International Physicists' Tournament
33, rue de Croulebarbe
75013 Paris

https://ipt.science/

International Physicists' Tournament

First Decision Assembly 2026

Agenda

1. News from the new IPT association: official status, bank account and financial report (see p.3-4)
2. General feedback from IPT 2026
3. IPT 2026 in the USA: visa issues, last-minute withdrawals and 4-team selective fights
4. Number of penalties this year in 4-team physics fights. Alberto Rolandi proposes removing the ban on problems previously reported by the opponent.
5. Rule changes proposals :
    - Evolution of the moderator role (proposed by Alberto Rolandi)
    - Hide grades for semi-finals and finals (proposed by Jeanne Bernard)
    - Increase registration fees (proposed by Joseph Haley). ExeCom suggests increasing the fee to 1600€.
6. Rule modification procedure: proposal to amend clause 1.1.8 to introduce structured discussion stages and defined voting windows (proposed by Anastasiia Vasylchenkova - see p.5-6 for complete description)
7. Flag ban: status update and discussion.

Second Decision Assembly 2026

Agenda

8. General feedback from IPT 2026. Discussion about how more destructive opponent postures rather than constructive ones are being rewarded with higher grades (Denise TL Germany discussed about this with other TM and TL, for instance Germany Berlin 1st time participants)
9. Clarifying that the penalties do not carry to the Final.
10. Discussion about Rule 2.10.3:

" In the case that there are 18 or more teams, one is held between the teams that ranked 1st, 6th and 7th, another one between the teams that ranked 2nd, 5th and 8th, and the third one between the teams that ranked 3rd, 4th and 9th. If there are less than 18 teams, one semifinal is held between teams that ranked 2nd, 5th and 6th, the other one between teams that ranked 3rd, 4th and 7th. "

11. Host country determination and announcement timings. This impacts both the participating teams (visas, tickets, and fundraising) and the LOC (funding opportunities, venue allocation/rental). Also, the procedure in case of several possible candidates. Was brought up last year but not resolved. (Anton)

12. UK withdrawal - recap and discussion

13. Votes

14. Grading schemes for the Finals

15. Flag ban - continued discussion

16. Four-way fights

International Physicists' Tournament
33, rue de Croulebarbe
75013 Paris

https://ipt.science/

1. News from the new IPT association

1.1. Official status

Following the votes at the last DA, we dissolved the IPT association in Alsace (at the EPS headquarters) and founded a new association in Paris in September 2025. Our legal address is now at the French Physical Society headquarters (33, rue de Croulebarbe 75013 Paris). The IPT association is now registered in the SIRENE directory (see document next page).

1.2. Bank account

After the association's registration in Paris, Jeanne Bernard and Mathieu Suter (appointed treasurer) opened an online bank account for the IPT association in February 2026. Wise was chosen for several reasons: the ability to easily create invoices, the ability to receive and send money in multiple currencies, and low maintenance cost. Jeanne and Mathieu both have access to the account and manage it jointly.

1.3. Financial report

2025-2026 expenses:

- Dissolution of the IPT association: 136€
- Github: 41€
- Bank account opening: 50€
- Reimbursement of ExeCom flights to IPT 2026: 3782€

2025-2026 income:

- Money left from IPT 2025: 1600€
- Money left from IPT 2024: 4900€ - *pending payment from ETH*
- IPT 2026 registration fees: 8800€

Current balance:

Total income - total expenses= 11 291€ - *once the pending payments from ETH is received.*

International Physicists' Tournament
33, rue de Croulebarbe
75013 Paris

https://ipt.science/

Service Statistique
Répertoire SIRENE

Service Info Sirene
09 72 72 6000
prix d'un appel local

SITUATION AU REPERTOIRE SIRENE

À la date du 31/08/2025

Description de l'entreprise	**Entreprise active depuis le 27/08/2025**
Identifiant SIREN	990 759 359
Identifiant SIRET du siège	990 759 359 00013
Dénomination	INTERNATIONAL PHYSICISTS' TOURNAMENT
Catégorie juridique	9220 - Association déclarée
N° RNA[1]	W751280524
Activité Principale Exercée (APE)	94.99Z - Autres organisations fonctionnant par adhésion volontaire
Appartenance au champ de l'ESS[2]	Oui
Appartenance au champ des sociétés à mission	Non

