

General Assembly

Minutes of the Meetings 28 August 2023 – 4 September 2023
Szeged, Hungary

GA Meeting 1

Welcome and apologies

Ben Burton welcomed everyone. He noted that Libya is a new (returning) delegation, and they are attending IOI 2023 as an Invited Observer. He informed the GA of two changes on the International Committee (IC) welcoming Brian Marshal and László Jobbágy and thanking Yugo Isal and Ágnes Erdosne for their contributions.

Introduction of GA Chair

Ben then introduced Dr. habil. Rudolf Ferenc as the Chair of the IOI 2023 General Assembly. Rudolf said a few words of welcome himself before taking the helm.

Presentation and confirmation of GA Agenda

The Secretary of the IOI, J.P. Pretti, reminded everyone of the previously distributed agenda and asked for its approval. Electronic voting using ioibot was not working properly so placards were used instead. The agenda was confirmed unanimously.

Call for nominations

J.P. reminded everyone that nominations are open for two seats on IC, and one seat on the International Scientific Committee (ISC). He said there is also one seat open on the International Technical Committee (ITC) for which expressions of interest are encouraged. J.P. reminded the GA of the deadline and how to put your name forward.

IOI 2026 and IOI 2027 hosts

Ben stated that we do have bids for IOI 2026, but we do not for IOI 2027. He noted that we normally take bids four years in advance but have had trouble garnering bids in recent years. Ben made a plea to anyone considering hosting a future IOI. He asked that they come to speak to anyone on IC for more information and he said IC hopes to take bids for IOI 2027 later in 2023 and for IOI 2028 in Egypt next year.

Approval of contest rules and procedures

Zsolt Németh (ISC) provided some information about the upcoming contest:

- Extra supplies must be submitted by the end of the practice session.
- Keyboards and mice cannot be wireless or have any programming functionality.
- Although grading and contestant workstations will be similar, it is not guaranteed that they will behave identically.
- Feedback is only provided for the first test case among the lowest scored test cases in an unsolved subtask.
- Appeal forms will be online and are due one hour prior to the GA meeting of the corresponding competition day.
- Code::Blocks will not be available because of stability issues.

This was followed by a short discussion. In response to questions about snacks from Bulgaria, Australia, and the United Kingdom, Zsolt confirmed the following:

- Some contestant supplied snacks are ruled out because of the requirement to submit them the day before (e.g., perishable items and hot coffee).
- The provided snacks will include pastries and bananas.
- Exceptions to some of the rules around snacks are permitted for medical reasons.

The GA then voted to approve the contest rules and procedures with no votes against and no abstentions.

Code of Conduct reminder

Ben reminded everyone that IOI is an inclusive, considerate, and welcoming community, with a diverse family of members. He said intimidation, harassment, or abuse will not be tolerated. He asked that team leaders remind their students that they must read and understand the Code of Conduct.

Call for proposals for Group Discussions

Ben asked everyone to think of topics for group discussions citing past examples of topics like Honourable Mentions in 2019 and 2021 and gender diversity in 2019 and 2022. He asked that proposals be submitted by GA 4 in time to plan for the discussions themselves scheduled for the second contest day. The eventual group discussion topics and people leading the discussions were:

Timing of IOI (Kylychbek Uraiymov)

Should there be a rule about the timing of the IOI? Do others share the concern that it can sometimes interfere with the school year in some countries?

IOI Alumni (Sun Teck Tan)

Can we establish a platform for IOI alumni (contestants and leaders)? This network would allow old friends to connect and provide a potential stream of financial support for future IOIs.

Decreasing the Cost of Hosting an IOI (Jakub Łącki)

How can we maintain the spirit of the IOI but find ways to make it cheaper to host the event? This might help address the recent challenge of finding hosts.

Increasing the IOI Registration Fee (Eslam Wageed)

Should we increase the IOI registration fee to ease the burden on potential future hosts and hopefully increase the number of bids received?

Face of the IOI (Araz Yusubov)

What can be improved on the IOI official website and other online infrastructure (country websites, social media, etc.)?

The CMS and Alternatives (Wolfgang Pohl)

How can the IOI community support joint future development of the current IOI grading system, variations used in other countries and other alternative systems?

Future of Programming Languages at IOI (Birk Tjemeland)

In recent years, only C++ has been permitted at IOI. Should Rust or other languages have a place at future IOIs?

Appointment of scrutineers for voting during GA meetings

The GA voted to approve Mohammad Ali Abam (Iran), Greg Lee (Taiwan), and Troy Vasiga (Canada) to be scrutineers during GA meetings with no votes against and no abstentions.

IOI Allies

Ben spoke about the new IOI Ally programme. He said IOI Allies are on-site, trained, safe and confidential points of contact on issues related to equity, diversity & inclusion / discrimination & harassment. He clarified that they do not provide professional counselling or legal advice and the list of these volunteers can be found on the IOI website.

Host announcements

László Jobbágy welcomed everyone to Szeged and made a few announcements about taking care of your belongings, keeping guides updated, the usage of the spa at the contestant hotel, and wearing badges. In response to a question from Sweden, he confirmed that “normal” mascots will be permitted at the opening ceremony.

GA Meeting 2

Issues arising from the Practice Session

Michal Forišek (ISC), known as Misof, provided a debrief on the Practice Session. He provided the following information:

- To avoid disturbing contestants, there will not be any live spectating, but the live scoreboard will be available. In response to a question from Canada, the scoreboard can be shared publicly as was the case before COVID.
- Permissions were set incorrectly for Desktop preventing files to be saved there. This should be fixed for Day 1.
- Links to the CMS which are currently only available when a new Firefox window (not a tab) is opened, will be added to the VM desktop for Day 1.
- Some contestants reported that some of the buttons are missing in their keyboard layout. This is a hardware limitation. Team leaders can submit additional items before the translation system.
- One complaint was received about a loud keyboard. This keyboard will be checked. If it is problematic, it will be rejected; otherwise, the contestant raising the concern will be moved.
- Many contestants touched their laptops before the practice session started despite instructions not to. It is especially important that this not happen during the contest. Contestants should also never attempt to restart their machine.
- Issues with two CMS translations (Japanese and Ukrainian) will be investigated but this is admittedly lower priority than other issues.
- The ioisubmit tool needs to be accompanied by an appeal and the contest notice will be updated to reflect this requirement. It is possible to use ioisubmit more than once for the same task and call for staff only after the last one. Submissions will be processed sequentially until the submission limit is reached.
- There were many questions about issues (e.g., time limits) answered in the provided documentation. Leaders are encouraged to ensure their contestants notice the Notice. Any questions like this received during the competition will be answered “See the Notice.”
- There are five actionable items for leaders: (1) Talk to your contestants before quarantine; (2) Bring forgotten unsubmitted items to translation night; (3) Stay tuned for an announcement coming from the IOI Treasurer; (4) Be available on Matrix to translate questions; (5) Talk to ISC during the appeals phase if you have reason to be concerned.

In response to a small number of questions, Misof said hot water cannot be provided to contestants during the competition, all translations will be available to all contestants, and it should be okay if contestants left something in their seat.

Zsolt said that the wristbands with NFC capability needed to open contestant hotel rooms will be allowed during the contest.

Other announcements

The IOI Treasurer, Eljakim Schrijvers, reminded all delegations to pay their registration fees.

Brian Marshal apologized for the miscommunication and lack of communication around the retrieval of IOI 2022 materials and some yet unclaimed IOI 2021 materials. As of now, these materials (e.g., swag, medals, and certificates) have been put in pigeonholes. He asked to be notified if anything is missing, but reminded everyone that online participants were not given the exact same set of items.

GA Meeting 3

The meeting began with a few words from Virginia Velasco Condori who is a senator from Bolivia, host of IOI 2025.

Presentation of regulation changes

Before presenting the regulation changes, Eduard Kalinichenko (IC) noted that awarding of Long-Term Service Awards will be delayed by one year to ensure he can correctly compile everyone’s names as they would like them to appear on certificates. He said this will be done by distributing names as currently used on IOI stats. He noted that this will be the default and any desire to use a different name should be submitted to Eduard during this IOI.

