



International Physicists' Tournament

Decision Assembly 2023

Minutes

Present:

Execom: Anastasiia Vasylychenkova (+ UK rep), Alberto Rolandi, Matheus Pessoa (+ Canada rep), Vladimir Vanovsky (+ Russia rep), Matheu Suter (+ Swiss rep), Joachim Hermansen, Aakash Bhat (+ Germany rep), Evgeniy Glushkov (Friday only), Kirill Geraschenko.

IOC: Noemie Planat (Canada), Christos Andrikopoulos (Greece), Leandro Tessler (Brazil), Rosty Martinez Duque (USA), Peter Christian Kjærgaard Vesborg (Denmark), Anastasiia Haieva (Ukraine), Arnaud Rauox (France+LOC), Åke Andersson (Sweden), Michele Guizzarda (Italy), Leonardo Martinelli (Italy), Nikola Pojak (Croatia), Victor Gonzales (Sweden), Andrew Penton (Australia, online).

Guests: Cyrus Pan Walther, Niloofar Jokar (IAPS, both Friday only); Yuliia Zotova, Alexey Cherkasov (both team IPT).

Agenda points:

Tuesday session

1. Preselection

- a. Don't have enough people to correct the grades.
- b. It is a big threshold for participating. It is going to be more of a limit in the future as IPT continues to grow.
- c. It is currently very formal with a rapport, whereas the tournament is much less formal.
- d. We need to make it less workload for the execom but at the same time give people more feedback.
- e. Vladimir Vanovskiy: Solution for d: peer review, but it will make participants steal from other teams.
- f. Colombia team: They didn't pass even though they did a nationals and they were upset. Having two rounds for sorting might help people realize that they must make more or less work for that problem. That might lead to IPT breaking in some countries.
- g. The new teams don't know how much is expected.



Disclose reports from each year could solve this.

- h. We must make the tournament bigger to solve the underlying problem.
 - i. Make them upload their presentations instead of report. This reduces workload for execom and makes it more fitting for the format. But it makes it harder to evaluate accurately. The consensus was against it.
 - j. Lower bar for automatic qualification so maybe top 10 teams instead of semi-finals. But does not solve the problem of kicking out more teams.
 - k. Never allow 2 teams from same country.
 - l. Arnaud: For preselection make the top 6 reports instantly go in the tournament and the rest of the spots can be given in a second round.
2. IPT in Brazil in 2024
- a. We need to plan for 2 years in advance because things take time.
 - b. How hard was it to get funds for countries to participate?
Some countries like Greece struggle with the funds.
 - c. Arnaud didn't come to Colombia because of carbon footprint, so that should be considered when choosing host country.
 - d. Vladimir Vanovski:
 - i. selecting more than semi-finals for automatic qualification: it is not good since team quality changes every year.
 - ii. Video: I am against since presentation is only 40% of the importance for a fight. The report is easier to judge objectively.
 - iii. Double selection: Additional work, maybe a compromise is to have a question session. For feedback and clarity.
3. Weight system:
- a. Can be modified with a parameters.
 - b. Now there are more people complaining about the juries.
 - c. Anastasia Ukraine team lead: really likes it.
 - d. The difference: There are small differences some very few teams' swap. We don't know which is better.
 - e. Vladimir Vanovski: this system avoids a small shift that happens with old since not all fights have the same juries since.
 - f. Alberto: we discard the lowest grade before is to avoid inexperienced juries ruining the enjoyment for the team.
 - g. They use the old one for the Olympics.
 - h. Krzysztof: Work harder for juries to have the same values. It is important that the juries grades matter. Which makes the juries have to grade responsibly.
 - i. We need feedback from the participants.
 - j. Anastasiia president: we do this for the students so we should do what makes them have the best experience.
 - k. Christos: It leaves a scar when you get a bad grade.
 - l. The juries will change their grade so they matter: Also the team gets more feedback if they can't disregard the grade.
 - m. The experience gets better comes from the communication from the jury explaining.
 - n. The moral goes down for multiple teams.
 - o. Krzysztof: Idea juries giving feedback before giving grade so people listen to the feedback.
 - p. Ukraine sometimes it allow it easier to listen to the feedback.



