# **General Assembly**

# Minutes of the Meetings held in Plovdiv, Bulgaria **8–15 August, 2009**

Petar Kenderov Chair of GA

Velin Tzanov Chair of SC

Mihal Forisek Chair of ISC misof@ksp.sk Martin Mares Chair of ITWG mj@ucw.cz

Arturo Cepeda President of IOI cepeda@auronix.com
Richard Forster Executive Director forster@olympiad.org.uk

#### 1. Welcome

- Krassimir Maney welcomed the members of the GA to the 21<sup>st</sup> IOI.
  - 78 countries would be participating, with a total of 305 contestants.
  - Observers from Algeria, Belgium and Madagascar were welcomed as new countries to the IOI community.
- Arturo Cepeda welcomed the members of the GA.
- Petar Kenderov, who had been chairman of the 1<sup>st</sup> IOI, was presented to the GA as its chair for IOI'2009.

# 2. Apologies

No apologies were reported.

## 3. Presentation and confirmation of GA agenda

The proposed agenda was approved by the GA.

# 4. Appointment of scrutineers for voting during GA meetings

In accordance with usual IOI procedure, it was proposed and approved that those past chairmen of IOI who were present should act as scrutineers.

# 5. Competition Procedures

- Velin Tzanov, Chair of the SC, was introduced and presented the competition procedures.
  - This year's competition would introduce an easy task with full feedback, in addition to the existing three problems on each competition day.
  - A separate technical sheet would be prepared, to accompany the questions on each day.
- The ED informed the GA that, should the proposed modification to S6.12 be passed, the approval now of the Competition Procedures would imply assent that the medal allocation algorithm would be used.
- The Competition Procedures were approved by the GA.

## 6. Call for nominations for IC and ISC

The ED announced to the GA that the closing date for nominations for the two IC positions and the two ISC positions (including the ITWG chair) was the start of the GA meeting "Before the second Competition period".

#### 7. Confirmation of the Minutes (IOI'2008)

The GA minutes from IOI'2008 were not distributed and no confirmation took place.

#### 8. Details for the IOI Conference

The GA was informed of the time and location for the *Olympiads in Informatics* conference that would take place concurrently with the competition days.

# 9. Details for proposed Regulation changes

The GA was given notice of proposed regulation changes (attached). These covered minor changes to bring the regulations in line with current practice, a minor alteration to those classed as invited observers, and a major change to the voting system for the IC and the ISC. The vote (item 23) was to take place several days later, after the GA had considered the changes.

# 10. Presentation of Tasks for Competition Day 1

- Mihal Forisek, Chair of the ISC, introduced the procedure for the presentation of tasks. As per the format in recent years, an initial period would be given in which to give major objections, to be followed by a vote on to accept the entire problem set. Minor objections could be submitted until the ISC and SC froze the tasks later that evening.
- No major objections were received and the problem set was accepted unopposed.

# 11. Report on Competition Day 1

- Velin Tzanov reported that fewer than 10 questions had been received from students during the contest, that the score distributions were as expected, and that there had been no appeals. That last announcement was received with applause.
- There was general agreement from the GA that the new format of 4 questions (including the easy question) had been successful.
- There was some criticism that, despite an early promise that descriptions would be shorter than in the past, this had no been the case. The SC offered 'apologies in advance', which was received with laughter.

## 12. Summary of Written Appeals for Competition Day 1

There were no appeals.

# 13. Presentation by Candidates for IC and ISC

- Candidates for IC and ISC were given a minute to introduce themselves to the GA. Information on all the candidates, which had been supplied on their nomination forms, was distributed to the GA.
- Members of the GA were encourage to speak with the candidates prior to the election later in the week.
- Candidates:
  - IC: Eljakim Schrijvers, Michael Chatzopoulos and Valentina Dagiene.
  - ISC (excluding ITWG): Michal Forisek and Mihai Patrascu.
  - ITWG: Martin Mares

## 14. Presentation of Tasks for Competition Day 2

- The same procedure was used as on the first competition day.
- The problem set was accepted unopposed.

