General Assembly of International Olympiad in Informatics

Minutes of the Meetings held in Tehran, Iran

28 July – 4 August 2017

Krassimir Manev	President	krmanev@gmail.com
Mohamad Ali Abam	Host Chair 2017	aabaam@gmail.com
Jakub Łącki	Chair of ISC	j.lacki@mimuw.edu.pl
Martin Mares	Chair of ITC	mj@ucw.cz
Ben Burton	IC	bab@debian.org
Eljakim Schrijvers	Treasurer	eschrijvers@eljakim.nl
Ricardo Anido	Executive Director	ranido@gmail.com

GA Meeting 1, Saturday 29 July, 08:30 – 09:30

1. Welcome

The President welcomed all members of the GA and asked for a round of applause for the new countries, starting in IOI2017: Iceland, Morocco and Palestine. He then introduced Mohammad Ali Abam, Chair of the IOI2017, the 28th IOI. Mohammad welcomed all countries to Iran, wished a pleasant stay and hoped everyone would enjoy the competition. Mohammad then introduced the Chair of the GA for IOI2017, Prof. Ghassem Jaberipur.

Apologies: No apologies were presented.

2. GA Chair presented

The Chair thanked everyone and expressed his wishes that the meetings will run smoothly and be effective.

3. Presentation and Confirmation of GA Agenda

The Chair reminded everyone that the agenda was previously printed and distributed in the pigeonholes and sent by email. Put to vote, the proposed agenda was approved unanimously.

4. Confirmation of the Minutes of the GA Meeting at IOI2016

The Chair reminded everyone that the minutes of the GA meetings of the IOI2016 were published in the website last year, and put the Minutes to vote. They were approved unanimously.

5. Appointment of scrutineers for voting during GA meetings

Traditionally, past chairs who are present at IOI are invited to act as scrutineers. However, to allow some of the previous chair more time to decide if they will run for any of the available positions, the ED proposes that this item is postponed to the end of GA Meeting 3. The GA approves the proposal.

6. Call for nominations

The Chair asked the ED to explain to the GA the positions that need to be fulfilled this year. The ED explained that we have to elect the President of the IOI (term of three years), one IC member (term of three years), one ISC member (term of three years), one ITC member (term of three years) and one additional ITC member (term of one year), because Stefano Maggiolo is stepping down, for personal reasons, and his term has one more year to go. The ED informed that candidates should fill the forms provided (in the pigeonholes, printed, and by email), and nomination should be complete by the end of the GA session where tasks for the second day of competition are discussed (GA Meeting 5 in the Agenda).

7. Contest rules

On behalf of the ISC, Richard Peng commented the changes in the contest rule approved by ISC for this year, available in the website (http://ioi2017.org/contest/rules), in which new text is marked in red. The first main change in the Contest Rules is that watches and snacks are no longer permitted. Snacks will be provided by the host and there is a large clock in the room. Exceptions can be made by the IC, for special dietary requirements, and Richard commented that ISC would interpret that rule broadly. Asked by Sweden to explain the reason for the rule, Richard commented that potential potential problems are smell and noise, which could disrupt other students. The second main change in the Contest Rules is in the Testing Interface: the number of submissions a contestant can make has been reduced to 50 (down from 100 from IOI2016). Michal Forišek (ISC) informed that last year there were five students that submitted 100 times, but everyone else had less than 30 or 40 submissions. The purpose of the change is to reduce the load of the graders in a way that does not affect the contestants.

Germany asked whether the ISC looked also at what happened in the last 15 minutes of the competition, and whether an extra rule is needed for the last 15 or so minutes, considering that the rule "no more than one submission per minute" does not apply. Richard answered that it should not matter since a contestant will not get feedback within less than one minute anyway. Sweden asked whether compile errors are included in the submission count, because since they do not use the graders they should not be counted. Richard, after consulting ITC, answered that compiler errors are indeed included in the number of submissions. ISC could consider changing this for next year, but for this year the suggestion is to compile before submitting.

Australia asked whether compiler commands are available to students. Richard answers that it is difficult to provide a general command line, but compiler commands are provided in the public folders for each task and language. Richard remarked that compilation instructions will not be included in the task statements.

