion that was distributed to the IOC before and comments on problems with current version.

MP suggests that the fact that an IMO is recognized for (up to) 5 years should be part of the statutes.

MP mentions the example of endorser of team India who only signed the IMO application and was not acting a TL.

Questions:

JeJa: If due to political reasons a country can not participate for 2 years, will the IMO expire?

MP: Yes, but It is easy to re-apply.

AK: In a case 2 organisations, one being current IMO but the other having a better selection procedure for example, is the second one automatically rejected?

MP: According to current statutes, yes. In the new proposed version, it up to the IOC's decision.

JB: Is it possible to cover more cases of not 'qualified enough' endorser? Is there a likely scenario not covered in this proposal?

MP: Maybe there should be a limit on how recently has the endorser participated.

JuJe: It is up to the common sense to decide.

MP: There can be a formal issue from legal side. Maybe there should be a limitation: a person who has participated in last 5 years.

JB: Does the IOC representative have to have this experience?

MP: No.

Motion on changing the main motion: Add a 5 year limit to the experienced team leader, so that this person actually has recent knowledge of the IYPT.

Valid: 29

For: 25

Against: 1

Abstain: 3

Vote on the main motion, with the agreed upon change:

Valid: 29

For: 26

Against: 0

Abstain: 3

As this is a change of the IYPT's statutes, a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority (20 votes) is needed. The motion therefore has passed.

Discussion and questions session end at 15:05.

Other current EC issues (if any) (5 min)

IYPT corporate identity:

SB: No news about a new logo.

SB Introduces Adam Roul who recorded video material during IYPT 2017 for a new IYPT promo video.

MP adds that Adam Roul can be contacted at adamroul@gmail.com, IOC members can get the raw video material from him if they wish.

IYPT support center in Slovakia:

MP is trying to get financial support for IYPT. Negotiations with the Slovak Ministry of Education are in progress. The IYPT support center was founded but it not funded yet.

Discussion and questions session are over at 15:10.

6) Motions by EC/IOC Members (1h)

Motion (Andrei Klishin): IOC collective request on EC committees (15min)

AK presents his motion that was distributed to the IOC before.

MP explains the current status. The EC selects one EC member to be the head of a committee.

This EC member can suggest other committee members, which are then elected by the EC.

Therefore there is currently no formal application procedure.

AK complains about not getting any coherent answers in November 2016 on his 'application' to be part of the committee.

Questions:

VL requests further clarification.

TSK suggests not to open the committees to 'all regular IYPT participants' (as stated in the motion) as that would include team members as well.

SB: It's a bit weird for the IOC to make such a change to an internal EC document.

EC will discuss this matter at the next EC meeting in November 2017.

GJ: How do you make it clear, that you are looking for members of these committees?

MP: When positions were to be filled, an email was sent out. If there are replacements to be made, people are asked to join.

CD: Usually there is a term also for a committee.

MP: It's the EC's responsibility.

MP declares to discuss the motion's intent at the next EC meeting. A way to include it in the RoP will be sought.

Vote on motion by AK:

Valid: 26

For: 2

Against: 5

Abstain: 19

Discussions and questions session end at 15:35.

Motion (Andrei Klishin): IOC collective request on juror registration (17min)

AK presents his motion to attract more qualified jurors without previous IYPT experience.

MP comments on the motion, trying to clear up some misunderstandings: Experienced jurors can judge from the first PF. Others calibrate during the first PF and can then judge from the second PF. LOC provides local jurors. Further it was decided to have 5 more slots for other possible jurors (e.g. distinguished guests).

AK: There should be an opportunity for qualified persons to act as jurors. It is not clear to whom are the co-opted positions open. There is currently no way for (new) countries to bring extra jurors, even if there are clear and good reasons. Their stay should be at least partially covered as they work much more than observers.

Vote on the motion by AK:

Valid: 29

For: 2

Against: 9

Abstain: 18

Discussions and questions session are over at 15:52.