# 15. Report on Competition Day 2

Velin Tzanov reported that there had been no major problems reported and that score distributions were as expected.

## 16. Summary of Written Appeals for Competition Day 2

Appeals had been received with regards to timing on the non-batch tasks. There had been complaints that students had been unable to reproduce the timing used in the evaluation.

# 17. IOI President's report

Arturo Cepeda presented a report on his activities since the last IOI (attached).

# 18. ISC and ITWG report

- Martin Mares, Chair of ITWG, reported on the ITWG activities (attached).
- Mihal Forisek, Chair of ISC, reported on the ISC activities (attached). In addition:
  - The GA were encourage to contact the ISC about the syllabus which had been available during the year.
  - An informal poll was taken, indicating that the majority GA were in favour of the 4th easy task, with a small number who would be in favour of it in a different variant, and a couple of delegations voting against. Around 2/3 of the GA expressed an opinion.
  - Some members of the GA indicated that this 'significant change' had been imposed on them, and that they would appreciate more open discussions in the future.
  - The GA requested that the technical sheet, which had been prepared alongside the tasks, should be made available for translation as early as possible. The ISC indicated that it had been available with the practice contest tasks.

# 19. Executive Director's report

- The ED reported verbally on his activities throughout the year.
  - Costs were well within budget.
  - The workload (outside of IOI and IC meetings) was around 1 day / month.
  - The GA were encouraged to communicate with the ED throughout the year.
- Communication with the GA outside of the IOI was brought up, and the ED pledged to inform the GA promptly of decisions.

# 20. Financial Statement for preceding year

Eljakim Schrijvers presented the financial statement for the preceding year (attached).

# 21. Registration fee for IOI'2010

- It was emphasised that the IC, ISC and GA would like to spend money, and that we could not guarantee that work that was currently done on a volunteer basis would continue on that basis.
- It is important to keep registration fees static for several years, since some delegations have difficulties in justifying changing fees to ministries.
- A registration fee of €200 for IOI′2010 was proposed and approved by the GA (72 delegations present) with 2 abstaining and 0 against.

# 22. Budget for forthcoming year

- Eljakim Schrijvers presented the budget for the forthcoming year (attached).
- The GA were reminded that the income supporting this budget came from this year's registration fees and not the registration fee approved for next year.
- The budget included a new item to cover the costs in establishing an IOI Foundation, initially intended to take over control of the IOI's bank account. This account, is independent of any host country banking.
- The GA requested that it was made clear in the future that the budget was in Euros.
- The budget was unanimously approved.

# 23. Regulation Changes

- It was clarified that the changed period for the ISC meetings in the proposed regulation changes had come by request of the ISC.
- It was clarified that, with the proposed voting change, the top candidates would be elected, even if the number of votes they received were under 50% of the GA.
- The regulations were approved by the GA (71 delegations present) with 4 against and 6 abstaining.

## 24. Election of IC members

- The new approval voting system was used in the IC elections.
- In the (only) vote, 71 delegations voted:
  - 46 (65%) approved of Eljakim Schrijvers
  - 27 (38%) approved of Michael Chatzopoulos
  - 57 (80%) approved of Valentina Dagiene
- Eljakim Schrivers and Valentina Dagiene were elected to the committee for a three year term.

#### 25. Election of ISC members

- There being only a single candidate for the Chair of ITWG position, Martin Mares took on the role for a three year term.
- The new approval voting system was used in the ISC election.
- In the (only) vote, 72 delegations voted:
  - 48 (67%) approved of Michal Forisek
  - 38 (53%) approved of Mihai Patrascu
- Mihal Forisek was elected to the committee for a three year term.

# 26. Notice on the proper usage of national symbols in closing ceremony

The GA were reminded to inform their students not to bring flags and large mascots onto the stage during the awards ceremony.