Eduard then presented the six distributed regulation changes for information and questions of clarification or about intent:

Modernising the IOI Report (S5.12)

In recent years, IOI Reports were delivered during the subsequent Winter Meeting and were not shared with the GA due to presence of information that is sensitive for the hosts. This change reflects what is happening in practice. Additionally, requiring a physical version of the IOI Report has proven to be an unnecessary burden.

Modifying Remote Competition eligibility (S6.14)

The current Regulations use the term “diplomatic relations”, which is a very specific requirement. This change rephrases the intention behind when we might want to apply this rule – when we know far in advance that it is highly unlikely that the participating Country will be granted permission to enter the Host Country.

De-anonymising IC votes (A3.7, N3.7)

With very limited exceptions (such as voting for Distinguished Service Awards or votes on issues specific to a single Country), this proposal would make votes in IC no longer anonymous, and instead the individual votes would be visible to the GA. The intention is to not make them public, but to distribute them to GA during IOIs through pigeonholes, similar to how we distribute budget information.

Using ranked voting for votes with 3 or more options (A3.2, N3.2.1, A3.5, A3.7)

The Schulze method has proven to be effective in selecting one option out of multiple choices. This change would officially make the Schulze method the way of voting for a motion with multiple options, so there is no need for multiple rounds of voting.

Vacancy of President position (A3.6.2)

The current Regulations specify that in the case of the absence of the IOI President, the role is taken by the most recent Chair of IOI. This position is often filled by people not closely connected to IOI or who might not be available after IOI is over. As such, this proposal states that a vacant President position should be filled by another elected IC member until the next time when GA can elect a president. Note that the current President does not intend to use this change.

Clean-up (N3.5, N3.8.2)

This is a minor renaming of Notes in the regulations.

Eduard then discussed logistics. He said feedback will be considered by IC and if there are any consequent amendments, they will be sent to the GA in advance of a vote. He added that anything that modifies a Statute requires a 2/3 majority when voting and changes will be in effect immediately following IOI 2023.

Germany raised the diplomatic relations issue suggesting potential hosts should be asked in advance if they anticipate all countries will be able to participate on-site. Ben answered to say that IC does care about this and does ask; however, sometimes we do not know in advance that there could be problems.

Spain said that the current wording is about delegations as opposed to individuals. They said they would like to see a similar accommodation be made for other groups of people to participate remotely when they are unable to attend on-site. They cited the specific example of members of the gay community who are not always welcome in all countries.

Sweden spoke to say that they are concerned about the lack of transparency related to the first regulation regarding the dissemination of IOI Reports. They asked for specific examples of sensitive data. Ben said budget and financial information is one of chief concern. Sweden indicated this is a reasonable concern. They suggested that redacted versions of reports from hosts be provided instead. Ben and Eduard said they will bring this suggestion back to IC.

Task selection for Competition Day 1

Before opening the task selection and translation part of the evening, ISC emphasized that students who use ioisubmit must also file an appeal and asked that leaders communicate this clearly to their contestants. They also announced that all rejected items have been returned to contestants.

Following this, the logistics of the evening (e.g., the handling of minor and major objections) and expected schedule were outlined and displayed on the screen, and the GA began to work on the proposed tasks. At 9:37pm, all three proposed tasks were accepted with no votes against and no abstentions.

GA Meeting 4

Report on Competition Day 1

Misof said that the competition started and ended on time. No extra time was awarded.

Martin Mareš (ITC) outlined technical issues that arose during the contest all of which were minor:

- At around 0:40, the CMS was unreachable to about half of the contestants for about five minutes. ISC decided that the impact was negligible, and no action is required.
- Before the start of the contest, the scoreboard was broken but it was fixed about 40 minutes into the contest by correcting a long-standing bug.
- The scoreboard suffered more downtime about 20 minutes before the end of the contest because of DDOS protection. This was fully solved about 15 minutes after the contest.

Misof expressed dismay at the fact that at the end of the contest, despite many instructions otherwise, many contestants shut down their laptops, restarted them or put them to sleep. He said this complicates things considerably for the technical committees. He reminded leaders to bring this up with contestants again and said other reminders will also be issued.

There were 351 official contestants as well as 4 contestants from the second host team. Statistics about the problems were shared (e.g., number of full solutions, average points, number of submissions, questions asked). Of the questions asked by contestants during the contest, the only one of significance was an actual clarification of a problem statement.

There were two health related incidents. One was quite serious and lasted two hours. It involved local medical professionals, and transport to a hospital. A second incident was much more minor.

Two submissions were made via ioisubmit close to the end of the contest, neither with a picture taken. One was evaluated to zero points. The other was invalid (a binary file was submitted). Leaders were again urged to ask their contestants to follow the required procedure.

Brazil asked what happens with respect to ioisubmit if the CMS goes down near the end of the contest. Misof replied to say special circumstances like this will require special action.

Sweden extended compliments for a fabulous Day 1, possibly the best ever in terms of clarifications and technical issues. Misof redirected this to the HTC.

Mile Jovanov (IC) commented that it was indeed a successful day, but the number of points was low. He hopes the tasks are not as hard for Day 2. Misof asked that we judge things after Day 2. Mile would like the issue of the scoreboard including unofficial participants fixed. Misof says that we will investigate doing this if there is time and no arguments against it are raised.

Australia asked about the scoreboard after Day 2 and asked that scores somehow be communicated to leaders at the end, before they speak to their students. Martin said this is the intent as it was on Day 1. He added that the testing queue also means absolute final data can never be guaranteed.

Appeals for Competition Day 1

No appeals were received following the first competition day.

Reminder of need for nominations

Cathy Espinoza (IC) reminded everyone about the open call for nominations for committee. She encouraged everyone to apply, especially to the IC where technical skills are not required. She said a variety of perspectives are needed to reflect the diversity of the IOI community. She also pointed out that she is the only woman on IC; it can be difficult to be the only one that feels she needs to “speak for woman”. She also noted that her term is ending on IC.

IOI President’s report

Ben began his report by outlining his role; the IOI President is its spokesperson and the “Face of the IOI”. He said they work with the IOI community and, most importantly, chair the IC. He observed that the powers of the president on paper are no different than others on IC (one vote on IC and none in GA) but they do have the (soft) power to set the agenda and set the tone.

Ben extended special thanks to J.P. as Secretary, Eljakim as Treasurer and Eduard as the “Regulations Guru”.

Turning his attention to diversity and inclusion, Ben said that the IOI community is richer for our differences. He said he has added Equity, Diversity and Inclusion and Outreach (to new countries) as permanent items on IC's future agendas. On this note, he presented past data illustrating significant issues with diversity at IOI including gender among participants, gender on committees, geography and policies/laws at past, current and future hosts related to LGBTIQ folks. He emphasized that as things currently stand, next year there may be no women at all on any of its three committees.

Ben described ongoing work to improve diversity concerns including the new IOI Ally programme and outreach to new countries notably work spearheaded by Eslam Wageed in the Middle East and Africa, and work by Sun Teck Tan in Asia. Ben said that despite this, progress is slow, and we can do more. Ben claimed that gender on the IC particularly matters; we need more women now. He proposed that we change the regulations, so we always elect at least one candidate of a minority gender. He clarified that here, "minority" means within the IC and is only required if such a candidate exists. Ben's rationale for this change was that the IC needs diversity; it is a job requirement. Ben said IC advises hosts on logistics and arrangements, sets policies, and manages harassment and discrimination. More bluntly, he said IC is often a group of men discussing what to do for women. Ben argued that this is not a major change; we already have five unelected voting members for a specific purpose (hosting). He noted this would ensure there are three elected members for a specific purpose (gender diversity). He said we would retain three "general" elected members and at most it would affect 3 of 11 members. Ben made it clear that he proposed this to IC, but the vote was split whether to bring this to GA, so it is his own proposal and not an IC proposal.

The specific wording of Ben's proposal was:

If there are candidate(s) of a minority gender [1] and at least two positions available [2], then at least one of the candidates elected should be of a minority gender.