Motion (Thiago Serra): Authorization for Physics Fights live streaming (35min)

TS presents his motion to allow for streaming of PFs. Most fights with the Brazilian team were streamed, when all teams agreed. There was a peak at 20k people reached, with 100 viewers. It's a strong platform for promoting IYPT that should be used. It should be made clear that we can use all this material (photos, videos, streams) to promote IYPT on the internet.

Discussion:

PON: Our current guidelines are against it. If there is a unique solution in a report, it should stay in that room and not instantly be available to everybody. Also, even though you can ask the teams for permission, if they are not over 18, then in many countries, they cannot give that permission themselves.

TS: It works if we make it part of the regulations, that they must agree to be filmed to participate. Just like all of us did when we visited Universal Studios - once you enter, you agree to be filmed.

VL: As a compromise we could allow it only for the 5th fight, which is likely to be the best of the teams' performances anyway.

MP: There are two issues: The legal issue, which is different in each country, but it seems like an issue that can be solved. We should focus on the other issue of harming other teams. But it should not be an issue nowadays to see another team's presentation, as you don't have all the background information. I cannot imagine another team to look at a live stream and change their report based on it, that's not a realistic scenario. So we should use this possibility to promote IYPT.

IM: I agree with Martin. We can not expect that participants will automatically misuse material they see.

TSK: It is an interest for IYPT to promote to competition. I support to do it only for the 5th fight.

JuJe: Science should not be hidden. It's unlikely that someone would be able to abuse this to drastically improve reports.

JeJa: Shots should be used for a final video, but live streaming can be a different issue, as the recording is immediately available to everyone. The teams should have to agree to be filmed and or streamed.

MH: There is probably not too much interest in foreign team's presentations in other countries. Also it's hard to follow, so the overall PR impact is minor. It should be up to the teams themselves if they want to make their reports public. It's better to have the reporting done in writing, as was done by some of the teams. This is a good solution that makes sure, none of the teams' copyrights are violated. It's a good solution to have written reports on what is happening so that people at home get a good picture, but without harming kid's copyright. That's a good compromise.

PON: We should limit it to only show PF5 and the finals. Trust me, otherwise teams will use it. The legal issue can be avoided by having everyone agree to it at the beginning.

GJ: The video can have low quality and therefore be hard to follow. In general, it is hard to follow a PF anyway. It's a huge advantage for an opponent to having seen a video of a report before.

JB: It is naive to assume that it would not be a significant advantage for a reporter or an opponent. There has been a discussion on non participating teams making videos, and the agreement was reached that it is not allowed. And now we discuss lifting this completely?

FO: The same advantage is reached by having your visitors watch other fights or by seeing the reports as a reviewer or observer. We need to have a very clear definition on what is confidential and what is not, including whether it is allowed to take photos - e.g. of every single slide. We need to make our definitions and rules very clear.

TS: Currently, teams taking part in PFs are allowed to film the whole presentation. And they could publish it immediately after.

JB: I'm not sure that that's what we agreed!

TS: Sure, the regulations say, that teams that take part are allowed to film the whole fight.

JB: But not to publish!

TS: Yes, they are.

MP ends the discussion at this point.

TH: As several IOC members have suggested to limit the motion to PF5 and the finals, possibly one of them would like to put forward such a motion?

PON: I would like to place an amendment to the motion, in order to find a good compromise: We allow live streaming from PF5 and the final only.

FO: What about photos?

SB: This discussion is about videos, live streaming.

MP: You can take photos. Or do you mean publishing the photographs?

FO: Yeah, and what about a text ticker? It's all connected.

SB: But this is not the current discussion.

MP: Yes, this is only about video.

SB: Yes, the proposal was about live streaming. So we should stick with that motion.

MP: Ok, so to make it clear, we first vote on the amendment to TS's motion. If you are in favour of the original motion, don't vote in favour of PON's motion. If you prefer PON's version, vote in favour both times. If you are happy with neither, vote against the second time.

The original motion is to allow live streaming in all fights. The amendment from PON is to allow it only in PF5 and the final. TS can withdraw the motion if he is not happy with the amendment.

Amendment of motion: Amend motion to say that live streaming of fights is only allowed in PF 5 and the finals.

Vote on amendment of motion:

Valid: 29

For: 18

Against: 5

Abstain: 6

The motion passes.

