

General Assembly

Minutes of the Meetings held in Waterloo, Canada 14–21 August, 2010

David Taylor	Chair of GA	
Gordon Cormack	Chair of SC	gvcormac@uwaterloo.ca
Michal Forisek	Chair of ISC	misof@ksp.sk
Martin Mares	Chair of ITWG	mj@ucw.cz
Troy Vasiga	Chair of IOI'2010	tmjvasig@cs.uwaterloo.ca
Arturo Cepeda	President of IOI	cepeda@auronix.com
Richard Forster	Executive Director	forster@olympiad.org.uk

1. Welcome

- Troy Vasiga welcomed the members of the GA to IOI'2010.
- David Taylor, director of the school of computer science, was presented to the GA as its chair for IOI'2010.
- Arturo Cepeda presented the 2009 Distinguished Service Award trophy (which had been unavailable last year) to Rob Kolstad.

2. Apologies

Kyrgyzstan were unable to attend IOI'2010 due to visa problems.

3. Presentation and confirmation of GA agenda

The proposed agenda was approved by the GA.

4. Appointment of scrutineers for voting during GA meetings

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

5. Competition Procedures

- Gordon Cormack, Chair of the SC, was introduced and presented the competition procedures.
 - All students should have a good chance of solving each task's first subtask.
 - Complete subtasks would need to be completed to get marks.
 - Release tokens would be used, with 2 per task (not subtasks) and rejuvenation after 30 minutes.
 - Issues with the practise session (regarding human organisation, printing and the signage of 'off limit' areas) would be addressed.
 - A summary rule sheet would be available for translation so that students would not need to read the 14 page Competition Procedures during the contest.
 - Any attempt to compromise the system would be grounds for disqualification; some DOS attacks had been observed.
 - The Pascal debugger appeared to be missing but gdb would be available which functions with Pascal.
 - Contestants should avoid leaving stderr output in their code.
 - Some error messages might have additional information, but nothing should be inferred from that information and no documentation would be provided.
 - A live scoreboard would be available on the web.
 - A "play along" version of a task would be available. This would not be visible to Contestants and would not form part of the contest.
 - This year's tasks would de-emphasise CPU time.

- Students should avoid messing with the sample grader and run the submit command from the given directory.
- The maximum score from any release submission (or final submission) would be the recorded score.
- It would be necessary to submit more than one program for some tasks.
- The GA approved the Competition Procedures (including the cover sheet).

6. Call for nominations for IC and ISC

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

7. Confirmation of the Minutes (IOI'2009)

The GA minutes from IOI'2009, having been originally distributed in September 2009 and circulated to the GA in the week leading up to the IOI, were confirmed by the GA.

8. Details for the IOI Conference

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

9. Details for proposed Regulation changes

The GA was given notice of proposed regulation changes (attached). Those relating to scores would be treated as 'experimental' during this IOI so that the scoreboard could be used.

10. Presentation of Tasks for Competition Day 1

- Michal Forisek, Chair of the ISC, introduced the procedure for the presentation of tasks. As per the format in recent years, an initial period would be given in which to give major objections, to be followed by a vote to accept the entire problem set. Minor objections could be submitted until the ISC and SC froze the tasks later that evening.
- One major objection was raised relating to the provable accuracy of the *Language* task. The SC indicated that the task was scored out of 110 (rather than 100) to take this into account. In SC experiments the variance of a given algorithm, against differently selected data, had proved to be under 1 mark.
- Additional minor objection raised (and voiced in the GA) on the *Language* task included those of Contestants guessing (the SC believed that a score over 40 with such an approach was remote) and that the question was outside the scope of the IOI (a similar question had been posed in the 3rd IOI).
- The questions set was approved by the GA, with 3 votes against.

11. Report on Competition Day 1

- There had been some issues on the first translation night with access to the printers. These would be fixed for the second night.
- The first day's contest had begun 30 minutes late.
- A small (4) number of questions had been received from students.
- During the contest a circuit-breaker had gone off. The affected students had been given an additional 15 minutes in compensation.

12. Summary of Written Appeals for Competition Day 1

- Three appeals were received but withdrawn after ISC investigation.
- The GA were reminded that appeals were to be submitted by delegation leaders only.