- [1] A "minority gender" is a gender held by strictly less than half of those remaining IC members who are not finishing their terms.
- [2] The President is counted as an IC position.

Ben said he will send out these details but is happy to take questions on the proposal, saying debate can come after we have had two days to think about this and chat informally.

Eduard pointed out that regulations do allow for this to be voted on this year for effect in 2024.

Germany commented that it is very important to talk about diversity and minorities. They said women investigated this in Germany and their findings, at least with respect to contestants, were that "it is not about us"; we are at the "end of the development". They said this is not meant to be a negative comment. Instead, they encouraged people to address this within their own countries before IOI. Ben said he understands, and this specific change is not meant to fix the gender divide among contestants, but for example to have a woman in the room if harassment happens again.

In concluding his report, Ben said minutes of the 2021 GA meetings were distributed this morning. He thanked everyone for their patience, asked that comments/corrections be sent to him and said we will vote on them later this week.

Confirmation of minutes of IOI 2022 GA meetings

The minutes of the IOI 2022 GA meetings were confirmed with no votes against and two abstentions.

Secretary's report

J.P. reintroduced himself and gave a brief report. He said much of his work and communication is centred around potential new countries. He repeated that membership to the IOI was granted to Libya. He listed inquiries received from Albania, Cameroon, Monaco, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Puerto Rico, Somalia, Uganda, and the United Arab Emirates. He described other Secretary business including producing minutes, calling for nominations for Distinguished Service Awards, calling for nominations for positions on IC and ISC, and calling for expressions of interest for openings on ITC. J.P. reminded everyone of the current openings.

The Secretary finished his report by reminding delegations to keep their subscriptions to the ioi-announce and other IOI mailing lists up to date.

GA Meeting 5

Call for projects

Mile made a call for projects with a reminder that a project should not apply to only one country but does not need to apply to all countries. He cited examples of past projects and outlined the process.

Task selection for Competition Day 2

Zsolt opened the second task selection and translation system with a test of voting via ioibot which was unsuccessful. He then said the translation system will be used again without changes except for the use of new credentials. He announced that items rejected for Day 2 have been returned to participants and now is the time when they can accept possible replacements.

The expected schedule for the evening was presented and work began on the proposed tasks.

After some time passed, Misof announced that ISC received two major objections:

- For the problem “carpet”, there is overlap with two national contests to varying degrees. Misof acknowledged that this could be a concern.
- For the problem “beechtree”, there is a complaint about the difficulty of parsing the problem statement. Misof said ISC’s position is that one of the ideas of this problem is for contestants to play around with the definitions. There is a distinction between not understanding the problem statements and not understanding the objects at play. At this time, ISC is not recommending it be replaced.

A back-up problem was introduced for consideration. After some time passed, it was determined that no major objection appeared to be pending for the back-up problem.

Misof then invited further comments on “beechtree” noting that ISC does recommend that it replace “carpet”.

Canada said that their objection is somewhere between minor or major. They expressed that we should not reject it but with work, examples and clarifying language it can be salvaged. In response, Michael said he fully understands and provided the background of its selection. He said ISC was always aware of the low approachability of the problem. On the other hand, he said its advantages include its range of difficulty and the fact that they had a lot of fun playing with it. He explained that this is why ISC is trying to salvage it.

Italy followed up to comment on the Day 2 problem set as a whole. They felt “beechtree” and “robot” may be too hard a combination and lead to too many zeros. They said they could accept one problem like this but two may be too many. Misof acknowledged that ISC and HSC made these same comments. He pointed out, of course, that they are dealing with the problem sets they have, and part of the issue here is the replacement of carpet.

Australia discussed the reasons to keep “beechtree” and wanted to raise a discussion point: distinguishing between what we think students should do to play with a problem and what they may actually do.

Germany suggested that we simply explicitly say something along the lines of “We know this problem is difficult, but we suggest you play around with it”. Misof indicated he really liked this idea, and a show of placards suggested it had a lot of support.

Latvia said they are in favour of keeping “beechtree”. They wanted to know if it is considered the hardest problem in the set. They also asked a technical question about convoluted trees. Misof said that ISC feels that “beechtree” is the medium difficulty problem in terms of “full solve”. With respect to scoring points, he said he feels the first subtask is very straightforward and the next three subtasks reward observations made when solving the first subtask. He noted that this results in 22 points before a full understanding is required.

Ben, speaking as host of IOI 2013, said if we are asking for changes the night before, there is an associated cost beyond lack of sleep. Sweden spoke up to strongly support this feeling and said most/many major past problems were the result of last-minute changes.

Finland said that believing “beechtree” will now be accepted, does an iterative description in words (over formal mathematics) give away too much? Misof said ISC still needs to discuss this. Iceland expressed agreement saying they feel a rewording is important here but the problem itself is good.

Denmark expressed concern about the number of zeros and low scores. They asked which problem is meant to be the easiest. They said the issue is not the contestants but the problems. Misof acknowledged this concern is amplified because

“carpet” was meant to be the easiest problem. However, he partially rejected the fact that the problem is the only issue. He said that even if there is a very easy problem, there may still be zeros. He added that stress and bugs can cause these.

Australia emphasized that the wording of the statement is important and really affects difficulty. For this reason, they asked that countries be reminded that translations stay very true to the final English version.

Given all of this, Misof suggested that it was time to vote. Nobody objected to a vote being cast. A significant majority voted yes. There were no votes against. There were five abstentions.

GA Meeting 6

Report on Competition Day 2

Misof announced that the contest started and ended on time, no extra time was awarded, ioisubmit was not used and contestants left the laptops running which HTC really appreciated.

Martin provided a list of all technical issues on Day. He showed a blank slide.

There was a 3rd health incident that was not too serious and ISC believes it was handled well.

There were roughly 35 questions during the contest none of which were of consequence.

There are still 351 official contestants.

Misof then presented statistics on the problems included some very preliminary comparisons to past results to judge the overall difficulty of the 2023 problem set. He said it turns out that that, in the end, this turns out to be one of the more difficult competitions in recent years. He said his personally feeling, which he believes most of the committee shares, is that he is not happy with this, and we should try to move the average. He added, it was not a disaster. For example, he noted that the mark needed to get a bronze was lower than the recent average, and replacing a problem was a factor. Given the situation, he described ISC as more or less pleased, but they do want to continue to investigate and take lessons away from the problem set and competition more generally.

Appeals for Competition Day 2

Misof announced that there were again no appeals. He extended thanks to the HSC and HTC for their hard and extremely competent work. He noted they were very pleasant to work with. Misof declared that ISC considers the results of IOI 2023 final, and their formal approval is scheduled for GA 7 on Sunday. He then opened the floor for questions or comments.

Bulgaria asked about “beechtree” and given discussion about it the previous night, asked for the opinion of ISC in reflection. Michael said he wants to look deeper, but his initial feeling right now is that the main determining factor today was time. He said if more time was available, the scores on “beechtree” would have been higher. He posited that people delayed or ignored working on this problem because it appeared less approachable. He said he believes they instead spent lots of time on “robot” which they understood but which was very difficult. Bulgaria accepted that this was a problem but did encourage ISC to think and dig further because they believe there are other factors.

Croatia commented that they disliked the partial scoring within many of the subtasks. They said they would like a larger number of more discrete all-or-nothing subtasks. Misof agreed with the sentiment that an ideal task has a linear increment of subtasks. However, he said we are not always able to do this, and some subtasks need to be independent. He explained why with respect to robots specifically, the scoring structure was justified. Croatia followed up to say they were more concerned about how this was communicated. Misof did agree that the presence of partial scores should appear sooner in the statement. Jonathan Irvin Gunawan (ISC) weighed in giving a technical CMS limitation at play. He had also toyed with some other possible wording tweaks.

Belgium responded to ISC saying they struggle to find problems that are easier or have easy subtasks. They said this can be worked on. Misof said this is true six months before the IOI, but not the night before. He followed up by noting there are many reasons why increasing the weight of early subtasks the night before is a problem (e.g., comparison across problems).