Description de l'établissement	**Etablissement actif depuis le 27/08/2025**
Identifiant SIRET	990 759 359 00013
Adresse	33 RUE DE CROULEBARBE 75013 PARIS
Activité Principale Exercée (APE)	94.99Z - Autres organisations fonctionnant par adhésion volontaire

1 : Répertoire National des Associations

2 : Economie Sociale et Solidaire

Important : *A l'exception des informations relatives à l'identification de l'entreprise, les renseignements figurant dans ce document, en particulier le code APE, n'ont de valeur que pour les applications statistiques (décret n°2007-1888 du 26 décembre 2007 portant approbation des nomenclatures d'activités françaises et de produits, paru au JO du 30 décembre 2007).*
Avertissement : *Aucune valeur juridique n'est attachée à l'avis de situation.*

REPUBLIQUE FRANCAISE

International Physicists' Tournament
33, rue de Croulebarbe
75013 Paris

https://ipt.science/

5. Rule modification procedure by Anastasiia Vasylchenkova

Motivation:
We tend to have an inconsistent approach when dealing with the rule changes. Some are discussed over multiple DA meetings, some are announced and voted straightaway, and mostly it happens at the discretion of the ExeCom members who evaluate to what extent the rule change is technical, or has been discussed informally before. It is vulnerable to misuse and biased towards ExeCom perspective, where non-execom IOCs may have an alternative perspective.

Recap:
The rule changes approach is governed by clause 1.1.8, which defines the rule modification approval procedure, but not the discussion stage. The clause currently reads:
"Any member of the IOC or ExeCom can suggest a modification to the rules. The executive committee is in charge of expressing the modification in a proper format. The whole IOC is asked to vote on each modification. The modification is accepted if more than 50% of the voters are in favor. In case of equal number of votes in favor and against the modification, the President has a decisive vote. The default voting period is 10 days since the IOC is called for voting."

Proposal:
Any rule modification and strategic decision need to be discussed during the in-person gatherings of the IOC, effectively during the IPT week, and have room for broader discussions. The rule modifications raised and voted only through online email exchange and online vote should be denormalised. There are possible scenarios:
--If the rule modification or a strategic decision is proposed as a part of the DA agenda, it can be discussed during the DA meetings, but voted on later in the year, for example, early autumn post the IPT. It will let the IOC think it through and discuss with their communities in their countries. The IOC may want to keep a record of the community discussion in some form.
--If the rule modification is proposed significantly before the in-person DA meeting, in autumn preceding the IPT, then it is deemed that the IOCs have sufficient time to discuss the rule proposal with their communities. It is also helped by the fact that the national selections will fall in the time window between the proposal and the in-person DA meeting, and the national communities will have sufficient engagement to consider the rule modification proposal, and also discuss it among themselves.

--The rule modifications raised and voted only through online email exchange and online vote should be denormalised, and be an exception resort. If the IOC or ExeCom member suggests the rule modification or a strategic decision in this format, then, together with the proposal, they should provide a rationale why this proposal is urgent and timely enough, and cannot wait for effectively one cycle of the IPT. It can be related to the formal IPT status as an association, or cases of uncovered rules interpretation which may severely affect the fairness of the upcoming edition. The rationale needs to be approved by at least 2 non-execom IOCs (excluding those who were proposing the rule modification or strategic decision) before the proposal can be submitted to the IOC vote. The ExeCom may want to keep a record of the non-execom IOCs approval in some form.

It will leave us with a paced rule modification schedule, and we will have two voting windows: at the DA in person and at the post-DA autumn vote. It will help to set expectations about the IOC engagement outside the IPT season and help them balance and manage their multiple roles and responsibilities. It will leave room for sufficient community discussion, still giving the opportunity to escalate urgent cases.