- q. Vladimir Vanovskiy: juries can ask general physics for 2 minutes helping the juries to understand the physics.
- r. Not clear the consensus on Kristoff and Vladimir's ideas.

Continuation below



Simulations results:

Complete discarding

Smooth system

if the lowest mark gets out and then the score is calculated with Gaussian

Rank	Team	Points (including bonus points)
1st	France (Lyon)	195.40 (8.00)
2nd	Team IPT	191.40 (8.00)
3rd	France (X)	190.60 (6.00)
4th	Ukraine	187.70 (6.50)
5th	Germany	183.00 (7.00)
6th	Poland	182.90 (5.50)
7th	Italy	173.80 (4.00)
8th	Denmark	167.40 (4.00)
9th	United Kingdom	165.60 (4.00)
10th	Brazil	164.44 (2.00)

Rank	Team	Points (including bonus points)
1st	France (Lyon)	190.00 (8.00)
2nd	Team IPT	183.60 (8.00)
3rd	France (X)	182.00 (5.00)
4th	Ukraine	180.20 (7.00)
5th	Poland	176.80 (6.00)
6th	Germany	175.30 (7.00)
7th	Italy	165.00 (4.00)
8th	Denmark	160.80 (4.00)
9th	Brazil	158.34 (2.00)
10th	United Kingdom	158.10 (4.00)

Rank	Team	Points (including bonus points)
1st	France (Lyon)	195.33 (8.00)
2nd	Team IPT	191.22 (8.00)
3rd	France (X)	189.94 (6.00)
4th	Ukraine	186.89 (6.00)
5th	Poland	183.39 (6.00)
6th	Germany	182.94 (7.00)
7th	Italy	173.67 (4.00)
8th	Denmark	167.33 (4.00)
9th	United Kingdom	165.50 (4.00)
10th	Brazil	164.49 (2.00)



11th	Netherlands	164.08 (4.00)
12th	USA	164.04 (2.00)
13th	Switzerland	162.40 (3.00)
14th	Canada	153.40 (2.00)
15th	Croatia	151.80 (2.00)
16th	Sweden	147.92 (2.00)
17th	Greece	140.60 (2.00)
18th	Romania	123.92 (0.00)

11th	Netherlands	156.50 (4.00)
12th	Switzerland	155.50 (3.00)
13th	USA	154.74 (2.00)
14th	Canada	146.60 (2.00)
15th	Croatia	145.50 (2.00)
16th	Sweden	139.60 (2.00)
17th	Greece	130.80 (2.00)
18th	Romania	116.88 (0.00)

11th	Netherlands	164.04 (4.00)
12th	USA	163.78 (2.00)
13th	Switzerland	162.50 (3.00)
14th	Canada	153.28 (2.00)
15th	Croatia	151.67 (2.00)
16th	Sweden	147.72 (2.00)
17th	Greece	140.39 (2.00)
18th	Romania	123.91 (0.00)

Continuation below



4. IAPS

- a. Had a partnership with them last year, They help us in finances and solve problems. But we must follow their rules. Main rules is that IPT participants have to be a member of IAPS.
- b. The communication has not been great and a bit slow.
- c. Options: keep following the deal that all IAPS, execom has to be chosen through the their process
- d. If we don't we have to give back money and don't do anything.
- e. Problems: they work very slow on operational level.
- f. There is some conflict since we rely on non-students for juries.
- g. Ukraine: a lot of teams join in last moment which doesn't allow for them to join since it is too slow.
- h. IPT has good relations with EPS,
- i. Vladimir: Not break completely but a declaration of friendship but have freedom of IPT as a organization. Ukraine agrees
- j. It's both money and membership: 1500eur/yr. How much time does it cost, and how much did we get. We get 6000eur/yr. Arnaud: It is not enough money, we get 2000eur pr team, they might help with reach, the politics matter since execom becomes part of the IAPS committee.
- k. Alberto: The promotion does not matter since we our growing at a good rate and we can't handle more teams, Tournament might be growing due to covid.
- l. Matheus: we joined because the fee might be too high that makes it too inaccessible. They might reduce the fee to 100euros. They want to spread to some of the countries that IPT is in.
- m. Vladimir: we have to apply for funds through IAPS. How will it work with LOC. Anastasiia president: they have been helping with paperwork. It is nice to have them around.
- n. Christos: IAPS is known in Greece, he reached out to him and helped him reach out for other universities which helped create a national selection. And promised funds for the national selection. Gave him leverage since it is usually hard to come to IPT since they could give funds.
- o. Aakash: They have helped reach out, they gave a nice mailing list. They funded the travel to Paris, it made it easier to get money they got 1100euros.
- p. Arnaud: IAPS might end up helping us get better connections to American physical society
- q. Ukraine: it doesn't help for countries where they are not there. It will be not fun to have to work with the IAPS in these countries.
- r. Matheu: We have been able to work with them locally well without IPT as an organization joining them. Aakash thinks they won't help if IPT isn't part of IAPS.
- s. Who had problems with funding: 2
- t. Which problem are we solving by joining?
- u. Krzysztof: summarize: if IAPS got from local would give the uneven help.
- v. Can we make the criteria so they only get membership from countries from where they are active and help those countries.
- w. We postpone votes.