Latvia asked about future use of the rejected “carpet” problem. ISC said the problem itself clearly can’t be kept secret; it was probably already leaked. Misof said that after some formalities, ISC is going to try and provide the data to this GA which can be used for local practice.

Canada asked if the results reflect the expected level of difficulty for the easiest subtasks and if ISC has recommendations on how to train countries for the easiest questions. Misof said it is hard to make any subtask that is “easy enough”. From talking to some countries to whom this happens, he said he knows the level of some of these students is quite low (a nested

loop with an if statement is already a challenge). He also reminded everyone of the IOI syllabus. Jonathan followed up to say that some of the easiest subtasks were among problems with complex set-ups which is also an issue. He felt they should aim with two tasks with both an easy set-up and easy subtasks.

Italy agreed that this was not a disaster and things were handled well. Knowing it is not easy, they said they would like to see more activity in developing easy tasks. Misof appreciated the suggestion but really felt the key issue was the need for problems like this to be submitted. He cited another problem: a very strong distaste of problems with reused ideas.

The Dominican Republic wondered about including a more diverse set of testers. Misof said they do have a wide range of testers but perhaps not any at the zero-score level.

Serbia brought up the issue that the problem statements were longer than usual. They felt some of this was from lots of explanations that perhaps were not necessary. They sought opinions on this. Misof said, yes, it was long but not the longest ever. He also did note that it included a lot of boilerplate that lots of contestants don't use and don't need to read.

Philippines said that there was pressure from the community to avoid similar (not novel) tasks. They disagreed with this and reminded everyone that lots of the students are new so reused tasks may still be new to them. They wondered if the expressed distaste for reusing tasks is coming from potential and future students. Misof said they are not getting it from the GA but, yes, from contestants (past, present, and future).

The Netherlands said lots of scientific effort goes into the task statements and we need to stop suggesting lots of minor issues that are often of personal taste and really make translation more difficult. They added that in the past, tasks were often very short because we accepted that an example was sufficient; we are now so afraid of misunderstanding things that we add far too much verbosity.

Important host announcement

László expressed serious concern about contestant misbehaviour (e.g., contestants were climbing out of windows) and indicated that it needs to stop immediately. A discussion ensued with leaders asked to speak to their contestants and with the GA asking the hosts to provide clear and consistent information through the guides.

Presentations by candidates for IC, ISC and ITC

J.P. introduced the candidates up for election for IC and each gave a brief statement:

1. Sandra Schumann
2. Anton Tsytko
3. Darko Pevec
4. Fredrik Niemelä

Then the candidates for ISC each gave a statement:

1. Andrea Ciprietti
2. Charlotte Knierim
3. Ali Sharifi

There was only one approved expression of interest for ITC and Martin Mareš is acclaimed to the position.

Continuation of President's report

Ben reminded everyone of his proposal to always elect an IC candidate of a minority gender if one exists. He said his plan is to have some debate now, then conduct a straw poll to see if the GA endorses the idea. He said if it passes, it will then go to IC for formulation of the regulation and then return to GA 7 for approval by the GA. As usual, he added that if approved, it would take effect next year. Ben said that there is not time to debate alternatives.

Switzerland spoke first saying it is nice that the IC is pushing for gender equality. However, they said this proposal ignores other aspects of diversity (e.g., this year all four IC candidates are from Europe). They asked if the IC considered this problem. Ben responded to say this has been considered. His answer was that we appreciate there are many aspects of diversity, and they all need to be addressed. He said the reason we are addressing gender is because it has been discussed for many years and there have been many problems in the past; it has been a particular sore point.

Fieke Dekkers said she has been approached many times to see if, as a woman, she supports the proposal. She said she fully supports it and in response to common follow-up questions, if it passes, she does not feel pressure to run.

Türkiye asked how many genders there are. They asked if there are as many genders as there are people and claimed that if so, the definition of “minority” is meaningless. They spoke against affirmative action practices at some American universities that aim to increase racial diversity, and claimed this proposal has the same flaws. They said they are not sure this proposal is necessary.

Mile pointed out that this is not a proposal from IC, and IC did not agree on it. He said this is a personal proposal from Ben and different opinions were expressed. He gave his opinion stating that he is against this kind of rule. Mile said we do need women on IC; we encourage them to apply and, apparently, they are applying. Mile said that if we do want to represent both genders fairly, then it should represent the GA, and this would mean approximately 10% of the committee should be women.

Germany reiterated the point that this proposal does not address other aspects of diversity. They said they agree that we should not have only people in Group A discussing disjoint Group B, and this holds in many cases. Returning to this general proposal, Germany would like to see this community be more effective in communicating to and involving underrepresented groups.

Eduard spoke to give three reasons why he supports this proposal. First, he acknowledged that yes, there are other diversity issues, but this is the most visible one and we should start somewhere. Second, cautioned about using artificial methods to address, for example, female participation at IOI. In general, he said he is more in favour of organic solutions like EGOI. However, he said for IC, we are not elected on skill; IC is not organizing IOI; the hosts organize IOI. He said the most IC can do is give advice to IOI and for this reason, diversity is critical. Eduard said we have tried encouraging people informally and we still have the problem. As a final point, we said we should discourage people from using the hypothetical argument that some candidates would not otherwise be elected because had this been in effect last year, he would not have been elected and yet he fully supports this.

Canada said that by some of the points being made, the point has been made. They said we need to listen to women and, clearly some people in this room are not listening. They continued to say that as Ben outlined, this has been an issue for 20 years and here we have a specific problem and specific way to solve it. They observed that events like this do have 5% women and that is a fundamental problem. They ridiculed the argument that we are doing okay because we only have 5% representation in the GA and IC should reflect this.

Germany said they disagree with Canada because the issue is not about contestants.

Then Spain disagreed with Germany. They said it is a place to start and they disagree that we would have less valid candidates as a consequence. All candidates today were good candidates.

Netherlands said the logic discussed by Canada and Germany is very different. They said it is about the climate we must deal with. They claimed that while we still have harassment and inappropriate behaviour by boys, we require change and if we have a step forward like this to make an improvement, we should do it. They hoped this need will pass.

Misof then spoke as an individual. He said he respects Ben and understands the initiative and shares a common goal but does not support this proposal. He said he has tremendous respect for the GA, and everyone here probably agrees that gender diversity on the IC is the biggest problem we have with the IC. He continued to say we have great female candidates today, for example, and he hopes lots of people see this and support them. However, Misof said he is worried how this might affect future IOIs; it locks us into one kind of diversity. Instead, let's vote these women in.

Martin then also addressed the GA as himself. He posed the question: If we believe that diversity is important, do the current voting rules give us enough rules to express this? He said if the answer is “yes”, we are okay and if not, we should fix the voting system.

Denmark said this voting system is not good enough to address this problem. They said just having a voting system capable of solving the problem is not enough. They noted that history shows we have a problem, and we must have some stronger means to solve the problem. They agreed that many of us see that it is a problem for the IC to not be representative. Therefore, they welcomed the proposed amendment to the system because our system is not enough.

Romania spoke in support of the proposal. They also addressed the argument that this ties the hand of the GA in the future. To the contrary, they claimed that this proposal helps in that regard.

Cathy said she feels she needs to speak as the only woman currently on IC. She said it is often hard for her to speak for all women on the committee because she is not a Muslim woman, not a married woman, not a vegetarian woman, and doesn't have all the experiences a woman could. Cathy urged people to encourage more women to be brought to IOI as deputy leaders and leaders.

Araz Yusubov (IC) said he is for more women at IOI and hopefully we will vote for more. He said we have excellent candidates. He said he was against this proposal in IC because he didn't see it as a way to solve the bigger problem, and he is more comfortable with EGOI-like initiatives.

Türkiye said that one thing we are missing here is what we expect from the IOI president and IC. They explained that at the beginning, Ben said we discussed this with a lot of people, and we don't want a lot more discussion here so let's just go ahead and vote. Türkiye said even in IC, a decision could not be agreed upon. They argued that the most important thing is the integrity of the information we get from the IC; it is more important than its diversity. Next, Türkiye said their question: (What is gender?) was not answered. They said they don't understand it. They asked why discussion is not being allowed.