International Physicists' Tournament
33, rue de Croulebarbe
75013 Paris

https://ipt.science/

International Physicists' Tournament

Decision Assembly 2026

Minutes

Present:

ExeCom: Jeanne Bernard (President), Aakash Bhat (Secretary), Christos Andrikopoulos (Vice President), Rosty Martinez, Maja Milas, Alberto Rolandi, Viktor Sundström, Debora Choinska

IOC: Jeanne Bernard (France), Aakash Bhat (Germany), Wilhelm Carmerik (Sweden), Kornél Dobos (Hungary), Michele Guizzardi (Italy), Despina Karavola (Greece), Rosty Martinez (USA), Patrick Mendes (Brazil), Maja Milas (Croatia), José Daniel Muñoz Castaño (Colombia), Alberto Rolandi (Austria), Elias Rothlin (Switzerland), Krzysztof Turzyński (Poland), Peter Vesborg (Denmark).

Guests: Daniel Grumiller (Team Leader Austria), Filippo Canino (Team Leader Italy, at the second DA)

Present online: Anton Lutsenko (Finland IOC), Nikolay Lysenko (ExeCom), Vladimir Vanovskiy (Russia IOC), Anastasiia Vasylchenkova (ExeCom and UK IOC).

Absent: Celia Cabrerizo (Spain), William Castillo Cabrera (Mexico), Aeysha Khalique (Pakistan), Zakhar Maizelis (Ukraine), Lisa Liu (China), Matheus Pessoa (Canada), Igor Shatagin Khanonkin (Israel), BP Tyagi (India).

Minute taker: Rosty Martinez (First DA) and Viktor Sundström (Second DA)

International Physicists' Tournament
33, rue de Croulebarbe
75013 Paris

https://ipt.science/

Session one: 27 May 2026
Place: OSU, Stillwater, USA

1. News from the IPT association (Jeanne)

- Official status of the association was reviewed.
- Bank account update.
- Current balance: approximately €11,000. Note: ETH still owes a payment.

2. Feedback on IPT 2026

Michele: Negative feedback regarding jurors using phones and laptops during fights.

Krzysztof: Four-team fights did not leave enough time for interaction.

Krzysztof: No gluten-free meals were provided by the LOC.

Alberto: Concern raised about the number of bathrooms available before change of dorms.

Alberto / Krzysztof: Juror selection is becoming more random.

Krzysztof: More time should be allocated to explaining the rules.

Maja: Suggested adding a clause on what happens if rules are broken.

Alberto: A chair failed to notice a swap between a guest and a team member.

3. IPT in the USA

Aakash: The UK's withdrawal resulted in only 20 teams participating in the tournament. The tournament should address what happens when a team drops out, including the question of the registration fee in such cases.

Alberto: Proposed that a committee address the scenario above.

Michele: Argued there should be no broader consequences — a mistake made by one person should not be held against the whole country or student group.

Krzysztof: Noted that the 4-fight format changes team strategy.

Maja: Suggested a "3 selective fights" idea — considered a good idea, but currently not written into the rules.

Alberto: Comfortable with some rooms running 4 physics fights.

Debora: As a chair, noted that 4 physics fights are exhausting to run.

Krzysztof: Reiterated the need for more time for interaction.

4. Four Physics Fights – Penalty Proposal

Alberto: raised the problem of four-physics-fight rounds and the fact that it adds a penalty for round 4. He suggested removing the ban, so that teams can reuse a problem that had already been reported in that fight.

Christos: Disagreed — considered it a bad idea, since students would then be able to use a previous presentation to improve their presentation.

5. Rule Change Proposals

a) Joe's Rule — Increase Registration Fee

Jeanne: Proposed €1,600.

Maja: Opposed — considered the increase too difficult for teams.

Rosty: In favour of an increase, with the additional funds used to support teams financially where needed.

Greece: Noted that funding is already difficult enough.

Alberto: Asked how much the fee should actually be increased by, noting that it would also motivate the LOC.

b) Alberto's Rule — Modify the Moderator Role

Proposal: the moderator introduces the problem.

Krzysztof: Agreed with the adjustment and liked the introduction idea.

Michele: The moderator should not take part in the choice of problem.

Aakash: Suggested reducing the moderator's time to keep the fight shorter.

Maja: Warned that having the moderator in charge from the start could negatively affect the fight, by steering the discussion in their own direction.

Unidentified speaker: Raised the "moderator paradox": some prefer an active moderator, others prefer a passive one.

Krzysztof: Against voting on this within the current timeframe.