TS: So what is the situation if i withdraw the motion. Am I allowed to stream or not?

MP: I cannot answer that question now. Anyhow, it's your decision now.

TS: Ok, let's have a vote on it.

MP: Ok, so we now vote on the amended motion.

Original motion as submitted by TS: It is suggested that regulations should be updated to clarify the authorization for live streams: "The IOC decides that all recording, streaming or other form of coverage (including texts or photos) of fights is allowed."

Amendment: *Live streaming of fights is only allowed in PF 5 and the finals.*

Vote on the amended motion:

Valid: 27

For: 18

Against: 2

Abstain: 7

The motion passes.

ES: Will the legal clarifications be done by next year, so that this can be implemented.

MP: Yes, that should be minuted: A sentence that informs teams, that their participation in IYPT implies, that they can be filmed and the material published online, will be added to the registration process.

TS: So I cannot live stream the other teams, even if they agree?

PON: No.

MP: That's why I was wondering why you didn't withdraw.

TS: Ok, so that's it? That's the decision? Can I film and stream my own team?

TH: I think that's a fair question to ask, and we should be able to give an answer - can he film his own team? Yes or no?

MP: I don't know the answer now. We should have a look at the regulations and then give an answer.

PON: The answer is clear: There is no live stream of PF 1, 2, 3, 4. It does not matter what country is streamed.

TS: That doesn't make sense. I withdraw the motion.

MP: I understand. But that was the vote. 18 people agree that we should not live stream even one's own team in PFs 1-4. That is the decision of the IOC.

GJ: just to clarify - can we delay-stream legally taken videos later?

MP: Again we do not know. We have just made changes to the regulations. We have to sit down and look at it. I will not answer that right now. We have a decision on the regulations. So if

anyone has any questions, please send it to us and we will give you an answer. But please don't put forward the question as late as the jury meeting.

Vote and discussions are over at 16:26.

Motion (Martin Plesch, Timotheus Hell): IYPT regulations – problem selection (30min)

TH starts presenting the motion regarding selection of a problem for 5th fight and the finals. One team followed the regulations precisely by waiting in the fight room, which obviously was not the regulations' idea. The proposal is to force submission of the selected problem latest 15min after the end of 5th PF. If a team does not select any problem by that time, reporter team will be challenged by their opponent in previous selective fights.

Questions:

JB: I am not sure whether to give the opponent this advantage.

FO: Is the reporter in 5th fight allowed to reject the challenge?

TH: Yes.

FO: Rejecting does not make any sense.

UR: It is a disadvantage for the opponent as they can reject. I don't see a way of not allowing rejections.

MH proposes a motion: A problem from one of 4 previously presented should be selected.

UR: The 4th one presented could be selected.

JB: We are getting far from the original proposal. Now it is clear and the only thing missing is time limit. They should have read regulations.

IM: I agree with JB. We need to make sure the chair understands the situation and his duties.

GJ: Chair could assign them a problem.

AK: Teams are not allowed to leave the room before handing in the selection.

RL: We can take away the multipliers if they do not select a problem in time.

MP: We do our best to make teams aware of what they need to do. We can not manage teams who 'misuse' the rule.

JB: It's a satisfactory sanction that they present the first available problem on the list.

UR: What if they don't have anything on that problem?

AK: Results should be published quickly.

MP: That's technically impossible to guarantee.

MP summarises options on selecting the problem if a team does not select any in time:

1. The team is challenge by the opponent (original suggestion)
2. A random problem out of 4 already presented problems is selected
3. A random problem out of all available problems (available problems are all except for the 4 already presented and rejected problems)
4. first available problem in the ordering of set of problems in selected.
5. multiplication coefficient for presentation is decreased by 0.2 for each 15 minutes of delay

A majority is in favour to choose first available problem from the list of set of problems. The following amendments are suggested:

Amendment 1: After the end of PF teams have 15 minutes to choose their selected problem.

Amendment 2: It is the responsibility of the chair (MP is not happy to have this in the regulations either. However, it should be included in Chairperson's guidelines.)