#### 27. Results and confirmation of medals

- The regulation changes having been approved, the medal allocation algorithm that formed part of the Competition Procedures (approved early in the week) was used.
  - There had been 301 contestants.
  - 26 gold medals would be given, 50 silver medals and 73 bronze medals.
- Despite the easy tasks on both days, 10 students still had a total score of 0.

#### 28. IOI Logo

The plans to change the IOI logo had been halted.

## 29. Proposals from GA members

No proposals had been received.

#### 30. Announcement of future host

Australia will host IOI'2013.

# 31. Other Business

- Ben Burton (Australia) spoke about the World Federation of National Mathematics Competitions (WFNMC). A major conference was held every four years and it would be good to have more informatics representatives at the congress in 2010.
- Wolfgang Pohl announced that the panel discussion at the *Olympiads in Informatics* conference had been positive (see appendix) and that there were plans to hold an IOI Workshop in Schloss Dagstuhl from May 17–22. Members of the GA were encouraged to come forward to participate at the workshop.
- The opening up of scores during the contest and before the Awards Ceremony had been discussed during the panel discussion. Members of the GA were given an additional opportunity to speak for or against changing the current restriction (S6.11).
  - In an informal poll, the GA were in favour of opening up the scores with 4 delegations against and 8 abstaining.
  - The GA were informed that during IOI'2010 advantage of the 'experimental regulation' regulation would be taken, and that scores would be more open.

# Appendix (Olympiads in Informatics panel discussion)

A 'future developments' panel discussion was held at the end of the *Olympiads in Informatics* conference. The panelists were Wolfgang Pohl, Fredrik Niemelä, Ahto Truu and Valentina Daginene. Contributions from the floor included Martins Opmanis, Gordon Cormack, Richard Forster, Ries Kock, Petar Kenderov, Pieter Walker and David Ginat. Two other contributors are currently unrecorded.

The following is a summary of points mentioned:

Making us accessible to the outside world (opening up of scores):

- We currently do not say much to the outside world.
- Our contests are more interesting than we may think. It's great fun as a judge watching submissions arrive.
- At the ICPC this year in Sweden there was live broadcasting, on national TV, throughout the contest.
  - It took 5-6 years of development to get to this stage.
- Audiences could include IOI people, parents and well wishers and potential competitors.
- Media coverage would assist with finance.
- Media coverage will open up the pandora's box of national teams.
- Is opening up scoring enough? Perhaps more multimedia aspects, such as robots or simulators.
- Our students show little interest in being TV stars and the media put silly questions to them.
  - Coverage of events is different from documentary coverage.
  - Sports journalists get this right.
- The media wants news immediately. Old news is not interesting.
- We're an international event with no coverage. Even technical sites (such as slashdot) are generally unaware of our activities.

## Real-time grading:

- The penalty for stupid / small errors is reduced.
- There's more excitement for the students
- Organiser errors (e.g. in test data) are a problem and can loose students time.
  - Perhaps we could give a bonus to students who find errors with the test data.

#### Communication:

- Social networks: the IOI community, national committees, teachers etc...
- We need to gather and keep material, such as pictures, stories and material in different languages.
- An olympiad-wiki?
- There are long silences between IOIs. We used to have newsletters.
  - The content of such a newsletter could contain 'community' content such as information on regional events.
- Members of the IOI should ensure their contact details, and those of their national events, are kept up to date. Especially in places such as the IOI website.
- We should gather information from students as well as from delegation leaders.

#### The future of the IOI:

- Are there countries who will host in the future?
- Should we insist on countries hosting?
- There are both scientific and financial resources needed for hosting; scientific are easier than financial.
- Perhaps we should charge a larger fee, such as Physics which charges €2000.

## Aims:

- We might produce education material for gifted students.
- We should promote awareness of informatics throughout society.

# Miscellaneous:

- The life of delegation leaders is easier at the IOI than at the IMO.
- The SC could produce a list of common faults.
- Perhaps the students should discover properties / produce tests. This is more akin to how science works.
- We could have open problems, with no test cases, just to see if a student can discover an unknown algorithm.

The two major trends, running throughout the discussions, were communication and opening up scoring.