III IYNT 2015

Please fill the protocol by recoding the Grades shown by the Jurors. In case of discrepancy with the Individual Juror's Protocols, the individual protocols are considered correct (*IYNT Regs*, Ch. 2, I, 8). In case of discrepancy, please check with Chairperson, correct this protocol, and request Juror's signature near the correction. No Grade however can be corrected retroactively by the Juror in their individual protocol when the Stage is over (*IYNT Regs*, Ch. 1, IX, 1).

Science Fight Attendant's Protocol

Fight Attendant's name Anika Vučićević Date 21.06.2015. SF 3 Group B

The Protocol is complete (Attendant's signature) Anika Vučićević Grades cross-checked with Jurors' Protocols (Attendant's signature) Anika Vučićević

	Stage I			Stage II			Stage III		
Problem in the Stage	Accepted: 3	Rejected, if any:		Accepted: 1	Rejected, if any:		Accepted:	Rejected, if any: 2	
	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer
Team →	Bulgaria	Russia Voronezh 1	Serbia 2	Russia Voronezh 1	Serbia 2	Bulgaria	Serbia 2	Bulgaria	Russia Voronezh 1
Presenter's Name → (ask the Team to write the Name on blackboard or give you the name badge)	Martin Polomski	Aleksei Krasikov	Dean Polimac	Evgeniya Elfimova	Stefan Huber	Vladimira Irinchera	Olgica Maksimović	Lili Komova	Nadezhda Dmitrienko
Juror Yellow Cards: NR, NP, NT →									
Yury Kartynnik	18	11	7	12	12	4	12	12	7
Evgeny Yunosov	18	15	7	13	10	7	12	12	8
Elena Chernova	18	16	8	15	10	9	15	12	6
Nika Sabeshvili	19	14	5	15	15	8	13	18	6
Dušan Dimić	24	12	7	16	17	9	18	14	7
Andrei Klishin	16	16	7	14	15	8	9	7	4

III IYNT 2015

Please fill and sign before showing your Grades. In case of discrepancy, the protocol is considered correct (*IYNT Regs*, Ch. 2, I, 8). No Grade can be corrected retroactively (*IYNT Regs*, Ch. 1, IX, 1). Please do not bend: we will scan, archive, and publish this protocol

Individual Juror's Protocol

Juror's name Dušan Dimić Date 21.06.'15 SF 3 Group B

	Overview of Science Fight		
	Stage I	**Stage II**	**Stage III**
Problem in the Stage	**Accepted:** 3	**Accepted:** 1	**Accepted:** 2
	Rejected, if any: —	Rejected, if any: —	Rejected, if any: —
	Fill below the names of Teams and Presenters, and any Yellow Cards announced by Chairperson (NR, NP, or NT)		
Reporter	Martin Polowski Bulgaria	Evgeniya Elfimova RU1	Olgica Maksimović S2
Opponent	Aleksei Krasikov RU1	Stefan Huber S2	Jili Komova BG
Reviewer	Dean Polimac S2	Vladimira Ivincheva BG	Nadezhda Dmitrienko RU1

Criteria for Partial Grades

	for Reporter	Range	for Opponent	Range	for Reviewer	Range
α	Essence of the solution. Results. Scientific methods. Vision of scientific context. Correctness. Justified conclusions. *Main tasks*: novel ideas, depth. *Inv Yourself*: problem statement. *Additional*: team work, resourcefulness	-6...+6	Objective critique. Skeptical inquiry. Relevant, nontrivial challenging questions. Justified opinions. Understanding of scientific context. Conclusions, suggestions	-4...+4	Impartial, independent, weighted review. Relevant, nontrivial clarifying questions. Justified opinions. Understanding of scientific context. Own conclusions. Summary	-2...+2
β	Persuasive and structured speech and presentation	-3...+3	Persuasive, structured speech and presentation	-2...+2	Persuasive, structured speech and presentation	-1...+1
γ	Defending own solution. Clear argumentation in the discussion	-3...+3	Active, polite discussion and argumentation	-2...+2	Short and critical synopsis of the Stage	-1...+1
δ	Technicalities, visual aids, demonstrations, team help	-2...+3	Technicalities, visual aids to Opposition, team help	-1...+2	Technicalities, visual aids to Review, team help	-0...+1

	Juror's Grades								
	Stage I			**Stage II**			**Stage III**		
	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer
Starting	15	10	5	15	10	5	15	10	5
α	+3	0	0	+2	+2	+2	0	+2	1
β	+3	0	+1	0	+2	+1	+1	0	0
γ	+3	+2	0	-1	+2	+1	+1	+1	+1
δ	0	0	+1	0	+1	0	+1	+1	0
Sum up the Starting Grade (15, 10, or 5) with all four Partial Grades, and write below your resulting Juror's Grade									
Juror's Grade	24	12	7	16	17	9	18	14	7
Juror's signature	[signature]			[signature]			[signature]		

RP

- good english
- fast
- method?
- bad answers
- good experiments
- but very general

the total number?