- x. We will re-negotiate with IAPS.

Friday session

1. IAPS:
 - a. Cyrus:
 - i. Now they know how it works now
 - ii. We are on the right path some countries are already getting support but some countries we need to pay more attention to.
 - iii. We can help with more money and people
 - iv. It will create new IAPS members and at the same time make better offers for pre-existing members. More countries will join.
 - v. He will support all the countries with them getting into IAPS.
 - vi. It is okay that not everyone was members in the first round. It was more of a test round.
 - b. Alberto: How we choose IPT president is non-negotiable, we have to choose it internally.
 - c. Cyrus: it is good that we talk about this, we want IPT to be great.
 - d. Alberto: Execom is chosen internally it is unstable and we don't want it to go away. Tournament decisions belong to execom.
 - e. What does IAPS want?
 - i. Decisions are bound by French laws so IPT must be combined with the existing IAPS structure. Why merge? It puts IPT in the IAPS framework making it easier to support.
 - f. Transition period ~2years.
2. Multiple teams from same countries.
 - a. Arnaud against
 - b. Krzysztof: rich countries have an unfair advantage due to extra funding and equipment. Only 1 team per country is fairer.
 - c. Vladimir: 2 in national, since it sucks to organize if they are not part of it.
 - d. Leonardo: it is okay to have two teams for same reason as Vladimir.
 - e. Only 1 team, up to country about national selection.
 - f. 1 guarantee for organizers = good incentive.
 - g. Leonardo: It is an institution not a country organizing Joe+1
 - h. Krzysztof takes pleasure away from participants when two teams from same country take the high spots.
3. Highschool students part of IPT
 - a. Banned after a vote 10 for banning 2 against.
4. Next years LOC
 - a. We would like to know 2 years in advance.
 - b. What is missing: 100000eurs team and facilities.
 - c. Poland: Krzysztof doesn't like it they did it in covid and they don't have manpower anymore.
 - d. Maybe in ETH but 1 yr is tough.
 - e. Everyone should take a look if possible, in their own country.
 - f. We need to know the next two in July.
 - g. Joe: USA 2 years or 3 years in the future.



5. Execom:
 - a. Anastasiia is president for next two years
 - b. Kyrylo and Alberto are running for secretary - postponed for later
 - c. We postpone treasurer vote till after secretary vote
 - d. Arnaud: we need more votes at the poles.
6. 30 year max age
 - a. We end up removing 9 votes for removing, 4 against, 1 neutral.
 - b. Vladimir: Psychologically difficult in a fight against a 40yr old.
 - c. Kyrylo: company experience could give an unfair advantage.
 - d. Ukraine Anastasia: change to 35
 - e. Krzysztof: it is an educational activity everyone should have the right to participate.
7. Team IPT without preselection:
 - a. Krzysztof: execom should decide.
 - b. Arnaud: IOC should not decide as this will lead to bias.
 - c. Kyrylo: team IPT is independent students and not a nation represented.
 - d. Krzysztof: set rules more clear.