IM: It is not a good idea to delegate this task (of reminding teams to select their problem) to PF assistants.

TH: Chairs are the most senior and responsible person. Fight assistants have a hard time to understand all the rules of the competition.

GJ: Students know the regulations very well, it should suffice to emphasize it enough at the Jury meeting.

Chrissy: None of the teams and not even the chair knew what to do.

TH reads the amendment to the original motion.

MP decides not to count the votes as there is a clear majority.

PON agrees not to put forward the a motion for amendment 2 (responsibility of the chair) to the regulations, but it is agreed upon to add it to the chairperson guidelines.

Vote on the amended motion:

Valid: 29

For: 27

Against: 0

Abstain: 2

Therefore, the new version of Regulations IX is the following:

'The following special rules apply to the last Selective PF:

The procedure of challenge is omitted. All teams may choose the problem to present. The only exception is that a team may not present a problem, which they presented earlier in the Selective Fights, and all problems presented in one group must be different. In case teams of one group choose the same problem, priority is given to the team with the higher TSP (see section XI). A team has to select its problems and submit this selection immediately (at most 15 minutes) after the end of PF4. The problem, which a team presents in this PF may not be presented again in the Final PF by the same team.

(...)

For the last selective fight and the final, if a team does not select the problem according to the regulations, the problem to be presented is the first one on the list of problems that was not rejected nor presented by the team before and was not chosen by one of the other teams for

that PF. If there are several teams who would get the same problem, the team with a name higher up in the alphabet gets the first one and so on.'

Break from 17:05 to 17:20. FT leaves during the break, therefore there are 28 voting IOC members present for the rest of the day.

7) Report of the Treasurer: (1h)

Financial year 2015/2016, endorsement of auditors (10 minutes)

Ilya Martchenko presents the financial report.

UR asks whether the slides shown by IM constitute a balance sheet or a P&L. After some explanation, UR thinks it's likely to be a P&L.

MP asks about the endorsement by the auditors.

IM did not distribute the report before the IOC meeting.

MP suggests to see extensive financial report beforehand. (e.g. sent to ioc@iypt.org several days before the meeting)

UR agrees it would be beneficial to distribute the report / P&L beforehand.

JB reads a letter by the auditor Thomas Lindner, which is positive, but suggests reinforcement efforts to get third party funding and a more transparent report from the LOCs to the IYPT.

Motion: Endorse the report of the treasurer and ask to receive it in written several days in advance next time.

Valid: 28

Pro: 27

Against: 0

Abstain: 1

Budget 2016/2017, report (15 minutes)

IM starts presenting budget report at 17:30 and ends at 17:45.

Again, the report should have been sent to IOC before the meeting.

Budget 2017/2018, approval (15 minutes)

IM presents the proposed budget for 2017/18 which will include the IYPT in China.

Next year, just like this year, there will not be a possibility to have discounts for observers / visitors as was possible at IYPT 2016.

Travel expenses for Ye Yeo (LOC 2017) should be removed from the budget according to the approval of *Motion to change the IYPT statutes: Restructuring of the EC*.

UR suggests not to include reserves in budget in each chapter, because it can encourage overspending in the end of fiscal year.

Motion: Accept the budget.

Valid: 28
Pro: 27
Against: 0
Abstain: 1

MP again stresses that it is very important to get the document in advance, before the IOC meeting. IM finishes his presentation and report at 18:00.

Fundraising / alumni (15 minutes)

QS reports that a long term support from a company would be helpful. At this point he has no clear idea how to achieve this. The companies he contacted asked about the benefits we can offer. In the next 6 months he will try to write a financial proposal and asks for help from the IOC members.

CD: If there is a donation to the IYPT, where would the money go?

MP: If it's given to an LOC, they will use it. If it's given to IYPT and earmarked we will use it accordingly - e.g. if the donation is to cover the costs for students to observe etc.

ES: We have high reserves and foundations don't want to spend money for meetings, but to support students.

QS: The companies care most about what their benefit would be.

MP suggests to form a fund raising committee and include ES. There should be a clear plan/ portfolio for sponsors explaining what IYPT needs money for.