OP

- good question!
- good english
- good ~~points~~
- specific presentation !!

RW

- stupid question
- specific question
- ~~bad~~

RP

- ok english
- reading
- interesting
- insecure
- no formula
- insecure !!!
- mean experiments
- no precise
- ok conclusion
- team work

OP

- repeated question
- good presentation
- good reasons
- good question !!
- no explanation, but ok

RW

- specific
- ~~tasks~~
- good

RP

- good answer,
- good english
- good presentational skills
- Where is water coming from?
- bad time management
- interesting point - Millard's reaction
- no experiments
- specific parts
- chemical

RW

- stupid question
- good english, good
- ~~bad~~ specific ? no suggestions

Op

- not good questions
- good points
-

Discussion

- good questions
- but connected with anything they said
- not

III IYNT 2015

Please fill and sign before showing your Grades. In case of discrepancy, the protocol is considered correct (*IYNT Regs*, Ch. 2, I, 8). No Grade can be corrected retroactively (*IYNT Regs*, Ch. 1, IX, 1). Please do not bend: we will scan, archive, and publish this protocol

Individual Juror's Protocol

Juror's name Yunosov Date 21.6.15 SF 3 Group B

	Overview of Science Fight		
	Stage I	**Stage II**	**Stage III**
Problem in the Stage	**Accepted:** 3	**Accepted:** 1	**Accepted:** 2
	Rejected, if any: [illegible]	Rejected, if any:	Rejected, if any:
	Fill below the names of Teams and Presenters, and any Yellow Cards announced by Chairperson (NR, NP, or NT)		
Reporter	Bg Martin Polovsky	V1 Evgen Elfimova	S2 Olgica Maksimović
Opponent	V1 Aleksei Krasnicki	S2 Stefan Huber	Bg Lili Komova
Reviewer	S2 Dean Polimoc	Bg Vladimira Ivanchova	V1 Nadezhda Dmitrienko

Criteria for Partial Grades

	for Reporter	Range	for Opponent	Range	for Reviewer	Range
α	Essence of the solution. Results. Scientific methods. Vision of scientific context. Correctness. Justified conclusions. *Main tasks*: novel ideas, depth. *Inv Yourself*: problem statement. *Additional*: team work, resourcefulness	-6...+6	Objective critique. Skeptical inquiry. Relevant, nontrivial challenging questions. Justified opinions. Understanding of scientific context. Conclusions, suggestions	-4...+4	Impartial, independent, weighted review. Relevant, nontrivial clarifying questions. Justified opinions. Understanding of scientific context. Own conclusions. Summary	-2...+2
β	Persuasive and structured speech and presentation	-3...+3	Persuasive, structured speech and presentation	-2...+2	Persuasive, structured speech and presentation	-1...+1
γ	Defending own solution. Clear argumentation in the discussion	-3...+3	Active, polite discussion and argumentation	-2...+2	Short and critical synopsis of the Stage	-1...+1
δ	Technicalities, visual aids, demonstrations, team help	-2...+3	Technicalities, visual aids to Opposition, team help	-1...+2	Technicalities, visual aids to Review, team help	-0...+1

	Juror's Grades								
	Stage I			**Stage II**			**Stage III**		
	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer
Starting	15	10	5	15	10	5	15	10	5
α	+1	+2	+1	-1	+1	+1	-0	+1	+1
β	+1	+1	+0	-1	-1	+1	+1	0	+1
γ	+0	+1	+0	-1	0	+0	-1	+1	+1
δ	+2	+1	+1	+1	0	0	+1	0	0
Sum up the Starting Grade (15, 10, or 5) with all four Partial Grades, and write below your resulting Juror's Grade									
Juror's Grade	18	15	7	13	10	7	12	12	8
Juror's signature	Yunosov.			Yunosov.			Yunosov.		