Richard commented that the rule about reverse engineering of data ("hacking behaviour"), from last year contest rules, was somewhat ambiguous. This issue was discussed in the ISC for several hours during the February meeting, planned changes were published in March. Richard explains the principle of the rule: contestants must not reverse engineer the test data and solve the problems in highly test-data-dependent manners. Richard notices that emphasis should be put on "this behaviour would be considered cheating only if a contestant submits a solution that would solve significantly fewer test cases correctly if the test data were replaced by an equivalent set of test cases". Latvia comments that there is not a clear distinction between cheating and not cheating in the rule. Accusation of cheating is very serious. Latvia suggests not to state that it is cheating; and furthermore he is not sure the ISC has the right to re-judge submissions with a new set of test data. Latvia also asked whether ISC can give a fixed percentage for the test cases not solved in the new test data, in order to decide it was cheating. Richard answers that it is hard to give a specific percentage because a large number of test cases are for easier subtasks. Test data is generated by random generators with a seed, so "equivalent set" means the same generators with a different seed. Thus, depending on the repartition of test cases between the different generators, the percentage of test cases impacted can change significantly.

Sweden commented that he was impressed by the quality of the wording of the rule, and asked if the ISC could confirm that it is not enough that a percentage of test cases are not solved in the equivalent set, but you also need evidence that the student was deliberately trying to use reverse engineering. Richard answered that yes, the percentage of test cases not solved is only a necessary condition, and reverse engineering is usually quite obvious when looking at the student's code (if test data equals this, then print this, etc.). ISC have not seen any unclear cases so far in the past, and agrees that the rule cannot be formulated in a 100% precise way. ISC will discuss more if they find borderline cases in the future.

Estonia supports Latvia's concern, and asks how the percentage will be measured, if only against the last submission. Estonia also comments that it would be best if task setters prepared the tasks having in mind that contestants can do reverse engineering, and the ISC should make sure that reverse engineering is not a valid strategy for the selected tasks.

Richard answers that the full feedback system is designed to benefit all contestants. ISC is in favour of providing more information for students, to help them, rather than restricting feedback to avoid cheating by a very small number of students. The ISC has seen this issue arise many times in the past five years in contests. Preparing tasks to make reverse engineering impossible is extremely hard and the ISC would be interested in any suggestion on how this would be possible.

Latvia asked if there were cases last year, after we decided not to have the rule. Richard said that a contestant came within two test cases of solving a task by reverse engineering.

The President interrupted the discussion to say that this is an important discussion, but it is not the moment for a long discussion, as we have a full agenda, and suggests that this topic is discussed in a Group Discussion in Competition Day 2.

The Chair then put the Contest Rules to vote. It was approved with 39 countries in favor, 4 against and 16 abstentions.

Michal Forišek asked the Chair to use the microphone to make one final announcement by ISC, concerning Java. It will be posted in CMS during the practice session, but please make sure your students see it: "on the present environment, simple arrays are much faster than composite objects".

Martin Mares, on behalf of the ITC, comes to the stage to announce that there are also some changes in the contest environment. For example, there is a new Call Staff button in CMS. He also reminds all Leaders to explain to their contestants the procedures for keyboards, mascots and dictionaries: register items, leave items on desks at the end of practice session.

8. Presentation of Regulation changes

Benjamin Burton (IC) presented briefly the changes proposed to the regulations, which were posted in the website, and which will be voted in GA Meeting 7:

1) Renaming
   ISC to stand for International Scientific Committee (not IOI Scientific Committee)
   ITC to stand for International Technical Committee (not IOI Technical Committee)
   SC (Scientific Committee) changed to HSC (Host Scientific Committee)
   Executive Director changed to Secretary
2) Observers
   The regulations contain:
   • Invited Observers, who represent new countries in the IOI;
   • Observers, who delegations can bring as extra people, and who pay the guest fee.
   To avoid confusion, we are removing the second "Observers". Delegations can still bring extra people as Guests and Adjuncts.
3) Secondary school enrolment (to remove ambiguity):
   • Was: during the period September to December in the year before IOI'n
   • Now: for the majority of the period 1 September to 31 December in the year before IOI'n
4) Other changes:
   • Invited Observers will not have to pay the registration fee, but also cannot
   vote in the GA (A3.2, E3.2, E5.9.1)
   • IC voting is changing from 2/3 majority to simple majority (A3.7)
   • Host team B are not officially considered to be medallists (E5.8)
   • ISC / ITC members are now eligible for distinguished service award (E5.11)
   • Flags are now allowed at IOI, just not on stage during the closing ceremony (S5.14, N5.14)