End of day 1 at 18:15.

Day 2:

MP starts day 2 of the meeting at 9:05. He suggests to change the agenda and start with items 10 and 11. MP checks the presence of IOC members and announces that only FT is missing, other IOC members confirm that she left before the last session on day 1. Besides the EC and IOC representatives, the following guests are present at the start of day 2: JP, VL, CD, AsKu, NR.

Vote on suggestion of changing agenda by MP:

Valid: 28
For: 27
Against: 1
Abstain: 0

10) Committee for Problems Selection: (1h)

Report by the Problem Committee (20 min)

SB starts his report at 9:07. SB will send a message to those IMO's who did not participate at problem submission process.

Questions:

MH: Is it possible to reduce the number of problems from which final IYPT problems are being selected?

SB: Problems could be arranged into groups consisting of similar problems and everyone chooses e.g. one of 3. There can be different problems with similar physics which can actually be different problems. If that's the case, this strategy would not work well.

AK: There is a non-public list of areas of physics which should be included. How can we know which problem to submit? On the IPhO web site there is such list, publicly available.

Discussion ends at 9:25

RoP for PC (20 min)

SB: How should PC decide on submissions?

PON: If the IOC would decide from the beginning, it would be much more inefficient. It is fine the way it works now.

AK: There can be internal vote in PC on larger number of submission, results can then be compared with the vote of IOC members.

IM: A test can be done with previously accepted problems, whether PC decision correlates with decision of the IOC.

AA: Keywords could be entered with each submission.

MP: It is difficult to vote on each submission. It is fine to vote on problems from a certain field.

SB: PC would be stricter in reducing the number of problems for vote from all submissions.

Motion by MP: IOC will choose from 50-60 pre-selected submissions, categorised into groups of similar physics idea behind.

Vote on motion by MP:

Valid: 28

For: 27

Against: 1

Abstain: 0

SB: Categorisation into groups must be transparent. Then it is easier to see which kinds of problems (from which fields) need to be submitted.

SB: IMOs repeatedly failing to participating on problem submission should not participate on the vote.

AK suggests to exclude them from the vote on short list of problems at the IOC meeting.

PON: If you did not contribute, you can't argue what you got.

SB: Is that a motion?

PON: It's a motion.

MP: Ok, so we have a motion here, let's take a minute to think - legally, is it ok that we vote for not allowing to vote for a portion of the IOC?

AA: The question is if it could apply today, because the people were not aware.

MP: No, we can't apply it today.

TH: We would have to make it part of the statutes, so we need a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority. And it does make sense, because otherwise any simple majority of the IOC could overrule this decision. So I think it would have to be part of the statutes. It's a valid motion to do this, and we're updating the statutes anyway.

MP: OK. Let's try to formalize it again: so the motion would be that the IOC member representing an IMO which did not submit at least 3 problems is not allowed to take part in the discussion and vote on the problem set.

PON: That's it.

MP: OK. Does it make sense? Any comments?

TH: So this is an update to the statutes?

MP: Yes, it's a motion to update the statutes. So for passing the motion we need a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority.

SB: I hope it's a further incentive to avoid that it comes to that.

It's a real problem, we'd like to have everyone involved.

Motion to change the IYPT statutes to prescribe that an IOC member representing an IMO that has not submitted at least 3 problems in that year, will not be allowed to participate in the discussion and vote on problems in that year.

Vote on motion to change IYPT statutes:

Valid: 28

For: 21

Against: 5

Abstain: 2

As this is a change of the IYPT's statutes, a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority (20 votes) is needed. The motion therefore has passed.

Discussion ends at 9:45.

Presentation of the suggested problems (15 minutes)

SB starts presentation of tentative problem set at 9:45, ends at 10:00.

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

MP announces the procedure for approval of problems. The IOC is first asked to vote on the set of problems as proposed. If this motion does not pass, the problems will be voted on individually.

Motion: Accept the set of problems as is.

Valid: 27

For: 11

Ag: 11
Abstain: 5

As this motion has not passed, we continue with individual votes and changes on the problems:

Problem 1:

Valid: 24
For: 17
Against: 4
Abstain: 3

The problem is accepted without further changes.