III IYNT 2015

Please fill and sign before showing your Grades. In case of discrepancy, the protocol is considered correct (*IYNT Regs*, Ch. 2, I, 8). No Grade can be corrected retroactively (*IYNT Regs*, Ch. 1, IX, 1). Please do not bend: we will scan, archive, and publish this protocol

Individual Juror's Protocol

Juror's name Nika Sabashvili Date 22.06.2015 SF 3 Group B

	Overview of Science Fight		
	Stage I	**Stage II**	**Stage III**
Problem in the Stage	**Accepted:** 3	**Accepted:** 1	**Accepted:**
	Rejected, if any:	Rejected, if any:	Rejected, if any:
	Fill below the names of Teams and Presenters, and any Yellow Cards announced by Chairperson (NR, NP, or NT)		
Reporter	BUL – Martin Polomski	RUS-Evgeniyev Elfimov	SERII – Olgica Maksimovic
Opponent	RUS – Alekseï Krasikov	SERII- Stefan Huber	BUL – Lili Komora
Reviewer	SERII- Dean Polimac	BUL – Vladimira Irinchera	RVI – Nadezhda Dmitrienko

Criteria for Partial Grades

	for Reporter	Range	for Opponent	Range	for Reviewer	Range
α	Essence of the solution. Results. Scientific methods. Vision of scientific context. Correctness. Justified conclusions. *Main tasks*: novel ideas, depth. *Inv Yourself*: problem statement. *Additional*: team work, resourcefulness	–6...+6	Objective critique. Skeptical inquiry. Relevant, nontrivial challenging questions. Justified opinions. Understanding of scientific context. Conclusions, suggestions	–4...+4	Impartial, independent, weighted review. Relevant, nontrivial clarifying questions. Justified opinions. Understanding of scientific context. Own conclusions. Summary	–2...+2
β	Persuasive and structured speech and presentation	–3...+3	Persuasive, structured speech and presentation	–2...+2	Persuasive, structured speech and presentation	–1...+1
γ	Defending own solution. Clear argumentation in the discussion	–3...+3	Active, polite discussion and argumentation	–2...+2	Short and critical synopsis of the Stage	–1...+1
δ	Technicalities, visual aids, demonstrations, team help	–2...+3	Technicalities, visual aids to Opposition, team help	–1...+2	Technicalities, visual aids to Review, team help	–0...+1

	Juror's Grades								
	Stage I			**Stage II**			**Stage III**		
	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer
Starting	**15**	**10**	**5**	**15**	**10**	**5**	**15**	**10**	**5**
α	+0	+2	-1	+1	+2	+1	0	+3	+1
β	+1	+0	+1	-1	0	+1	0	+2	0
γ	+3	+2	0	0	+2	+1	0	+2	0
δ	0	0	0	0	+1	0	-2	+1	0
Sum up the Starting Grade (15, 10, or 5) with all four Partial Grades, and write below your resulting Juror's Grade									
Juror's Grade	19	14	5	15	15	8	13	18	6
Juror's signature									

ADR-Protein.

What was the exploration?

No experiments

What would happened if add ADP.

opponent -

improve questions

discussion - good.

questions out of topic

RW - question failed.

op

bad question

↓

good discussion.

SER - concentration. 26 - on what

How they count.

III IYNT 2015

Please fill and sign before showing your Grades. In case of discrepancy, the protocol is considered correct (*IYNT Regs*, Ch. 2, I, 8). No Grade can be corrected retroactively (*IYNT Regs*, Ch. 1, IX, 1). Please do not bend: we will scan, archive, and publish this protocol

Individual Juror's Protocol

Juror's name Elena Chernova Date 21.06.15 SF 3 Group B

	Overview of Science Fight		
	Stage I	**Stage II**	**Stage III**
Problem in the Stage	**Accepted:** 3	**Accepted:** 1	**Accepted:** 2
	Rejected, if any:	Rejected, if any:	Rejected, if any:
	Fill below the names of Teams and Presenters, and any Yellow Cards announced by Chairperson (NR, NP, or NT)		
Reporter	Bg / Polonski M.	V-1 / Elfimova E.	Serb-2 / Maksimović
Opponent	Vr-1 / Krasikov A.	Serb-2 / Heeber S.	Bg / Komova L.
Reviewer	Serb-2 / Polimac D.	Bg / Irincheva V.	V-1 / Dmitrienko N.