9. Proposals for Group Discussions

The Chair asked the ED to explain the Group Discussions planned. The ED explained that instead of two Conference sessions, this year we will have only one Conference session, on Competition Day 1. On Competition Day 2 we will have Group Discussions. Mathias Hiron (IC), will coordinate a discussion about "Checklist and guidelines for hosts". Marina Tsvetkova (Russian Federation) will coordinate a discussion on creating a "Virtual IOI Museum". Prompted by Sweden, Richard Peng agrees to coordinate a Group Discussion about "Contest Rules". Germany would like to propose a group to discuss cooperation on CS

educational activities. The ED asked that anyone with new ideas for Group Discussions should contact the ED or a member of IC so that he can prepare an agenda for the Group Discussions.

GA Meeting 2, 12:00 – 12:45

10. Issues arising from the Practice Session

Before starting this item, the Chair informs that he will read a message sent by Brian Dean, Leader of USA: "The USA delegation wants to express its gratitude to the host organizing committee for the tireless work they invested to help us achieve our goal of attending IOI 2017, and to the Chinese team leadership for agreeing to look after the single contestant representing us this year who has managed to arrange travel to IOI at the last minute under his Chinese passport. Although our visa situation didn't quite work out in time for our full team to attend, I wish everyone at IOI 2017 the best of luck and I look forward to seeing you all at IOI 2018! Sincerely, Prof. Brian Dean, Director, USA Computing Olympiad and USA Team Leader".

The Chair then asked Martin Mares (ITC), Michal Forišek (ISC) and Hamid (HTC) to come to the stage to present the issues arising in the practice session.

Martin starts by informing that if it is necessary to make an announcement during the contest, they will mail the announcement also to the Leaders, and if a contestant does not understand English, the Leader should mail the translation of the announcement back to the ITC, preferably by text, and the translation will be delivered as soon as possible.

ITC reported that there were some unexpected problems during the practice session, but they were quickly solved. A series of questions followed, about availability of Microsoft Visual Studio (Martin will look), refreshing scores inside CMS (already fixed). Singapore asked if a contestant brings her/his own keyboard, can she/he put the official keyboard aside (Martin answers yes). Canada asked how to print, Hamid answered that it should print OK if you print inside the application/environment, but "lpr" also works. Martin said they will test again to be sure. Finland asked what will be provided by the host to the Contestants. Hamid answers that like the previous year, the host will provide paper, pen, snack, water. Russia asks whether rulers are allowed. ITC answers no, as the rule does not allow it. Russia then asks if checkered paper will be provided, and ITC answers yes.
Sweden asks: if contestants leave something that is not allowed, where should they pick up? ITC answers that they will give the unaccepted item to the team guide.

ITC also announced that Yandex will be given the context data after the contestants are in the competition room, although Yandex probably will run the contest some hours after the start of the real contest.

GA Meeting 3, 19:30 – 22:00

11. Task selection for Competition Day 1

The ISC presented three tasks: Nowruz, Wiring and Toy Train. After some minor objections, the tasks were approved.

GA Meeting 4, Sunday 30 July, 16:30–17:30

12. Report on Competition Day 1

ISC reported that there were a few minor issues during the competition. At 9:54, a contestant reported "wrong answer" on sample test case 2 in task Wiring. ITC found that it was a configuration issue on CMS, and that it didn't affect the scoring. Around 13:00, the solution stub for Pascal had the arguments swapped. This didn't really matter in most cases, except for a single subtask where the red points were on the left and blue points on the right. It was fixed soon after 13:00.

CMS got overloaded in the last minutes and contestants could not submit. Fourteen contestants couldn't submit and were given the opportunity to submit after the contest ended, and the staff made sure they only submitted solutions they already had before the end of the contest.

