

Agenda and minutes of the IOC meeting

26th of April 2019, Lausanne

Following we will note down the discussion points for the IOC meeting. Feel free to add yours and specify the time you think may be needed. (we have a limited amount of time).

Topic	Presenter	Time needed
Next year host	David	10
Assured spot for next year Rule 1.5.6	Sebastian	5
Max 1 team/ country?	Daniel	10
Penalty duration (from IOC pools) with votes	Sebastian	20
Role of the reviewer	Sebastian/Arnaud	20
Allowing jury members to discuss before grading	Krytzoff	10
Sharing experience among IOC	Daniel Suchet	10
Remind to collect testimonials and solutions		5

Present people:

All IOC representatives for the teams present at the tournament, except for Italy, Colombia, German, Switzerland and Poland, for which were present team leaders as substitutes.

Looking for a host:

David will send a mail with possible more informations. Denmark seems to have trouble with housing, same for Greece. Poland will look into it and have an answer for around June. Italy may be interested in two years.

Teams admitted by default for next edition:

We all agreed with the interpretation of the rules, so from Germany up all accepted by default.

Multiple teams from the same county:

Daniel presents the problem, especially referring to this year final where two french team participated.

There are different options for which may be voted in the future.

- Leave rules as they are
- Forbid more than one team, with exception of the host
- Leave the decision to the LOC/IOC for each year

The general idea was to prevent countries from having more than two teams joining the tournament.

Malus Duration:

Concerning the veto duration there was no general consensus on how to implement it. From the Danish side (Peter) arrived a very appreciated suggestion to add one more tactical veto for the first fight so that to lower the probability of using extra vetos right at the beginning.

We voted for the rule:

13 favor

Colombia abstain

Poland against

Proposal passed.

Role of the reviewer:

Arnaud expone how in the FPT taking out this role improved the fights. He doesn't necessarily suggests to do the same for the IPT but at least proposes to remove all "dead moments" during the discussion, like the presentation of the reviewer.

He shows that by removing the reviewer grades, the ranking is only slightly modified.

There is a general disconsensus on removing completely the role because it's a strong part of the current image of the tournament.

There is a proposition for giving final remarks to the reviewer.

Currently it appears as the roles of opponent and reviewer are too similar.

Guidelines didn't seem to play a relevant role.

Feedback from both teams and jurors: often it is not clear what should be the role of the reviewer and how to grade it.

Jury discussion before grading:

Krytzoff proposes to let the jurors discuss before putting down grades.

The main argumentation is that, often, this can allow experts on the field to comment if what was presented had any major flaw.

Andreas says that this may lead to a disparity over more and less impressionable jurors.

Overall the statist should average out any possible disparity.

Sharing IOC experience on iptnet.info

In order to help the expansion of the tournament it was proposed to open a dedicated page in the private section of the website where all IOC members could share their experiences on how it was carried out in their particular country. Will be soon done by the ExeCom