13. Presentation by Candidates for IC and ISC

- Candidates for the IC were given two minutes to introduce themselves to the GA. Information on all the candidates, which had been supplied on their nomination forms, was distributed to the GA.
- The Candidate for the ISC was not present to speak.
- Members of the GA were encouraged to speak with the candidates prior to the election later in the week.
- Candidates:
 - IC: Zide Du, David Ginat, Krassimir Manev, Mario Cruz and Mile Jovanov.
 - ISC: Mihai Patrascu.

14. Presentation of Tasks for Competition Day 2

- The SC announced that the bleachers overlooking the contest room would be available for Delegation Leaders to use to observe the contest. No seating would be provided to avoid extended stays and talking.
- The same procedure was used as on the first competition day.
- A major objection to *Memory* task was that it was too similar to an existing task. The ISC compared the 'similar' task and declared them suitably different.
- A major objection to the *Traffic* task was that it was too classical. The ISC declared that their intent had been to admit such a classic task.

15. Report on Competition Day 2

One Contestant had been caught making prohibited access to the network. It was the ISC recommendation (later ratified by the IC in accordance with S6.13) to disqualify the Contestant.

- It was questioned whether this would affect the medal boundaries. No Contestant in the contest would be penalised (i.e. lose a medal) due to another being disqualified.

16. Summary of Written Appeals for Competition Day 2

6 appeals had been received, several of which were agreed (by the Delegation Leaders) not to be taken further. In addition:

- Several Contestants had issues with the task requiring multiple simultaneous file submissions. The correct method of submission had been on the day 1 cover sheet which had not been provided on day 2. Incorrectly submitted submissions would be accepted and remarking was currently ongoing for all Contestants with this problem — not just those for whom an appeal had been filed.

17. IOI President's report

Arturo Cepeda presented a report on his activities since the last IOI. In particular:

- Work on the IOI Foundation had continued. (The IOI Foundation's initial purpose will be to enable the IOI to hold funds in an independent bank account. The current situation has the funds held in proxy.)
 - The officers of the IOI Foundation will be selected by the IOI community. This is required in the Foundation by-laws and an appropriate section will be added to the IOI Regulations.
- Members of the GA were encouraged to make proposals for making good use of the IOI's funds. These exist to support external activities of the community (e.g. conference proceedings, workshops, ...).

18. ISC and ITWG report

- Michal Forisek, Chair of ISC, reported on the ISC activities (attached). In addition:
 - Authors of externally accepted tasks had been asked to act as members of the HSC this year and had been invited the IOI with their attendance paid for.
 - The approach to task design had been "mother has to understand the problem, if not the solution".
 - The mark distributions for each task were shown and briefly discussed.
 - On each day the top student had solved both of the easier tasks within 30 minutes. On the second day over 10 contestants had scored 200 points within 30 minutes.
- Martin Mares, Chair of ITWG, reported on the ITWG activities (attached). In addition:
 - The MAIN task repository (as opposed to the IOI wiki):
 - Is designed for Contestants rather than Leaders
 - Provide an online grader.

- This year's technical system had two components. The grader has been produced within the IOI community and could be made available on request. The submission server used Marmoset (marmoset.cs.umd.edu) by agreement with that project; it is now available at sourceforge.net/projects/marmoset.
- Wolfgang Pohl reported on the Workshop that had been held in May. A detailed report can be found in Volume 4 (2010) of the *Olympiads in Informatics* proceedings.
 - Members of the GA who were interested in gaining access to the wiki should contact Wolfgang Pohl (pohl@bwinf.de) directly.
 - Wiki pages had already been written covering tasks, delegations and projects.

19. Executive Director's report

- The ED reported verbally on his activities throughout the year.
 - Costs were well within budget.
 - The workload (outside of IOI and IC meetings) was around 1 day / month.
 - The GA were encouraged to communicate with the ED throughout the year.
- The ED mentioned some of the areas the IC had been discussing during the past year including the IOI Foundation, task ownership, means of communication and the assessing of new countries.
- The ED welcomed Montenegro as a new participant this year and mentioned that Bolivia had also been invited but had been unable to attend.
- The ED reported that three additional countries had applied to attend the IOI but, since the IC judged that they did not have suitable national contests in place, they had not been approved at the present time. These countries (who were not named) had been pointed at regional events to assist them in building their national events.

20. Financial Statement for preceding year

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

- In the last year the excess of income over expenditure was only €1739.