Also, it was detected, with the task Nowruz, that some students had a different stack size limit on their local computer compared to the stack size limit on the grading machines.

A contestant was locked in bathroom, for 15 min, and was given 15 min extra time. Another contestant machine overheated; the contestant and data were relocated, and he was given 30 min extra-time. Next year, ISC and ITC want to practice on crashes during practice session.

Jakub showed some graphics with statistics of the contest: distribution of scores for each task, time to judge each submission, submission count by minute and by task.

ISC informed that 307 contestants competed on Day 1 (including Team 2 of Iran), as one contestant did not compete because he was sick.

13. Summary of Written Appeals for Competition Day 1

ISC informed they received three appeals. The first Appeal was from Latvia: Russian translation was not provided to their contestants, as requested. Jakub apologised, commented that the safest would be for leaders to print and guarantee that all prints were in the envelope.

The second Appeal was from a contestant who complained that his solutions ran within the time in his machine, but not in CMS in the grader. Martin suspects this is due to a difference in machines; although they have the same specifications, there may be a component variation that makes some machine run faster, but they are still investigating. Ali explained that they investigated it previously, with experiments, and did not detect differences.

The third Appeal was a problem with CMS at the end of the system; contestant was not able to run the solution in the next test case for the output only task. ISC accepted the appeal and made a suggestion: in the future, in case of problems with CMS, run the solution and store the result in the contestant's computer.

Michal Forišek announced that scores are not final, and may be re-judged. Although the ISC does not anticipate many changes, no scores will decrease.

Bernard Blackham (ITC) arrived and explained that they found the cause for the variation in running time of machines. It was due to a feature of the linux kernel, which transparently chooses between two options of performance. They disabled it and are re-judging all submissions now. Even then, ISC/ITC does not foresee many changes in the scores.

Finally Michal Forišek informed that there were comments on some internet forums that the task Wiring was not original, and had been used before in another contest. The ISC believes that this does not present a problem, did not interfere in the least in the contest, and in the future the ISC would like to consider using good tasks that may have been used before in other contests, as long the ISC judges it will not interfere in the contest results.

The Chair then announced that the proposed scrutineers for the elections will be Troy Visaga (Canada) and Krassimir Manev (Bulgaria). Put to vote, the scrutineers were approved by a show by flags.

The Chair then called Ben Burton (IC) to make some announcements. Ben explained that after his presentations of the proposed changes in the eligibility rules, El Salvador approached him to say that by the new rule El Salvador students will be negatively affected, as their school term runs from February to mid-October. Therefore, instead of trying to keep adjusting the rule, the IC suggests to add at the end of the new eligibility rule: "Exceptions may be requested through the IC". The second announcement was that, as it occurred last year, there was harassment of female contestants during the Opening Ceremony, by broadcasting offensive and abusive wifi names on phones. Ben asked all Leaders to speak seriously to their students, so that this disgusting behaviour is not repeated, nor on this IOI nor on any IOI in the future.

GA Meeting 5, Monday 31 July, 19:30 – 22:00

14. Task selection for Competition Day 2

On behalf of the ISC, Michal Forišek explained that the delay in starting the meeting is that one of the tasks may cause problems if the servers are not fast enough. He asked for a show of flags (indicative, not voting) to have a feeling of what the GA thinks: is it OK to have a different limit on submissions for different languages for this particular problem? Most countries think it is OK, very few countries think it would not be OK.

The ISC then presented three tasks: The Big Prize, Simurgh and Ancient Books. After some minor objections, the tasks were approved, 76 being in favor, no country being against and no abstentions.

GA Meeting 6, Tuesday 1 August, 19:30–20:30

15. Report on Competition Day 2

The ISC showed the GA the results for each task. The ISC and ITC also reported that the competition had to be extended twice, by 15 minutes each time, due to disruptions during the contest. The disruptions were caused by a conjunction of problems. The first problem was that a disk in a grader machine became full; the second problem was a bug in CMS, which used two different transactions to store the data and the meta-data of a submission; and the third problem was an optimization within CMS, which does not store a submission if it notices it already has the submission, and for deciding if it has already the submission it also stores and compares the hash of the source code and the hash of the executable code. ISC, ITC, HSC and HTC are sorry for the disruption in the contest the problems caused, but after reviewing what happened, they believe the did the best they could under the circumstances.