Ben said he did not think the gender question was a serious question. However, he said that if the question was about "minority gender", then, in practice, today, it can be informally summarized as "not male".

The discussion continued with the leader of the United Kingdom saying he has lots of experience with the IOI and despite this, when he saw Ben's numbers, he was shocked. He said this is disgraceful and we should be ashamed that we have yet to do anything about it. The United Kingdom stated they think this is a good proposal, and they fully support it.

Mile said that while we are talking about problems, we could include a rule that each country must bring leaders of different genders. He said this would solve that problem. Then he asked people rhetorically what we would think about that solution. He then gave another (in his words ridiculous) example to illustrate that the proposed solution is not enough. He alluded to alternatives to the proposal.

Netherlands suggested we stick with the current proposal as suggested.

Araz said there may have been some misunderstanding; there was IC discussion; it was lengthy; the vote was 50/50 and Ben decided to bring the issue to the GA. Araz said we should consider Mile's suggestion (of making team gender balance mandatory) and all other suggestions. He asked rhetorically whether or not we are ready for change (i.e. to give up medals).

Austria sought insight into what happens in a year where the presidency is one of the open positions on IC. Ben said the technical answer is that the president is one of the IC members. He said if the elected president is a woman, the IC candidate could be anybody, and if the elected president is a man, the IC candidate must be a woman or non-binary person (if any).

Jonathan asked whether this proposal would require people to identify their gender. Ben answered to say "yes".

Bolivia asked what would happen if we hit a perfect 50/50 gender split on IC. Ben responded to say that this only affects two positions each year, and he will eat his hat if we ever reach a 50/50 split.

In closing, Ben said he would like to understand that we have talked about proportion of contestants, proportion of leaders, and other types of diversity. He said we are here only to try and fix the composition of the IC. He understands that we trust the IC. However, he implied that even this year IC has provided evidence that it would benefit from a better gender balance. He said we are looking for something that will survive him and this room; something that will achieve something closer to balance; one woman is not enough. He said we cannot, every single time, ask the one woman to speak for these issues; it is physically draining; we need more than one. In conclusion, Ben said he hopes everyone feels they have had a chance to express their opinion and he called for a straw poll: "Do you support working on this proposal?". There were 31 votes in favour, 25 votes against and 12 abstentions.

Group discussion follow-up

Jakub Łacki gave a brief report on the group discussion about making the IOI more sustainable by reducing the cost for future hosts. He listed the ideas discussed:

- Increase registration fee (except for IMO, other Olympiads charge \$2500 to 3000)
- Shorten IOI by one day
- Reduce committee sizes (IC/ISC/ITC)
- Make deputy leaders optional (but they can come if they pay a fee)
- Change guest track by increasing guest fees or not organizing guest track activities

More details were provided on the first two and the last of the ideas listed above because they received the most support. Jakub said the main goal at the moment was to determine if the GA might be prepared to vote on the issue at the next and last meeting, or whether it is better to wait a year.

Sweden wanted two straw polls: "If fee was X, do you still think you would come?" (for two values of X).

Germany said these ideas are coming quickly and he would need to talk to people and local organizations to form an opinion. They felt completely unprepared to decide now. Germany then also raised a regulation technicality asking if it was okay to decide to set a fee for IOI'n+2 because according to E3.1, it needs to be ratified at previous IOI. Eduard responded "yes", any amount needs to be ratified in the previous year, but this doesn't prevent from agreeing upon what amount will be included in a ratification attempt.

Mikhail Tikhomirov said we should ask the countries that have inquired about hosting if a fee increase would greatly affect them.

A straw poll suggested 40 delegations would still attend IOI if the registration fees were raised to 1.200 Euros. About 15 delegations said they would not be able to come. It was evident that many delegations did not yet know how a fee increase might affect them.

Germany complained that a representative from only one group discussion was given the opportunity to speak. Jakub responded to say this was a request; he was not invited to speak. Given the sentiment, he said it seems clear that the GA is not ready to vote on a large registration fee increase at IOI 2023. Instead, he requests that each delegation reflect on the impact of a large potential registration fee increase on their specific circumstances. Sweden agreed that this makes sense, the idea is coming too quickly, and it would be premature to vote the next day.

The Czech Republic and Lithuania made similar comments indicating that their national Olympiads are funded out of one pot of money. They said this means that an increase in the cost of the IOI has implications beyond only the IOI and might be tricky to navigate.

Spain wondered if some countries who can pay more might consider doing so voluntarily.

GA Meeting 7

Romania asked to speak about something that transpired the previous evening at cultural event. A map was presented of a former Hungarian empire. It included territory of its current neighbours. Also, the band sang a song with lyrics heralding the empire and wishing for it to return. The Romanians left that party as a protest. They said they don't consider this acceptable and felt insulted. They said they await apologies and hope things of this nature will never happen again. There was applause. In response, the deputy leader of Hungary said that what happened was a shame and they are sorry. There was applause. Then the Hungarian Chair of the GA said he will speak to the organizers, and he also extends his own apologies. There was more applause.

Results and confirmation of medals

Eduard brought forth a proposal to nullify the scores for one contestant. This contestant did make submissions, but they had serious medical emergencies on both contest days. This is something that the contestant and their leaders want. Eduard noted that they will still count as a contestant, so this proposal does not affect any medal boundaries; the effect would only be to remove the contestant from the final ranking page. A vote via placards was held, and the proposal passed.

Eduard then called for a vote to confirm the medals. It passed with 68 voters in favour, no votes against and one abstention.

Report from the ITC

Martin reminded everyone of the purpose of the ITC. This year, they helped the host with technical issues but in a limited way because HTC was excellent and on top of things. Longer term projects of ITC include investigating the security of grading, performance of CMS, efficient grading of interactive tasks and new programming languages. Martin spoke about several IT resources providing a detailed update on the Task Preparation System. He listed the IOI mailing lists and other infrastructure. One change of note is that the registration system will be used to automatically create subscriptions to ioi-announce.

Germany said they loved the idea that Matrix is continuing and wanted to know if there is a plan to keep it going between IOIs as a communication channel. They recognized that it is tricky because, for example, the composition of the GA changes, but they do feel it would be quite valuable. Martin appreciated the suggestion and ITC will investigate this.

Report from the ISC

Misof reminded everyone of the main duties of ISC. He listed its members and thanked them for their excellent work. They stood and received applause. The authors of the IOI 2023 tasks were revealed, and they too received a round of applause. Misof then provided some minor updates on the IOI syllabus and contest rules. The annual post-IOI survey will be

conducted again this year. Leaders were asked to fill it out and to encourage their contestants to do the same. Previous survey results were displayed showing that contestants prefer using the functional interface of the current CMS as opposed to standard i/o. This was true across contestants of varying abilities/scores. In conclusion, Misof asked people to submit task proposals for 2024.

Jakub asked what the community can do to supply sufficiently many easy tasks in future years. As a brief answer, Misof said the pool of ideas is finite; everything that is simple and beautiful has been tried. Therefore, he said this problem is getting worse as we age and grow. Misof said he personally believes we need to shift our expectation and accept that some problems don't need to be entirely new.

Financial matters

After providing an overview of the financial matters to discuss, Eljakim began with details for 2022 during which the IOI had an income of 23.000 Euros income and expenses of approximately 10.000 Euros. At the end of 2022, our balance sheet contained assets of 152.113 Euros. The 2022 financial figures were approved by a vote with no votes against and no abstentions.

Eljakim then provided a brief update on the current year (2023). He noted that he tracks a running balance for each country's registration fees. He extended many thanks to our continuing financial sponsors Huawei and Jane Street. He emphasized the previous call for projects given our current healthy financial situation and ability to fund good initiatives.