Problem 2:

Valid: 24
For: 18
Against: 4
Abstain: 2

The problem is accepted without further changes.

Problem 3:

Valid: 24
For: 15
Against: 4
Abstain: 5

The problem is accepted without further changes.

Problem 4:

Valid: 25
For: 22
Against: 1
Abstain: 2

The problem is accepted without further changes.

Problem 5:

Valid: 25
For: 18
Against: 4
Abstain: 3

The problem is accepted without further changes.

Problem 6:

Valid: 25

For: 20

Against: 0

Abstain: 5

The problem is accepted without further changes.

Problem 7:

Valid: 25

For: 15

Against: 4

Abstain: 7

The problem is accepted without further changes.

Problem 8:

Valid: 26

For: 10

Against: 6

Abstain: 10

The problem will be discussed for up to 15 minutes.

After discussion and some changes, the problem is again voted on:

Valid: 27

For: 22

Against: 1

Abstain: 4

The problem is accepted.

Problem 9:

Valid: 26

For: 19

Against: 2

Abstain: 5

The problem is accepted without further changes.

Problem 10:

Valid: 26

For: 15
Against: 5
Abstain: 6

The problem is accepted without further changes.

Problem 11:

Valid: 26
For: 17
Against: 3
Abstain: 6

The problem is accepted without further changes.

Problem 12:

Valid: 26
For: 17
Against: 7
Abstain: 2

The problem is accepted without further changes.

Problem 13:

Valid: 26
For: 15
Against: 7
Abstain: 4

The problem is accepted without further changes.

Problem 14:

Valid:
For: 18
Against: 1
Abstain: 6

The problem is accepted without further changes.

Problem 15:

Valid:
For: 13
Against: 5
Abstain: 8

The problem will be discussed for up to 15 minutes.

After discussion and some changes, the problem is again voted on:

Valid: 26

For: 19

Against: 3

Abstain: 4

The problem is accepted.

Problem 16:

Valid: 27

For: 18

Against: 5

Abstain: 4

The problem is accepted without further changes.

Problem 17:

Valid:

For: 15

Against: 7

Abstain: 5

The problem is accepted without further changes.

Therefore the set of problems is finalised at 10:45.

Vote on IMO re-applications (10 min)

After a break we continue at 11:05 with the vote on IMO re-applications, that was postponed on day 1 to allow for further original application documents to arrive.

The IOC is asked to individually and in a secret ballot vote on all applications that have arrived by now: Austria, Belarus, Brazil, China, Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Iran, Korea, New Zealand, Poland, Russia, Slovakia, Switzerland and USA.

Georgia and Thailand will send original IMO application forms and their re-applications will be voted on at EC meeting in November.

IM and SB present results from vote on IMO applications:

Austria

Valid: 28

For: 28

Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Belarus

Valid: 27
For: 27
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Brazil

Valid: 28
For: 28
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

China

Valid: 27
For: 27
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Czech Republic

Valid: 27
For: 26
Against: 0
Abstain: 1

Germany

Valid: 27
For: 27
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Hungary

Valid: 27
For: 27
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Iran

Valid: 28
For: 26
Against: 1

Abstain: 1

Korea

Valid: 28

For: 28

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

New Zealand

Valid: 28

For: 28

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Poland

Valid: 27

For: 27

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Russia

Valid: 28

For: 28

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Slovakia

Valid: 28

For: 28

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Switzerland

Valid: 27

For: 27

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

USA

Valid: 27

For: 25

Against: 2

Abstain: 0

All applications are therefore recognized. Thailand and Georgia have not handed in originals so their renewals will be voted on when they hand in the original application. All other IMO applications handed in both electronically and physically are renewed.

8) Jury Committee: (2h 15min)

Update to the RoP for the Jury Committee (5 minutes)

MP presents JC rules of procedure.

Questions:

CD: I have a concern about whether a juror with a degree from other science fields but has a reasonable teaching experience can act as a juror.

MP: A juror has to be in contact with science and have knowledge beyond high school physics, not only because of experience with teaching physics at high school.