16. Summary of Written Appeals for Competition Day 2

ISC informed that there were two appeals. One appeal argued that the second extra-time had been given without necessity, and therefore all submissions after the first extra-time should be disregarded. ISC rejected this appeal, as they consider it was necessary to give the second extra-time. The other appeal came from the off-site competition, arguing that as the students in the off-site competition did not have the extra-time, their results, for allocating medals, should be compared to the results of the on-site competition at the end of the five hours period. The ISC considered this would not be fair, as the off-site competition did not have any problems which affected their contest, and also rejected this appeal.

17. Presentations by candidates for President, IC, ISC and ITC members

There were brief presentations to the GA from each candidate for President, ISC and ITC.

GA Meeting 7, Thursday, 3 August, 09:00–13:00

18. IOI President's report

The president took the floor and made a brief summary of his presidency. He explained the creation of the off-site competition (discussions in the IC and GA over the last years), the proposed change of the name of the role "Executive Director" to "Secretary", the latest change in eligibility rules. He then commented that he thinks that we need more awards, as we have only one award, DSA, and many people who deserve recognition. Looking as statistics, we have three categories of people: administrative, scientific, and training-oriented. Theses three categories cannot be compared. The President proposes to have a DSA for each category. Maybe in some years we may not have a person awarded in one category. He would like also to have metrics (e.g., number of years in a specific position) for each DSA category, not as a sufficient condition, but as a starting point.

The President then commented on the status of the Acer sponsorship: after many discussions, he finally signed the Acer contract, and Acer is now in the process of negotiating specific contracts with each of the future hosts.

The President informed that, in consonance with his desire of more awards, he decided to present an Award for Long Time Service to two persons: Teng Lam from Macau, which this year is completing 26 years as a Leader, and Jørgen E. G. Nielsen from Denmark, completing 26 years as a Leader and Deputy Leader. Teng and Jørgen were summoned to the state, and were presented Certificates of Achievement by the President.

19. Executive Director's report

The ED made a brief report, saying that we had a full agenda ahead. He commented that most of his work was to answer inquiries about participation in IOI, from different countries:
Cameroon, Kosovo, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Oman, Peru, République Démocratique du Congo, United Arab Emirates. Some of this inquires, though, were from students. From the interested countries, the ED commented that two seems more promising to become Observers in the near future: Peru and Nepal, for the persons/entities involved seemed committed to this goal. There were several other inquires, such as where to find information, where to find the syllabus, contestant eligibility and others. The ED reported that he had also several communications and issues related to the off-site contest of this year, and thanked Russia for helping solving the issues quickly.

20. Report from the ITC/ISC

Martin Mares took the floor to present the ITC report. ITC helped the host before the contest, and then helped firefighting (translation system before Day 1, disk full issue, timing issues). He also announced that new software is available: new sandbox, and several contest utilities. The ITC also improved its Technical Checklist for the future hosts, and contributions are welcome. ITC also maintained the lists used by the community. He finished remembering everyone to please subscribe to at least the ioi-announce list.

The ISC report was presented by Jakub. In the meeting in February ISC selected 9 tasks, discussed task preparation, updated contest rules, discussed updates in the syllabus. Before the IOI, the ISC produced guidelines for writing task statements, helped proofreading the tasks and prepared this year's' survey.

21. Financial Statement for preceding year

The Chair asked the Treasurer to come to the stage to present the next two items in the agenda. The Treasurer presented the Financial Statement for the preceding year, showing that the income was EU 19.552 (from projected EU 17.000), and expenses were EU 15.075 (from projected EU 32.700). The Treasurer explained that expenses were less than expected mainly because the planned IOI Workshop and ITC Workshop did not happen, and because the ED Office did not claim the money reserved for air tickets. Germany asked about the item "Miscellaneous expenses", the Treasurer answered that they referred to the offsite contest (EU 2.600) and manufacture of five IOI trophies. Martin Mares asked on which website the money was spent. The Treasurer answered it was the ioinformatics.org and statistics. The Treasurer informed that the President and the ED have confirmed the Financial Statement by looking at the bank statements on-line. The Chair put the Financial Statement for 2016 to vote; it was unanimously approved.