The 2024 budget was presented. It listed income consistent with 2022 and 2023 at 23.000 Euros. Line items for expenses (Office of the IOI, financing expenses, communication, development and miscellaneous) totalled 36.200 Euros which is approximately three times the 2022 actual figure. This was reflected mostly in the hope to spend more on development (e.g., through funded projects) but also in a general increase in the cost of things. Germany noted an error in the miscellaneous amount on one slide that Eljakim said he would fix. Then the 2024 budget was approved with no votes against and no abstentions.

Jakub issued a reminder that we previously discussed the possibility of increasing registration fees to support future hosts without an undue burden on countries. He asked every delegation to work to understand their local situation in preparation of discussing this at IOI 2024.

Vote on regulation changes

Eduard said he would like to begin with the regulation changes presented early this week. First, there is an amendment to item #1 about modernizing distribution of the IOI report. A vote was taken with 8 votes in favour of the original version, 48 in favour of providing a redacted version of IOI reports to the GA, and 12 abstentions.

Eduard then asked for questions on the bundle of six items.

In response to a question from Germany, Eduard said that a 2/3 majority is required because the bundle includes at least one statute change.

Eduard started the vote. After a short while, Türkiye asked that we vote one by one because he said there is lack of clarity. Eduard then walked through the slides of all six items. He took a straw poll at that point, and nobody indicated a desire to vote for each item individually, so the vote restarted. The six proposals passed with 76 votes in favour, one vote against and no abstentions.

Eduard then moved to Ben's proposal on IC election reform.

Before getting into the details, Türkiye objected to getting email about this late the day before. They said that according to our regulations, the GA must be given 24-hour notice, and therefore this proposal cannot be considered until next year. They said gives us one year for IC to fix several issues with the proposal.

Eduard responded to the issue of 24-hour notice. He said it is correct to say that this regulation exists. He said the difference here is that the GA, as an owner of IOI, asked IC to draft this for a vote today. He said the message was sent as early as possible given scheduling constraints. Eduard also pointed to precedent of proposals changing at the last moment (a relatively recent example was a vote to change the results).

Türkiye responded to say that at the previous GA, the president said there was a straw poll, not a vote. They also said that the existence of constitutions is to prevent this kind of thing from happening and continuing with this proposal now is illegal.

Ben responded to say he understands that we have this in the regulations. He said every year at IOI, we have violated this regulation. He said, every year, we have regulations that come from the floor or changes to original proposals. He claimed that following this regulation strictly would cripple us.

Türkiye said that from now on they are going to make sure regulations are followed.

Germany said maybe this can be resolved because the GA is the owner of the IOI, and a vote can be taken that an exception can be made to the 24-hour regulation. Eduard said a simple majority vote could be taken for this.

Italy noted that we already violated this rule this morning and we do it all the time. They said in this case, it was an amendment that maybe came late, but it has been discussed for a while. They said they think the rule could/should be fixed but feel this should go forward.

Australia said this does not break the spirit of this regulation. They said they do not believe IC is doing anything dodgy to deceive the GA. They said they made it very clear that this was coming, but only the exact wording was pending.

Misof said it is routinely the case that we have a discussion and make amendments accordingly.

Sun Teck then came to the front to speak against the proposal itself. He said we need to consider all the possible implications before voting.

Saudi Arabia said this rule is changing so much. They said it is too convoluted and the regulations clearly say that ample time should be given. They urged everyone to ensure we follow the rules. They acknowledged that we do and should sometimes make consideration as this morning for humanitarian reasons (removing a score from the ranking). They said this is different and the proposal includes holes open to abuse. For example, they said it allows somebody without experience to be elected.

Ben responded to say that yes, it has changed. He said the reason it has changed because he firmly believes in listening to the GA. He added that the amendments were made in response to feedback and these changes soften the proposal.

Türkiye said they wondered who Ben is speaking to because he feels ignored. They then gave an argument on how this is counter to modern democracy.

Canada asked to call the question despite appreciating lectures on democracy.

Someone spoke to say we all need to show each other respect.

Araz told everyone that the road to hell is paved with good intentions. He said there is lots of negativity here, it is not acceptable to insult each other, and we should try to refrain from it. He said we should try to not take things personally and be more professional.

Mile said people speaking about the content of the proposal were trying to say it is controversial and that is why the vote should not happen now.

Türkiye yelled "Do your job." and "Only one day ahead."

The leader of the United Kingdom said he wrote this part of the regulations so perhaps this is his fault. He said in his opinion it does not say anything about wording. He said we knew about this for a long time and there is no reason to not go ahead.

Latvia said they feel that we can discuss this intelligently and not start calling each other names. They took issue with the tone taken by some people during this discussion.

Spain agreed with what the United Kingdom said and that what is happening here is very common. They asked if people prefer that only the original proposal is put forward, Türkiye responded to say "yes" because that is the proposal that was discussed.

Andrea (Italy) speaking for himself, said he feels that this argument from Türkiye is coming now for convenience, and it should have come earlier.

Eduard then called for vote asking GA if they are okay continuing to debate and then vote on this proposal overriding A3 (if even needed based on interpretation). He said if this overrides anything, it is only an appendix item and so requires only 50%. He then asked for questions about this.

Brazil said that as much as they support the change, they should obey the culture of the IOI. They agree on the 24-hour issue but are less sure of the 2/3 issue. Eduard gave a technical response, but Brazil then said they prefer not to be technical and would rather have another year. They feel there is uncertainty, and we need more time.

Türkiye said statute 1.2 includes appendices in the regulations. Eduard responded to say they are reading the regulations incorrectly. The United Kingdom spoke to verify Eduard's reading of the regulations.

Eduard said that the one and only regulation that he thinks he is interpreting is that the GA owns the IOI, and what this entails.

The technical discussion continued with Türkiye speaking again. They agree that the GA owns the IOI and has the power to change the regulations, but to do that it has to obey the regulations.

Ben, as a procedural comment, asked that everyone please keep the discussion polite and civil.

Germany said they think we have different opinions on whether the 24-hour regulation has been obeyed. They feel it is about how we interpret A3.2 and it has probably not been violated. They said the discussion is now how we interpret A3.2 and we need to determine how the majority of the GA feel on this.

Türkiye said that they expected Ben to make his previous comment earlier when somebody ridiculed someone else. Ben said that was a fair point and he does make this request to everyone.

Eduard called the vote via placards on the interpretation of A3.2:

Interpretation 1: There was 24-hour notice and what followed were wording changes.

Interpretation 2: The final wording was not given within 24-hours, so it was violated.

The question was "Does the GA believe A3.2 was met?" where "yes" would mean we continue and "no" would mean we end any discussion or vote on this proposal at IOI 2023.

Mile said we should use iobot, but not on display votes cast on the screen. Türkiye said they feel this cannot be anonymous and must be shown on the screen. Eduard said these are fair points so iobot will be used and not anonymously, but the results will not be shown while voting occurs. Later, a quick show of placards showed the GA overwhelmingly agreed with this approach in general.

The vote occurred with 54 "yes" votes, 23 "no" votes and 5 abstentions.

At this point, the GA took a short coffee break.

Before resuming, host organizer Flora Retfalvi spoke. She said the issue raised by Romania was investigated. She apologized to all her neighbours. She explained the purpose of the map; it was historical (to show from where the different folk songs and dances originated and said no offense was intended. She said she was glad to have had friendly follow up with neighbours during the coffee chat.

Eduard said that knowing that we will now continue, he will provide a summary. He showed slides describing the two separate changes (a value statement and the election process) and the voting process (changes voted on independently using iobot non-anonymously; a 2/3 majority required for the value statement; a 50% majority required for the voting process).

Values statement (added to end of S3.4): Ideally the composition of the International Committee will be diverse enough to represent the richness of the communities both within and beyond IOI that it aspires to represent.

Elections process (new appendix A3.5.2): If there are candidate(s) of a minority gender and $n \geq 2$ elected IC positions available (including President if applicable), then the candidates elected will be the highest ranked candidate of a minority gender, plus the highest ranked remaining $n-1$ candidate(s).

- A "minority gender" is defined to be a gender held by at most 1/3 of the voting members of IC whose terms are not ending the year that the election takes place.
- In a year where the President is elected, the election for President should take place first and the highest ranked candidate should be elected. Following this, if there are candidate(s) of a minority gender for IC then at least one such candidate should be elected, as described above.
- If a candidate is ranked lower than "leave the seat vacant", they will not be elected.