21. Registration fee for IOI'2010

- Last year it was stated that *"If we continue to collect significantly more money than we spend a reduction will be considered"*. Nearly 90% of last year's income had been spent.
- A registration fee of €200 for IOI'2011 was proposed and approved by the GA without opposition.

22. Budget for forthcoming year

- Eljakim Schrijvers presented the budget for the forthcoming year (attached).
- The GA were reminded that the income supporting this budget came from this year's registration fees and not the registration fee approved for next year.
- The budget was approved without opposition.

23. Regulation Changes

- It was clarified that the changed membership of the ISC meetings in the proposed regulation changes had come by request of the ISC.
- The regulations were approved by the GA without opposition.

24. Election of IC members

- In the (only) vote, 64 delegations voted:
 - 48 (75%) approved of Krassimir Manev
 - 29 (45%) approved of David Ginat
 - 21 (33%) approved of Mario Cruz
 - 18 (28%) approved of Zide Du
 - 15 (23%) approved of Mile Jovanov
- Krassimir Manev and David Ginat were elected to the committee for a three year term.

25. Election of ISC members

- There being only a single candidate for the ISC position, Mihai Patrascu was elected to the committee for a three year term. No vote was required.
- Mihai Patrascu was given the opportunity to address the GA, having been originally absent during item 13.

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

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

27. Results and confirmation of medals

- The medal allocation algorithm that formed part of the Competition Procedures (approved early in the week) was used.
 - There had been 300 contestants.
 - 25 gold medals would be given, 52 silver medals and 73 bronze medals.

28. Proposals from GA members

No proposals had been received.

29. Announcement of future host

- Taiwan will host IOI'2014.
- Kazakhstan will host IOI'2015.

30. Other Business

- A discussion was held on the changes to the contest that had occurred at this year's IOI. See appendix.
 - An informal poll of the GA was in favor of the changes at this year's IOI.
 - The GA requested that they be informed about changes as early as possible.

Appendix (Open discussion)

The final GA meeting concluded with an open discussion, motivated by the changes to the contest that had occurred at this year's IOI. This discussion began with a presentation (attached) by Gordon Cormack on "IOI Accessibility".

The following is a summary of points mentioned:

NB: These points often indicate comments made by individuals and do not necessarily represent the views of the GA.

Making the IOI a spectator sport:

- It should be easy to "play the game" even if it is difficult to do so at an elite level.
- In other contests (e.g. sports) the competitors are not in a closed environment and this engages people who are not participating.
- Large segments of the population do not find the IOI attractive. This includes many of the "brightest and best" (who we lose to other disciplines) and women in particular.
- Many people at the conference had been following the scoreboard; in some cases more than the talks.

Grading:

- A one-to-one correspondence between the scoreboard and the medal distribution would be good.
- The fact that Contestants could not lose marks by sending a wrong solution after a correct one was described as a "turning point".
- There was debate over whether too many easy marks were available and whether we discriminated between all students (as opposed to just those at the top).
 - There was a feeling by several members that the number of "easy" marks was too high, especially on the second day.
 - Having more points for harder tasks would encourage Contestants to attempt the harder tasks. We want to play a "real game" and not "junior" version.
 - The SC stated that the tasks had been developed in accordance with Item Response Theory to distinguish between all students.

Tasks:

- The appropriateness of heuristic tasks was mentioned.
- It was suggested that we return to 3 tasks per day. An additional task places a burden on the SC and distracts from other work. (This was greeted by applause.)
 - This year we did not require the easier task since the other tasks had suitable easier sub-tasks.

Scores and Medals:

- The boundary between what a contestant is proud of and ashamed of may be below that of medal-winning:
 - By not displaying the non-medal winning scores in the official final results we penalise those Contestants who just missed out.
 - Publishing the scores of Contestants who scored badly on both days might haunt them for the rest of their lives.
- It was questioned whether the regulated "*No more than half of the Contestants are to receive medals*" was appropriate; what about those who just missed out?

Practise sessions:

- It was generally felt that the practise time is too short.
 - Suggestions included additional open practise time on the arrivals day and online practise in advance of the IOI.
- There should be a Q&A session in the middle of the practise session.
- A guide should be available for the practise session that indicates all the possible situations that might arise during the contest.
- There are language issues at the IOI. Contestants are not required to speak English.