22. Budget for forthcoming financial year and
23. Registration fee for IOI-2018

The Treasurer then asked Mile Jovanov, from IC, to come to the stage, to explain two new items in the Budget, proposed by the IC. Mile explained that the IC is suggesting to budget EU 8000 for projects proposed by the community. To select the projects, the IC would make a Call for Projects. Each project should ask for at most EU 5000, should have as the Main Endorser the country from the proposer, and each project must also have at least one additional proposer or every EU 500 asked for. Every proposal must have a list of deliverables, to be checked by an independent auditor. Projects must be submitted by 31 Dec 2017.

Germany comments the idea is interesting, but we have already a project that is really interesting for the community: CMS. Germany suggests spending the money in both fronts: CMS and this Call for Projects. Germany suggests we could organize a Summer of Code for CMS, for example. Ben Burton (IC) comments that anytime people can come to the IC and ask money to fund a project. Germany would like to discuss more the rules for the Call for Projects. The Chair proposed that we vote the merit of the Call for Projects now, and if it is approved we can discuss the rules while the election votes were being counted.

The Chair then voted the inclusion, in next year's' Budget, of EU 8.000 for a Call for Projects. No one being against, the inclusion was accepted.

The Treasurer then asked Mathias Hiron, from IC, to come to the stage to explain another proposal from the IC. Mathias explained the IC proposes to spend EU 5.000 in a project already being implemented, used by several countries. The money would be spent specifically to add a new feature to this existing system: a repository of public (already used) and private (not yet used) tasks. The system is the one being developed since 2014 by IOI-France. Mathias showed some screenshots of the existing system, and of the proposed features. Sweden comments that if we start spending money in developing time, we will burn our money and not having much back, as good, experienced programmers are expensive.

The Chair voted the inclusion, in next year's' Budget, of EU 5.000 for the project presented by Mathias. With 54 votes in favor, and one against, the inclusion was accepted.

The Treasurer then presented the proposed Budget for next year, including the newly approved items, and the Registration Fee at the same value as this year's. The Chair put the Budget to vote; it was approved unanimously.

24. Update on Acer sponsorship

The Chair also asked the Treasurer to present a brief report on the state of the Acer sponsorship, since he has been more directly involved. The Treasurer explained briefly the Acer proposal for sponsorship, and that our contact person in Acer has changed, which caused some extra delays. The Treasurer explained what will be provided by Acer (all equipment for the contest: computers and networks) and what will not be provided by Acer (any task that could be done by the country, like unpacking/packing,

are expected to be performed by the country). A Memorandum of Understanding has been signed by Acer and the President of the IOI. Individual Host Countries will be signing specific contracts. Japan and Singapore have already signed their contracts, Azerbaijan is still negotiating, because a new team from Azerbaijan has been assigned by their government to take over the organization of the IOI. Sweden asks where we are going with the Acer sponsorship. The Treasurer proposes that since there are confidentiality terms in the contracts with the countries, he will negotiate with Acer which information could be made available to the GA.

25. Election of President and
26. Election of IC member and
27. Election of ISC member and
28. Election of ITC member

The Chair reminds everyone that there is one position for IC (three years), one position for ISC (three years) and two positions for ITC (one three years term, one one year term, for Stefano Maggiolo is stepping down and there remains one year of his term).

The Chair announces that since there is only one candidate for the ISC, Jonathan Irvin Gunawan, from Indonesia, is the new ISC elected member. He received a round of applause.

The scrutineers then announced that they will distribute ballots for the three remaining elections at the same time: President, IC and ITC. After the ballots were distributed, the scrutineers waited that all countries had voted, and collected the ballots. While the votes were being counted by the scrutineers, the Chair said the meeting would continue.