Unidentified speaker / Krzysztof: Suggested testing the change during national selections, or running a mock-up test.

6. Rule Modification Procedure 1.1.8 (Anastasiia)

Michele: Agreed with the proposal; suggested voting on the second option.

Jeanne: Noted that IOCs are difficult to communicate with by email.

Krzysztof: Suggested that the IOC meeting sets overall direction, while ExeCom takes the decision, as long as the original ideas are preserved.

Jeanne: Clarified this is not possible: according to our association status, ExeCom executes decisions, it does not make them.

7. Flag Ban

Aakash: Current approach is inconsistent.

Maja: Flags are already shown on the website.

Nikolay: Participants should not be drawn into political issues; the current approach is also inconsistent.

Nikolay's proposal:

- Remove the flag ban.
- Adopt an apolitical document.
- Introduce an internal ethics mechanism to prevent discrimination based on nationality.

Anastasiia: Opposed.

Alberto: Partially agreed with Nikolay's approach, but also partially not.

Michele: Supported Anastasiia's position.

Greece: Supported Nikolay's position.

Jeanne: Warned that introducing bans is itself a political act.

Aakash: Recalled that the flag ban originated because Ukraine indicated it would not participate if Russia were participating. However, the tournament cannot be isolated from the current world situation.

Michele: Suggested voting on a case-by-case basis.

Jeanne: Shared an example from IPhO: Russia participates under its own flag but cannot vote on official decisions — offered purely as an illustrative example.

Krzysztof: Noted that support can be shown bit national barriers remain in place.

Maja: Asked how the situation would be resolved for other countries.

Krzysztof: Suggested that the democratic process itself may be the issue.

Aakash: Proposed voting on Friday on the multiple points raised in Nikolay's document.

Alberto: Not ready to vote.

Krzysztof: Considered it not appropriate to vote yet, as no further proposals had been put forward.

Alberto: Proposed continuing the discussion on Friday.

Unidentified speaker: Noted that teams represent universities only.

Maja: Underlined the fact that competing with national flags helps with securing funding.

End of minutes.

Session two: 29 May 2026
Place: OSU, Stillwater, USA

8. General feedback - Climate of Opposition and Feedback During Physics Fights

Jeanne: Noted that several participants had expressed concerns that this year's IPT is taking a more aggressive stance, with a perception that reporters are being rewarded for "destroying" presentations rather than engaging constructively.

Filippo Canino (Italy, Team Leader): Felt something was different during the fights this year, with Physics Fighters focusing more on what was not done rather than on what was actually presented. Contrasted this with 2024, when he participated as a student and found the discussions warmer and more constructive.

Krzysztof: Took a middle position: in his view, opponents are often reluctant to point out when something is simply incorrect. The challenge is finding the right balance between criticism and constructive discussion.

José: Suggested describing the role of the Opponent as analogous to that of a journal referee.

Alberto: Strongly supported José's suggestion, and noted that Krzysztof's point is somewhat orthogonal to Filippo's concern: identifying mistakes is different from focusing excessively on what was not done.

Filippo: Clarified that the concern is not criticism itself, but destructive criticism, giving an example of a team criticized for not using a hint mentioned in the problem statement, even though that hint was not a requirement of the problem.

Krzysztof: Agreed that this is not an appropriate way to oppose a report.

Maja: Noted that, as a juror, she and the rest of the jury did take such considerations into account during grading.

Aakash: Pointed out that, in the example given, the opponent was not actually rewarded.

Filippo: Emphasized that the issue is not specifically about grading outcomes, but about an overall shift in climate that several participants share the perception of.

Anton: Although not present during the incident, observed that the juror grading sheet rewards opponents for improving the report, and suggested the wording might be adjusted to focus less on identifying omissions and more on constructive contributions.

Daniel: Did not witness anything he would describe as aggressive, but did observe some pedantic behaviour, which may be perceived differently depending on emotions and context.

Krzysztof: Warned that Alberto's proposal to explicitly sensitize jurors could unintentionally stifle discussion.

9. Clarification: Penalties Do Not Carry Over to the Final

Jeanne: Reported that the French Team Leader had approached her about whether the Swiss team's penalty would carry over into the Finals. The French delegation was dissatisfied because information from a Chair had suggested that it would; Jeanne stated that the rule should be clarified.