This regulation will hold up to and including IOI 2028, at which point the GA must revisit it to determine whether it should be kept, revised, or removed.

He then called for comments on the procedure.

Jonathan spoke for himself saying he feels these two changes should be combined and the second part should require a 2/3 majority.

Estonia suggested an alternative. They suggested that we keep the proposals separate and wondered if it is possible for the GA to vote to require a 2/3 majority on the second part (voting process). Eduard said this would be possible if the author of the proposal concurs.

Italy asked for a clarification. They wanted to know if this would cancel the idea that the second one won't go through if the first doesn't. In response, it was clarified that this would not change in this way.

Ben spoke to say his perfectly happy with requiring a 2/3 majority for both changes/parts.

Estonia said they are very happy that this has been split into two parts because they are very happy with the statement but have concerns about the implementation. They are concerned that it requires people to be honest when being nominated for IC.

Ben replied to say that we put a lot of trust in the GA (e.g., problem statements) and we trust you to report your gender correctly. He said he also thinks this group is more mature than that.

Sweden said they understand Estonia's point, but we now know we can override this, and the GA could deal with a bad actor.

Türkiye said there are several other loopholes. They gave a scenario: I apply for IC. We need to determine his gender and that of those on IC. Therefore, we are currently requesting that IC members publicly declare their agenda. Suppose a woman then wins a seat on IC this year and then refuses to disclose her gender the next year. Ben responded to say that like we trust the GA, and we trust IC members. He also said the proposal has a five-year expiry. He added that he thinks the hypothesized scenario is unlikely, but we can deal with it if it occurs.

Serbia said there is a contradiction: "you keep saying you trust the GA" but this proposal says the opposite because it is saying we don't trust the GA to vote appropriately.

Estonia thanked Ben for saying we trust the GA. They made the small technical point that you don't need to be in this room to run for IC. In response to concerns about bad actors, they said they can be dealt with after.

Sweden issued some clarification. He said he feels we don't need to cover every corner case because we have the power to fix it.

United Kingdom's deputy leader said this is not an issue of trust. She said there are all sorts of mechanisms in place that prevent women from being on IC; they influence all of us, herself included. She said is a different type of trust.

Türkiye objected to how this is being handled. They said IC must be unbiased, but the slides show bias because some wording on the slide does not exactly match the email. They complained that the meeting is not being chaired. The IOI Chair asked what he should be doing differently. This was not answered but Eduard made the change to the slide requested by Türkiye, so that it exactly matched Ben's email message.

The leader for China spoke to say that as a woman, she supports anything that addresses diversity on the committee. She said she also feels quality should matter. She also expressed the feeling that all this should have happened before the presentation of the candidates.

Germany requested that we come back to the procedure that was announced (discuss the procedure and then the content).

With the procedural discussion complete, Eduard said we will begin with discussion of the values statement.

Germany wanted to make it clear that they strongly support this values statement. They said that though it doesn't have technical impact, we should not downgrade how important something like this is at capturing the spirit of IOI.

There were no more comments and the values statement (changes to S3.4) was approved with 62 votes in favour, 12 votes against and 3 abstentions.

Eduard then opened discussion on the implementation part. There were no procedural questions, so discussion followed on the details of this part of the proposal.

Bulgaria asked us how many non-male IC candidates there have been in the last 10 years. Ben said he can get that information, but not now because it requires a deep dive of past minutes.

Iceland asked if the list male, female, non-binary is exhaustive. Ben said the "e.g." is to acknowledge that this may not be a perfect list and different terminology is used in different places.

Greece asked if we should establish a minimum number of votes needed for the non-minority member to be elected. That is, they said perhaps this should not kick in if they got zero votes, for example. In response, Eduard reminded everyone that

we now have a “leave the seat vacant” option for votes (starting in 2024). He said he believes the intent here is that this would solve this problem and he updated the slide to make this clearer.

South Africa asked for a clarification of how a minority is computed. Eduard said the denominator is “up to eight” (eight if the norm of three drop off each year). He said therefore in a normal year, it kicks in when less than three people on IC (zero, one or two) are of a minority gender.

China asked how many genders we are considering. Ben said there are certainly at least seven genders, but to acknowledge that different people, countries, etc. have different views, he suggests that we just ask the person. China totally disagreed because they said it renders this proposal meaningless.

Martin dug into past minutes and gave historical numbers on female candidates for IC:

2014	0
2015	0
2016	1
2017	not in minutes
2018	0
2019	0
2020	no election
2021	1
2022	1
2023	1

Türkiye raised the issue that the five non-elected members should not impact this. They said it is too restrictive. Also, since there is no bound on the number of genders, they said there are going to be too many on IC.

Canada asked a clarifying question. They think that some of the questions that arise about a multitude of genders are based on one interpretation which is different than his. They “lump” all the non-majority genders as one. They asked if that is a correct interpretation. Ben responded to say that this effects at most one seat per election and therefore at most three at any point in time.

New Zealand said that if we read the proposal, it begins with “If there are candidate(s) of a minority gender” and right now we don’t have many people of a non-minority gender. Moreover, they pointed out that not everyone is willing and able to run for IC. Therefore, they said a lot of people should be reassured that this will be a no-op; until the number of minority gender GA members increases, this will be the case. Speaking personally, Suzanne Scott said women are conditioned to often not put their hands up unless they are very sure of themselves. She said that is one of the hindrances and a generality, but it shows one reason why women often don’t feel represented in positions of responsibility like this.

Bosnia and Herzegovina spoke to say that they understand the motion but feel like it should be postponed to include other minority groups (perhaps racial or disabled). They asked why we are only addressing gender minority.

India said that they have been thinking carefully and don’t follow the math. They feel we should make this clearer and have only three categories: male, female and other. Ben said this has been heard and the notes can be edited to reflect this.

Tajikistan said we could make a cultural type of divide as well. They asked why nobody is thinking about them in this case.

The Czech Republic asked a clarifying question about leaving a seat vacant. Ben confirmed that, yes, if the “leave the seat vacant” option received more votes than a minority gender candidate, a seat would not be filled by that candidate.

Misof felt further clarification was needed. He asked Ben to confirm his understanding of two scenarios under which we will assume male is the majority gender on IC. First, if only males are running, two males will be elected. Ben confirmed this. Second, if two males receive the most votes, “leave the seat vacant” receives the third most votes, and a female receives some votes but less than this, one male will be elected and one seat will be left vacant. Ben confirmed this.

The vote was taken. There were 33 votes in favour of the proposal, 28 votes against the proposal and 10 abstentions. The proposal did not pass and was not approved.

Eduard thanked everyone, said he tried to be neutral but was worried he might have failed. He welcomed feedback on how he could do better.

Ben added his thanks. He said he knows this is unpleasant, but he feels it is important. He appreciates everybody spending time on this, but he does not apologize for the discussion taking place.

Election of IC, ISC and ITC members

Troy outlined and initiated the approval election voting process. The results listed below were announced later:

For IC:

Sandra Schumann – 64 votes (elected)
Anton Tsytko – 26 votes
Darko Pevec – 22 votes
Fredrik Niemelä – 44 votes (elected)

For ISC:

Andrea Ciprietti – 26 votes
Charlotte Knierim – 36 votes
Ali Sharifi – 42 votes (elected)

Announcement of future host(s)

Ben announced that IC has selected Uzbekistan as the host of IOI 2026. This was confirmed by a vote of the GA with no votes against and two abstentions.

Ben reminded everyone that we need a bid for IOI 2027 and the extended deadline for submitting one to IC will be the end of November.

Confirmation of 2021 minutes

Ben said there have been no comments or suggestions on the 2021 minutes and asked for their confirmation. They were approved with no votes against and no abstentions.

Proposals from GA members

A proposal from Ukraine was the only proposal received from GA members.