The Chair then opened the discussion on the rules for the Call for Projects approved previously. Germany asked why the endorsement from so many countries? It would make it very difficult to propose projects. Mile said the endorsement from other countries will help the IC to decide which is more important to the community, it shows the project is interesting for other countries. Germany commented that he thinks the IC is passing the responsibility to the GA: the IC should decide, and if it involves asking the community, the IC should do it, not the proposing country. Sweden comments that his opinion is completely different from Germany. Mile proposes that the endorsement could be from the proposing country, and other endorsements could be optional. Germany thinks this is not the same; if IC wants, IC could look for endorsements, not the proposer. Slovenia comments that we could make like a kickstarter. Mexico asked if there is a timeline for the Call of Projects. Mile wants the deadline for proposals to be the end of this year; the project themselves can be longer than one year.

The Chair put the item to vote: endorsements expected from proposer, although not obligatory received 11 votes in favor; no endorsements from the proposers, and IC will look for endorsements if necessary received 19 votes. Another 20 countries abstained.

29. Results and confirmation of medals and
30. Off-site contest

The Chair asked the ISC to present a brief report on results and medals, so that the GA could confirm it. Jakub reported there were 304 official contestants, and therefore the number of medals are 26 gold, 50 silver, 76 bronze.

In the off-site contest, which occurred in Innopolis, only Israel competed, with four contestants. According to their scores, and the rules decided by the GA, they will receive two silver medals and two bronze medals.

The Chair put the Results and confirmation of medals, including the off-site contest, to vote: it was unanimously approved.

31. Proposals from GA members

One item was raised by the GA: dropping pascal from 2019. The item was proposed by the ITC. Stefano Maggiolo explained that the proposal had been printed and distributed in the pigeonholes. Some countries asked about the introduction of Python. Stefano replied that ITC understands that for some countries eliminating Pascal without introducing Python could be a problem, but Python would introduce timing problems, and at the moment could only be used as a second class language, and ITC would continue looking into this in the future. Put to vote, the proposal was approved, with one abstention.

Election results
The scrutineers then announced the results for the elections, informing that 75 countries voted. For the ITC positions the votes were: Amir Keivan Mohtashami 16, Bernard Blackham 48, Georgiy Korneev 38, William Di Luigi 38. Therefore, Bernard Blackham won the three years term nomination, and we will need a new election to decide the other ITC member. A round of applause followed.

For the IC posiiton the votes were: Darko Pevec 39, Michael Chatzopoulos 12, Valentina Dagiene 46, Vladimir Kiryukhin 23, and therefore Valentina Dagiene is the new elected IC member. A round of applause followed.

For President the votes were: Ben Burton 37, Greg Lee 49, with Greg Lee being elected the new President of IOI. A round of applause from the GA followed.

The ED then explained that Bernard Blackham was not present, as he had already returned home, but Bernard had asked that instead of being nominated for the three years term, as it would be normal, he would like to be nominated for the one year position, for personal reasons. The Chair then put this proposition to the GA, and it was unanimously approved. The Chair then announced that a new election round would take place, for the three years term in the ITC, between Georgiy Korneev and William Di Luigi.

The scrutineers then distributed another ballot for the ITC election, allowed time for all countries to vote and collected the votes. While the votes were being counted, the Chair announced the meeting would continue.

Election result for the extra round
The scrutineers announced the result of the second round for the ITC election. In this election, 78 countries voted, and Georgiy Korneev received 36 votes , William Di Luigi received 42 votes, and therefore William Di Luigi was elected for the three years term at the ITC.

32. Voting on regulation changes

The Chair put the regulation changes to vote, and they were approved by the majority of delegations.

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

The ED asked all countries to remind their students of the proper behaviour during the awards ceremony. No large objects should be brought to the stage, and contestants should not obstruct the view of other contestants, such as by spreading a large flag over other contestants. If a contestant wants to bring a large flag to the stage, please instruct her/him to wrap her/himself with the flag, and not open it in front of other contestants.

34. Other business

As there were no other business to discuss, the Chair declared the meeting closed, but before anyone left the hall, he invited the leaders of Bolivia, Korea, Germany, Cyprus and Georgia to the stage.The host then presented gifts to these countries, to apologize for the mistakes with national flags in the opening ceremony.

Ben Burton (IC) expressed the gratitude of the IOI community for the Host, for having organized a wonderful IOI. The GA then gave a long and warm applause to the Host.