Alberto: Proposed putting the matter to a vote.

Krzysztof: Suggested clarifying the rule explicitly, so that the penalty does not count in the Finals, and considered the Team Leader's behaviour contrary to the spirit of IPT.

Jeanne: Confirmed consensus that the rules should be amended to ensure such penalties do not affect Final scores.

— Viktor Sundström takes over minute-taking —

10. Proposal: Semi-Final Scoring Reform

Maja & Michele: Presented a proposal on the Semi-Finals, motivated by the fact that many teams entering the Semi-Finals have little realistic chance of qualifying for the Finals and are effectively "playing for fun." Maja had noted that Team Croatia realized they could

strategically influence which teams reached the Finals without suffering any direct consequences themselves.

Proposed solution: carry over a limited number of bonus points from the qualification ranking into the Semi-Finals, resetting the rest of the scores. Example: teams placed 1st–3rd in different Physics Fights receive 4 bonus points, teams placed 4th–6th receive 2 bonus points, and the remaining teams receive none. The winner of each Physics Fight would then qualify for the Finals.

José: Expressed support for the proposal.

Michele: Gave an example from 2023 in which the proposal would have altered Team Italy's qualification to the Finals.

Maja: Suggested running simulations to determine appropriate bonus-point values.

Alberto: Considered it a good idea.

Krzysztof: Felt the proposal seemed overly motivated by one specific historical case involving Team Italy, and rejected the assumption that teams with little chance of reaching the Finals no longer care about their Semi-Final performance.

Maja: Added that Team Croatia remained motivated to improve their ranking but still felt uncomfortable having the power to influence which teams advanced.

Krzysztof: Noted that this would be a significant rule change: one current advantage is that success accumulates, reducing pressure on teams entering the Semi-Finals since their chances of proceeding to the Finals are more predictable.

Michele: Argued the proposal would enrich the strategic aspects of the tournament by encouraging teams to save stronger problems for later rounds.

Alberto: Observed that similar strategic effects already exist in selective fights, where teams can influence qualification outcomes.

Elias: Felt that too much information and performance history from the Selective Fights would effectively be lost.

Michele: Clarified that some accumulation of points would still remain, just less extreme.

Nikolay: Raised the question of whether the competition should reward preparation or tactical play, largely agreeing with Krzysztof's concerns, and asked whether previous problem blockings would also be reset.

Michele: Answered that only points would be affected; all other mechanisms would remain unchanged.

Maja: Pointed out that teams who receive particularly harsh juries in the Selective Fights continue to be disadvantaged under the current system.

Anton: Suggested an alternative approach: retaining only bonus points (e.g. from winning a fight) from the Selective Fights.

Krzysztof: Observed that only a few teams realistically contend for the Finals each year, largely due to differences in resources available at their university, and that the proposal could help level the playing field.

Aakash: Was not opposed to the proposal and found it interesting, but felt rule changes have been occurring too frequently. He noted that under the proposal, a 12-point lead could shrink to only 2 points, while underlying sources of unfairness would still remain.

Maja: Asked rhetorically whether a team unable to outperform another despite a four-point bonus is really the stronger team.

Aakash: Argued that accumulated leads are fairer because they are based on a larger number of fights.

Alberto: Pointed out that introducing three Semi-Finals already significantly changed tournament dynamics by giving lower-ranked teams more opportunities, and that since scores are already partially reset before the Finals, he does not view this proposal as a fundamentally different concept.

Krzysztof: Commented that tournament development over the last decade has consistently moved toward making the competition more engaging and accessible, beginning with the introduction of the Semi-Finals.

Greece: Found the proposal interesting, particularly because it could reduce the impact of earlier judging biases and alter strategic considerations.

Elias: Used a football bracket analogy: in football, losing directly implies one team is weaker, whereas in IPT a team may perform worse simply because they happened to present an older or less-developed problem.

Krzysztof: Noted that the Polish team won the Finals in 2023 after entering the Semi-Finals in 7th place, showing that strong comebacks are already possible.

Aakash: Asked why teams should not simply present their strongest problems from the start.

Michele: Argued that teams should still face meaningful strategic decisions, otherwise there is less incentive to solve a broad range of problems, since the Semi-Finals and Finals become relatively predictable.