Travel support for experienced jurors (40 minutes)

MP explains that this year, there were 5 experienced jurors who received support of maximum 500 EUR to partly compensate for their travel expenses. Taking into account the fact that there were just enough experienced jurors available to judge the first PF this year, MP stresses that number of experienced jurors need to be increased.

MP asks if there are any suggestions from the IOC on how many jurors should be supported.

POH and UR are very happy they have received support, otherwise it would not have been possible for them to attend IYPT 2017.

ES: It should not end up the way that countries start pushing jurors on those free slots for support.

JuJe suggests that budget for jury support should be increased to 4000 EUR.

MP: If we agree on a higher number of jurors to support and do not receive enough reasonable applications, it does not mean that exactly the agreed on number of jurors must receive the support. We do not want to give support to someone who we will then receive a complaint on.

Motion: Increase the amount available for travel support for experienced jurors to 4000 EUR.

Vote on the motion to increase amount for JS:

Valid: 25

For: 15

Against: 4

Abstain: 6

MA: Is there a limit on the number of Jurors or amount of money to be distributed? In case any Juror ask for less than 500 EUR.

MP: No, the amount of money is the limit.

MP: We have a good juror who can not afford travel, do we support them regularly? Or would it be better to support different people each year?

JeJa: Different people.

MP would like jurors to take this funding as the last possibility. Jurors must explain why they can no longer receive the funding from the same source they did before.

End of discussion at 11:48.

Feedback on Jurors (20 minutes)

At 11:52, MP starts reporting results and conclusions obtained from feedback from IYPT 2016 on chairs.

MP: With only few exceptions, chairs with positive feedback chair a lot. There was a single chair with a very bad feedback who was chairing a lot, this juror did not chair this year anymore.

Questions:

AA: Could you compare this results to previous years' ones?

MP: No, teams have handed the feedback only when they were unhappy.

MP continues with reporting results and conclusions obtained from feedback from IYPT 2016 on jurors.

Questions:

AA: If (as with chairs) a juror receives bad feedback, will they judge less?

MP: Certainly they do not get support. But for TL jurors we cannot deny a qualified enough juror because of bad feedback.

VK: Is there a correlation between whether the juror gives high and low marks?

MP: It is negligible.

JuJe: Is there a correlation with ranking of teams?

MP: Again, it is negligible. Best jurors are ones who give best feedback, not best grades. There are jurors consistently receiving bad feedback but giving high grades.

Lunch break from 12:10 to 12:45.

Scoring Guidelines / Scoresheet (20 minutes)

AsKy reports on the procedure that lead to the new scoresheet. The new scoresheet is mostly positively accepted.

Results from the scoresheets reflect the expectations on grades of more experienced jurors.

AsKy explains the differences between 'old' and 'new' scoresheets. There is overall good feedback on new scoresheet.

AsKy asks for any kind of feedback for new scoresheet and mentions suggestion for introducing a period in PF for feedback from jurors towards performance of teams.

MP: feedback form will be distributed and jurors are encouraged to submit within few months.

AK: The scoresheet should have been released much earlier.

MP: Yes I agree, but JC decided to collect feedback first. Changes were made regarding to feedback received on few local tournaments where it was tested. The feedback was that it is not perfect but better than previous version of scoresheet.

A new version of the scoresheet will be distributed after collecting and implementing feedback from jurors and there can be a second round of feedback afterwards towards the new version.

TSK: A dialogue would be much clearer than feedback forms.

Motion by LG: No later than on 1st March 2018, the final version of scoresheet for IYPT 2018 will be ready and published on web.

Valid: 28

For: 28

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

CD: It would be good to receive all feedback which has been submitted.

GJ: Who do we expect feedback from?

MP: From all jurors.

AA: It is not good that some teams were aware of the scoresheet before IYPT.

MP: I did not see this could be an issue. But for the future I completely agree.

ES: Regarding postponing time to the discussion. Is there a change of rules intended?

MP: No.

Motion by AK: JC is obliged to distribute to the IOC full raw data feedback from jurors with possibility for anonymity:

Valid: 28

For: 26

Against: 0

Abstain: 2

Discussion and questions session are over at 13:22.