Criteria for Partial Grades

	for Reporter	Range	for Opponent	Range	for Reviewer	Range
α	Essence of the solution. Results. Scientific methods. Vision of scientific context. Correctness. Justified conclusions. *Main tasks*: novel ideas, depth. *Inv Yourself*: problem statement. *Additional*: team work, resourcefulness	-6...+6	Objective critique. Skeptical inquiry. Relevant, nontrivial challenging questions. Justified opinions. Understanding of scientific context. Conclusions, suggestions	-4...+4	Impartial, independent, weighted review. Relevant, nontrivial clarifying questions. Justified opinions. Understanding of scientific context. Own conclusions. Summary	-2...+2
β	Persuasive and structured speech and presentation	-3...+3	Persuasive, structured speech and presentation	-2...+2	Persuasive, structured speech and presentation	-1...+1
γ	Defending own solution. Clear argumentation in the discussion	-3...+3	Active, polite discussion and argumentation	-2...+2	Short and critical synopsis of the Stage	-1...+1
δ	Technicalities, visual aids, demonstrations, team help	-2...+3	Technicalities, visual aids to Opposition, team help	-1...+2	Technicalities, visual aids to Review, team help	-0...+1

	Juror's Grades								
	Stage I			**Stage II**			**Stage III**		
	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer
Starting	**15**	**10**	**5**	**15**	**10**	**5**	**15**	**10**	**5**
α	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
β	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
γ	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
δ	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
Sum up the Starting Grade (15, 10, or 5) with all four Partial Grades, and write below your resulting Juror's Grade									
Juror's Grade	18	16	8	15	10	9	15	12	6
Juror's signature									

III IYNT 2015

Please fill and sign before showing your Grades. In case of discrepancy, the protocol is considered correct (*IYNT Regs*, Ch. 2, I, 8). No Grade can be corrected retroactively (*IYNT Regs*, Ch. 1, IX, 1). Please do not bend: we will scan, archive, and publish this protocol

Individual Juror's Protocol

Juror's name Yury Kartynnik Date 21.06.2015 SF 3 Group B

	Overview of Science Fight		
	Stage I	**Stage II**	**Stage III**
Problem in the Stage	**Accepted:** 3	**Accepted:** 1	**Accepted:** 2
	Rejected, if any:	Rejected, if any:	Rejected, if any:
	Fill below the names of Teams and Presenters, and any Yellow Cards announced by Chairperson (NR, NP, or NT)		
Reporter	Bulgaria Martin Polomski	Russia Voronezh 1 Eugeniya Eltimova	Serbia II Olgica Maksimović
Opponent	Russia-Voronezh I Aleksei Krasikov	Serbia II Stefan Huber	Bulgaria Lili Komova
Reviewer	Serbia II Dean Polimac	Bulgaria Vladimira Irinchera	Russia-Voronezh I Nadzieżda Dmitrienko

Criteria for Partial Grades

	for Reporter	Range	for Opponent	Range	for Reviewer	Range
α	Essence of the solution. Results. Scientific methods. Vision of scientific context. Correctness. Justified conclusions. *Main tasks*: novel ideas, depth. *Inv Yourself*: problem statement. *Additional*: team work, resourcefulness	–6...+6	Objective critique. Skeptical inquiry. Relevant, nontrivial challenging questions. Justified opinions. Understanding of scientific context. Conclusions, suggestions	–4...+4	Impartial, independent, weighted review. Relevant, nontrivial clarifying questions. Justified opinions. Understanding of scientific context. Own conclusions. Summary	–2...+2
β	Persuasive and structured speech and presentation	–3...+3	Persuasive, structured speech and presentation	–2...+2	Persuasive, structured speech and presentation	–1...+1
γ	Defending own solution. Clear argumentation in the discussion	–3...+3	Active, polite discussion and argumentation	–2...+2	Short and critical synopsis of the Stage	–1...+1
δ	Technicalities, visual aids, demonstrations, team help	–2...+3	Technicalities, visual aids to Opposition, team help	–1...+2	Technicalities, visual aids to Review, team help	–0...+1

	Juror's Grades								
	Stage I			**Stage II**			**Stage III**		
	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer
Starting	**15**	**10**	**5**	**15**	**10**	**5**	**15**	**10**	**5**
α	+1	0	+1	−1	+1	−1	−2	+1	+1
β	+1	0	+1	−1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1
γ	+1	0	−1	−2	0	0	−1	0	0
δ	0	+1	+1	+1	0	0	0	0	0
Sum up the Starting Grade (15, 10, or 5) with all four Partial Grades, and write below your resulting Juror's Grade									
Juror's Grade	18	11	7	12	12	4	12	12	7
Juror's signature	Картынник			Картынник			Картынник		

III IYNT 2015

Please fill and sign before showing your Grades. In case of discrepancy, the protocol is considered correct (*IYNT Regs*, Ch. 2, I, 8). No Grade can be corrected retroactively (*IYNT Regs*, Ch. 1, IX, 1). Please do not bend: we will scan, archive, and publish this protocol