Krzysztof: Felt the discussion was beginning to repeat itself and proposed establishing a committee to study the matter further.

Alberto: Asked whether the intention would be to implement any changes as early as next year.

Aakash: Observed that rule changes are often less polished than expected, and suggested undertaking a comprehensive review and rewrite of the rules rather than introducing isolated modifications.

Nikolai: Agreed that the proposal shifts unfairness from lower-ranked teams toward higher-ranked teams. Also noted that the term "Semi-Finals" may be misleading, as the stage effectively functions as a fifth Physics Fight, and argued that the proposed system could encourage stronger problems to appear later in the tournament, which would be beneficial.

Michele: Supported creating a committee and suggested setting a deadline (e.g. October or December) for recommendations.

Alberto: Suggested the possibility of running the system as a trial year, subject to agreement from the LOC.

Krzysztof: Volunteered to serve on the committee. While personally supportive of the idea, he would also be comfortable waiting up to two years before implementation.

Michele: Encouraged Team Leaders to discuss the proposal with their teams and forward their opinions.

Anton: Asked whether the proposed number of accumulated bonus points would be four.

Michele: Clarified that the proposal currently suggests eight bonus points.

Maja: Noted that unfairness can still arise when teams are paired against particularly strong opponents during qualification rounds.

11. Host Country Announcement and Determination

Anton presented an unresolved issue from last year's selection of the USA as host.

Anton: Wanted the host to be revealed as soon as possible so that people could apply for visas in time. The announcement ended up being made much later than expected, and later than it should have been after the decision itself was made. He saw no reason for the delay, particularly given its impact on fundraising; for example, if Finland were to host, it is important that such decisions be known as early as possible for funding purposes.

Aakash: Explained the reason for the delay: OSU wanted to make their own announcement video, and ExeCom was not allowed to reveal the host before that, despite trying to convince them otherwise. The announcement was still relatively early, roughly 6–7 months ahead. It is not the norm for such announcements to be made this late, since the host is typically decided 1–2 years in advance; this also clarifies the situation if there are competing bids.

Patrick: Suggested that, ideally, the next host should be announced at the closing ceremony.

Aakash: Confirmed that this is exactly the plan for this year.

Jeanne: Stressed that anyone wishing to organize the IPT should approach ExeCom 1.5 to 2 years in advance.

12. UK withdrawal — Recap and Discussion

Aakash recapped the situation regarding the UK team's withdrawal.

Peter: Asked whether the UK had forfeited their registration fee, which had already been paid prior to withdrawing.

Jeanne: Clarified that this was not exactly the case: the UK did not request a refund, and ExeCom did not proactively propose one either.

Aakash: Said that, ideally, ExeCom would prefer not to return the fee.

Nikolay: It depends on when it was announced. If it was announced less than a month before the event, then LOC simply can't cancel some reservations and agreements. Therefore we can't make a refund.

Krzysztof: Noted that, unlike the IYPT, IPT currently has no mechanism to prevent this kind of last-minute withdrawal.

Daniel: Suggested the registration fee itself could serve as such a mechanism, especially if it were increased.

Maja: Asked whether a deposit system could be introduced instead.

Viktor: Asked what the actual economic damage from this year's withdrawal had been, given that fees do not cover the full cost of the event.

Aakash: Said the damage was minimal this time, but the tournament was lucky in this case. The broader question remains what to do if a fee is never paid, or paid late.

Anton and Jeanne discussed possible approaches to establishing a penalty, exchanging general thoughts on the matter.

Alberto: Asked why not simply ban the specific university involved, noting that there is often a lot of overlap between the team and its university. He asked for arguments against this approach, as he was not convinced by it.

Viktor: Asked who is more responsible in such cases — team leaders or team members.

Aakash: Explained that in this case the team leader had communicated he did not wish to join, but left it open for the students to attend without him; the students then also decided not to go. So responsibility was not limited to the team leader alone.

Elias: Noted that in his team, turnover is nearly 100% every year.

Anton: Asked about the possibility of a "ghost team" mechanism.

Aakash: Said this idea, and variations of it, had already been considered in the past — in short, it does not work.