Ukraine reminded everyone of last year's decision that Russian and Belarussian students should participate as individuals. They then sent an image to Matrix showing an image taken during the opening ceremony. It showed Russian participants wearing shirts with a small RU displayed on each. Consequently, Ukraine proposed that Russia be banned indefinitely. They said this proposal does not extend to Belarus because they did not violate a GA rule.

Upon a request from Estonia, last year's decision was displayed for everyone to see.

Upon a request from Australia the image in question was displayed on the screen.

Denmark said they feel this should disqualify Russian participants from this year (and beyond).

France asked what would happen to the results if Russian participants were disqualified this year, because the results have already been approved. Denmark replied to say they were approved under false conditions so we should be able to overturn those results. However, they accepted a decision to postpone that discussion.

Brazil said that it is very sad this happened, and they are very disappointed and will support the Ukrainian proposition. However, they said they do not support it for this year because they do not know if these contestants are "guilty" or understood this situation. Nonetheless, Brazil reaffirmed that they feel this was a misstep.

Serbia said that they are totally against this. They said the RU is an internet domain and the proposal is ridiculous.

Estonia countered to say that using an email address with .ru is something we should obviously allow but there was no technical reason to include it on shirts.

Türkiye asked to hear from the other side. IOI Team 2 had a non-voting member present in the GA to assist with the participation of students from Russia who were competing as individuals. They stood to firstly say that they understand the decision of the previous GA and they accept it and never meant to violate it. They explained that the students wore shirts provided by sponsors and it was not meant to make a statement or demonstration. The student asked if they could wear shirts with anime versions of their faces. They said they never thought about the Russian internet domain but did instruct the sponsors to not include any Russian symbols. They accepted that this may not be the best explanation and it is probably their mistake for not giving instructions to not wear these shirts. IOI Team 2 repeated that they we did not show any flags and did not try to represent Russia. They said the domain is tiny, but they do understand the objection and will respect what the GA decides.

Martin had two comments. First, even though he does not agree with this happening, this was an honest mistake, and we should treat it as such. Secondly, he would like to compare it with another incident: students escaping the hotel during quarantine. He said those students were not punished and that was a much bigger violation.

Denmark was very shocked by the last comment. They felt it was not appropriate to compare a criminal war with leaping out of a window. They said Russia should be excluded now and into the future.

Mile responded to say that this is not what happened; this is about the use of RU and not the war more generally. He agreed with Martin. He also agreed Russia should be told to be more careful in the future.

Australia raised the option of not presenting these students their medals at the closing ceremony, but to not go as far as Ukraine is proposing.

Spain asked if someone has talked to the kids about this and determined if they know what happened. They indicated they think they wore it again at the zoo. They said if someone talked to them and they still did it, that would be more problematic. It was later clarified that they did not wear the shirts after being instructed not to.

Netherlands asked why this is being brought up now and asked if it was brought to the IC earlier. Ben said it was brought to his attention earlier and he essentially had this same conversation with Russia. Only J.P. and Ben knew about this. Ben said it did not go to IC because the GA last year complained about IC making decisions on behalf of GA. After a discussion with Ukraine, it was decided to leave the issue until now. He said there is no intention to rush this through.

The Chair then initiated the vote. Ben brought up the issue of anonymity because of political/safety reasons and suggested this happen again. He asked for a quick show of placards on the issue of anonymity. There were many votes in favour of conducting the vote anonymously, 2 votes against and 9 abstentions.

Upon requests from Switzerland and Slovenia, a statement of the proposal was displayed on the screen:

Proposal from Ukraine: "To remove Russia from the IOI from 2024 until the end of the war."

Serbia asked if this requires a 50% or 2/3 majority. Ben and Eduard discussed this and announced that they think the threshold is 2/3 but they were uncertain. Therefore, they suggested 2/3 as that was their best understanding and called for possible objections. There were none.

Tajikistan complained that this was known beforehand but is now being discussed near the end of the meetings with no warning. They said this goes against the notion that the GA owns the IOI. Ben said he understands that source of frustration.

The vote was taken with 20 votes in favour, 46 votes against and 13 abstentions. The proposal from Ukraine was defeated.

Denmark then proposed the alternative from Australia. Australia said they did not know how they feel themselves. They just posed the possibility and would like to hear how other people feel.

Jonathan said we are close to the closing ceremony and asked if we can even do this.

Eduard said this will be an anonymous vote requiring a 2/3 majority.

Ukraine asked what statute this overrides. Eduard cited S5.10 which is hosts awarding medals.

Brazil said that they don't think the 2/3 majority applies here. Denmark agreed with Brazil. They said the debate is whether medals must be awarded at all, or whether all medals need to be awarded. Sweden agreed this is unclear and in a case like this we should err on the side of caution and require a 2/3 majority. A bit later, Eduard said he agrees with Fredrik, and he feels we should take the stricter interpretation.

In response to a question Eduard said this proposal said the contestants would receive their medals but just not have medals presented to them at the closing ceremony.

Denmark said that if the result is that there is no consequence to this action, then they will/can just do it again.

Australia explained that this conveys the clear message that this was not okay, and it issues an implicit warning that if this happens again, it might have bigger consequences.

A vote was then conducted on this proposal:

Proposal from Denmark: To not present IOI Team 2 medallists at the closing ceremony. The contestants will still receive medals, but in private. (The host says this can be arranged. A 2/3 majority is required since it overrides S5.10. The vote will be anonymous.)

The vote occurred with 45 votes in favour, 25 votes against and 6 abstentions. It was just below the 2/3 threshold and therefore the proposal was defeated.

Türkiye then made a proposal:

Proposal from Türkiye: That the IOI should follow the regulations, including the 24-hour notice on voting.

Ben answered to say that he believes an earlier vote demonstrates that a majority of the GA feels the regulations have been followed. However, he said he is definitely taking this on notice.

Denmark said they think it is an empty proposal. They said we don't need to decide to obey our own rules.

Türkiye responded to say that he proposed this because we need 24 hours. In particular, they think 24-hour notice is needed for this proposal from them, so they suggest voting on it at the first GA in 2024. Ben said it will go to IC in February so this can be done.

Araz spoke to say first that looking back at earlier conversations in the day, there were lots of name-calling and finger-pointing. He said we need to be aware of cultural diversity, and, for example, be mindful of cultures deeply centered around respect. For the current matter he said that we are forgetting the second objective of the IOI: "To foster friendly international relationships among computer scientists and informatics educators". He went on to reiterate his arguments on the IOI's response to the invasion of Ukraine made in 2022. He received some applause.

Iceland then made a proposal on Matrix which was displayed as follows.

Proposal from Iceland: Publicly inform the GA that, if a similar thing happens next year (by any country) then we will disqualify them (for the year in which the incident takes place).

Brazil wondered why we must vote on this. Iceland said they want a public warning.

Bulgaria said if we go with a vote then we need to be much clearer.

Ben said IC normally handles disqualification and it is now on notice about this issue.

In response to a request for clarification, Iceland later said they would like it stated that if contestants break the rules, they are disqualified for the year during which they break the rules.

Switzerland said they don't see value in discussing this hypothetical. They said they feel the GA has been very clear.

Ben repeated that IC has taken notice and will remember this if future events take place. Iceland indicated they are okay with this. Norway agreed that the GA has been very clear about this, and we don't need a vote.

Notice on the proper usage of large objects in closing ceremony

Ben gave the usual warning asking medal recipients to avoid blocking another recipient standing beside them.

Denmark asked if we could simply ban all flags on stage during the closing ceremony. Ben said we can come back to revisit this next year. Denmark said the rules specify flags or mascots. In response, Ben noted that it is difficult to ban flags on shirts, and Sweden pointed out that regulations say you cannot obstruct people; flags are just an example.

Other business

Mile gave thanks to the organizers and especially all the volunteer organizers. A large round of applause followed. The Hungarian organizers all stood up. The applause continued.

Ben added his own personal expression of gratitude. He thanked László Jobbágy for his management of the endeavour, to László Nyúl for running the technical team, to Zsolt Németh for leading HSC and to Ágnes Erdősné Németh who did three years of hard work leading up to this successful IOI.