Individual Juror's Protocol

Juror's name Andrei Klishin Date 21-06-15 SF 3 Group B

	Overview of Science Fight		
	Stage I	**Stage II**	**Stage III**
Problem in the Stage	**Accepted:** 3	**Accepted:** 1	**Accepted:** 2
	Rejected, if any:	Rejected, if any:	Rejected, if any:
	Fill below the names of Teams and Presenters, and any Yellow Cards announced by Chairperson (NR, NP, or NT)		
Reporter	BG/Martin Polanski	RV1/Evgeniya Efimova	SZ/Olgica Maksimovic
Opponent	RV1/Alexei Krasikov	SZ/Stefan Huber	BG/Liti Kamova
Reviewer	SZ/Dean Polimac	BG/Vladimira Irincheva	RV1/Nadezhda Dmitrieva

Criteria for Partial Grades

	for Reporter	Range	for Opponent	Range	for Reviewer	Range
α	Essence of the solution. Results. Scientific methods. Vision of scientific context. Correctness. Justified conclusions. *Main tasks*: novel ideas, depth. *Inv Yourself*: problem statement. *Additional*: team work, resourcefulness	–6...+6	Objective critique. Skeptical inquiry. Relevant, nontrivial challenging questions. Justified opinions. Understanding of scientific context. Conclusions, suggestions	–4...+4	Impartial, independent, weighted review. Relevant, nontrivial clarifying questions. Justified opinions. Understanding of scientific context. Own conclusions. Summary	–2...+2
β	Persuasive and structured speech and presentation	–3...+3	Persuasive, structured speech and presentation	–2...+2	Persuasive, structured speech and presentation	–1...+1
γ	Defending own solution. Clear argumentation in the discussion	–3...+3	Active, polite discussion and argumentation	–2...+2	Short and critical synopsis of the Stage	–1...+1
δ	Technicalities, visual aids, demonstrations, team help	–2...+3	Technicalities, visual aids to Opposition, team help	–1...+2	Technicalities, visual aids to Review, team help	–0...+1

	Juror's Grades								
	Stage I			**Stage II**			**Stage III**		
	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer
Starting	15	10	5	15	10	5	15	10	5
α	–1	+3	+1	+3	+3	+2	–4	–1	–1
β	–1	+1	+1	–1	+1	0	0	–1	0
γ	+2	+1	0	–2	+1	+1	–2	–1	0
δ	+1	+1	0	–1	0	0	0	0	0
Sum up the Starting Grade (15, 10, or 5) with all four Partial Grades, and write below your resulting Juror's Grade									
Juror's Grade	16	16	7	14	15	8	9	7	4
Juror's signature	Klishin			Klishin			Klishin		

BG Rep 3. Chemistry SF3

Potato + starch

Iodine molecule?

Q - does it color other substances?

Maillard's reaction

Big borrowed diagrams ±

structure ---

no story - English + calm +

form ± not spec.

Rev expt. e, starch +

pictures +, iodine +, small pict. +, Mall. react +

chem. +, time +

Opp - gen., expt.?? no Q on PDP

Opp - Aleksei Krasikov

good, reported, can oppose

Phys-chem starch, types.

✓ not much about growing, more on frying

Q - chem heating.

amino acid + sugars. ✓ - good A.

Q - measure starch ✓

Q - cook whole, cook cut?

Q - what for frying, boiling.

more starch - fry.

Q - temp to fry.

Q - crisp +

RV1 1 Physics

Q - how humidity influences? +

what is the mass? Herror -

how many sig fig?

Q - how big electrostatic field?

earth es field?

Q - which relative error

goes down for larger obj?

Q - why no air buoyancy?

Opp - S2

why diff methods, not just the best?

expt, pict., methods.

no expt calc. + more phys. param

Q - diff. in $\bar{g}$ - what's influence? (~0,1%) Opp: 2%

solid object - prism?

buoyancy force solid?

def. of buoy. f.

Rev - no Q. not be so stressed.

def. + factors + human

comm. only by notes.

read. from paper.

opp. - info ab. the slides.

g fine.

short. pres.

not all relevant.

S2 2 Biology

cosmopolitan clear present.

soil pollution color-coding

Q - so mg/l of what?

# of resistant bacteria

strands? how measured?

how changed concentration?

4 min.

Opp - BG

species of bacteria used for bioremed.

Images

no photos of expt.

short. - little text.

how count species?

amazing?

Rev RV1

Rev - on expt./theory.

Opp - not size of presentation.