Aakash: Asked whether the registration fee should be increased to €1,600.

Anton: Asked why that particular figure, rather than another number.

Krzysztof: Suggested a multi-tier vote on the amount.

Alberto: Suggested including a fee waiver and a travel grant as part of the same bundled vote.

13. Vote: Hiding Grades in the Semi-Finals and Finals (Agenda Item 5.2)

Aakash opened the vote on agenda item 5.2: not showing the grades in the Semi-Finals and Finals.

Delegations present and entitled to vote:

- Alberto Rolandi (Austria)
- Wilhelm Carmerik (Sweden, in place of Åke)
- Peter Vesborg (Denmark)
- Elias Rothlin (Switzerland, in place of Mathieu)
- Jeanne Bernard (France)
- Krzysztof Turzyński (Poland and UK, in place of Anastasiia)
- Michele Guizzardi (Italy)
- Patrick Mendes (Brazil)
- Despina Karavola (Greece)
- Kornél Dobos (Hungary)
- José Daniel Muñoz Castaño (Colombia)
- Maja Milas (Croatia)
- Rosty Martinez (USA, online)
- Anton Lutsenko (Finland, online)
- Aakash Bhat (Germany)

Present but not entitled to vote:

- Nikolay Lysenko (online)
- Daniel Grumiller (Austria, Team Leader)
- Viktor Sundström (ExeCom)

Vote result: unanimous in favour.

14. Grading Scheme for the Finals — Frequency of Ties

Alberto: Presented simulations showing a high likelihood of a tie in the Final. The simulations use a distribution based on previous jurors' grades. Because the spread of marks tends to be small in the Finals (jurors typically give high grades), the current system — removing the lowest grades and rescaling — normalizes the scores even further. Ties have only started occurring since this system was introduced. He proposed changing the rule so that this grading scheme is no longer used for the Final.

Krzysztof: Asked what is actually wrong with having a tie.

Alberto: Responded that having a tie every other year is not desirable. The grading scheme was designed to protect weaker teams from feeling bad about their grades, since this can be emotionally difficult. He added that a decision does not need to be made right now — new simulations could be run based on this year's grades.

Elias: Suggested that the lowest grades could still be dropped.

Alberto: Agreed that this should be kept, precisely in order to increase variance.

José: Suggested there could be useful insights from the field of psychometrics — his wife works in that field, and this could be looked into together.

15. Flag Ban (Continued Discussion)

Michele: Said it is time to start writing proposals.

Aakash: Admitted he had not yet read Nikolay's proposal, being too busy with the tournament.

Krzysztof: Also had not had time this week, and suggested the matter be postponed, with a clear deadline set.

Aakash: Suggested the end of August as a deadline.

Krzysztof: Objected that August is a poor choice of timing.

Jeanne: Asked whether this deadline was for the vote itself.

Aakash: Clarified no — the deadline is for submitting proposals; there would then be a two-month wait before voting.

Nikolay: Felt that two months was too long.

Aakash: Asked that proposals be sent to him or to Jeanne, who would then forward them to the IOC.

Alberto: Confirmed that ExeCom also commits to sending a reminder about this deadline.

16. Four-Way Fights

Aakash: Asked for a quick round of opinions on four-way fights. Most participants said they preferred as many three-way fights as possible, with only a few four-way fights.

Greece: Noted that while no one wants to end up with "one less Physics Fight," participants would find it unfair.

Jeanne: Observed that this was the same discussion as two days earlier, and closed the topic.

End of minutes.

Summary of Votes

Rule Changes Voted and Accepted — May 2026

- ☒ Hide grades for the Semi-Finals and Finals.
- ☒ Clarified that penalties do not carry over to the Finals.

These decisions will be implemented in the rules starting from the 2027 edition.

IOC Votes Following IPT 2026 (End of September 2026)

- ☐ Increase registration fees: choose one option among: increase of 0€, 500€ or 1000€.
- ☐ Flag ban — the IOC has time until the end of August to submit a proposal.
- ☐ Rule modification procedure (proposed by Anastasiia).
- ☐ Semi-Final modification — Maja and Michele will run simulations and come back with a proposal before the end of July.

Alberto will review the rules to check whether anything else, besides the Finals-penalty issue, remains unclear.