Motion by TH: The grade written down on each juror's scoresheet is considered the final grade.

TS: Also for a PF that has already ended?

TH: It's not clear which grade must be considered 'correct'. The grade written on the scoresheet/paper, which is in the system or the one shown. The juror is usually asked if there is an inconsistency.

IM: There are situations when it is not clear what the final grade written on the scoresheet is.

JuJe: There can be a problem as we have allowed video-streaming for 5th fight and the final.

Vote on motion by TH:

Valid: 28

For: 25
Ag: 1
Abstain: 2

13) Number of Jurors per room (10 min)

As items 13 and 14 are related to jurors, MP suggests to start with them before the report of the DC.

Session starts at 13:28.

AK: Complains towards fixing 5 as maximum number of jurors.

TH: If we want for everyone to have 1 fight off, it is not possible with current number of jurors.

POH: It is faster with 5 instead of 6 jurors. I would rather see a consistent number of jurors throughout all fights.

MP: 5 was the only number which can guarantee that no juror will serve all 5 fights. TL jurors want to see their teams. There is an option to ask jurors whether they want to serve more or less. If we maximise number of jurors, TL jurors will not see their teams.

Motion by AK: There should be as many jurors as possible in each jury - the JC should use as many jurors per fight as possible.

ES: Will there be reserve of jurors?

MP: It can cause problems when a juror misses on the fight, so that more jurors would have to be moved to different juries.

Vote on motion by AK: The JC should use as many jurors per fight as possible.

For: 13
Against: 9
Abstain: 5

The motion does not pass.

Still, as it was a close vote, jurors will be asked whether they want to serve for more or fewer fights and if possible, this will be taken into account when creating the jury schedule.

Discussion and questions session end at 13:36.

14) Declaration of jurors' conflicts of interest

A way to declare conflicts of interest will be added to the new registration system. Nationality is by default considered a conflict of interest.

9) Disciplinary Committee: (15min)

RoP for DC (15 min)

QS starts his report at 13:37.

QS suggests IOCs to send him their opinions on what should be in disciplinary rules. It will be discussed at EC meeting.

MP: There should be a draft before EC meeting.
QS emphasises that disciplinary rules are a bottom line for behaviour at the tournament.
UR: How strictly should communication between TLs and their team be treated?
MP: It is up to the juror's common sense whether to report it or not.
JB: It is strange to invent hypothetical situations. We should rather focus on the consequences.
DI: Can TL approach team during preparation time for report?
MP: No, it should not happen..
IM: Chair persons should not hesitate to intervene.

Issues from IYPT 2017 (0 minutes)

There weren't any.

Discussion ends at 13:52.

15) Various issues (if any) (15 min)

MH: There should be a reasonable distance between jury members: it can happen that jurors accidentally see other grades.

Suggestion: Reasonable distance between jurors should be discussed with the LOC and checked on inspection visit.

MH: How should we handle a conflict of interest for 5th round when there are teams close to each other in ranking.

MP: If a juror asks to be removed from a certain jury, we'll do our best. But there will not be any active steps from organisers.

MH: Is there direct clear plan for getting countries back to IYPT? E.g. inviting persons from particular countries. Are there clear plans for (actively) expanding IYPT?

MP: We tried through other competitions' channels, but they treat IYPT as a competing organisation.

IM: Contact persons are known, initiative from any IOCs is welcome.

AK: There was money raised from different sources to include Chile again.

MP: Further growth of IYPT will be discussed at EC meeting.

AA: Change in regulations to allow discussion and clarification before voting on each problem should be made.

MP: It should be part of regulations how exactly voting should be held.

AA: Discussion on phenomena is fine.

SB agrees. There should be limited time for discussion of each problem.

JeJa: Jurors explain grades but they cannot be changed anymore.

MP: It's a basic rule is to never change grades. A formal complaint can be handed in.

JuJe: Discussion with jurors about grades after grading could be part of PF.

MP: This should be done privately. A team has a right to require an explanation of each grade and the chair should allow this.

MP closes the IOC meeting at 14:05.