International Young Naturalists' Tournament

www.iynt2013.com

Personal protocol for a juror Deniz EROĞLU

Date	3.05.2013	SF	3	Group	D	Stage	2	Problem	4

ID	515	Team	SAHANYOLU	Reporter	

Scoring of the Report		Max 16	Grade
Contents of the report (theory and experiment)			
1.	Performed measurements of conductivities	5	3
2.	Compared quantitative data, offered theory, read references	5	2
3.	Correctly identified samples	6	4
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.	Overall impression	4	1
9.	Quality of the presentation, relevance	3	1
10.	Discussion with the opponent (if no discussion maximal score)	4	–
11.	Discussion with the reviewer (if no discussion maximal score)	1	–
12.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills	1	–
13.	Concluding remarks of the Reporter	1	–
	Sum of points:	30	11

ID	509	Team	ECO GENERATION	Opponent	

Scoring of the opposition			Max	Grade
1.	Contents well analysed:	strong sides highlighted	3	2
2.		considerable shortcomings noted	3	2
3.	Conclusions challenged		2	1
4.	Quality of the opposition		3	1
5.	Quality of the presentation, relevance		2	1
6.	Discussion with the Reporter: relevant questions asked		2	2
7.		: understanding of the problem understood	2	2
8.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills		2	2
9.	Discussion with the reviewer (if no discussion maximal score)		1	1
		Sum of points:	20	14

ID	509	Team	ECO GENERATION	Reviewer	

Scoring of the review		Max	Оценка
1.	Detailed evaluation of the Report given	3	2
2.	Detailed evaluation of the Opposition given	3	2
3.	Relevant questions to the Reporter asked in discussion	2	2
4.	Relevant questions to the Opponent asked in discussion	1	1
5.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills	1	1
	Sum of points:	10	8

Signature: _____

International Young Naturalists' Tournament

www.iynt2013.com

Personal protocol for a juror Natalia Borodina

Date	3.05	SF	3	Group	D	Stage	2	Problem	4

ID	515	Team	SAMANYOLY	Reporter	

Scoring of the Report		**Max 16**	**Grade**
Contents of the report (theory and experiment)			
1.			5
2.			1
3.			6
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.	Overall impression	4	1
9.	Quality of the presentation, relevance	3	2
10.	Discussion with the opponent (if no discussion maximal score)	4	1
11.	Discussion with the reviewer (if no discussion maximal score)	1	–
12.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills	1	–
13.	Concluding remarks of the Reporter	1	–
	Sum of points:	30	16

ID	509	Team	EGO GENERATION	Opponent	

Scoring of the opposition			**Max**	**Grade**
1.	Contents well analysed:	strong sides highlighted	3	3
2.		considerable shortcomings noted	3	3
3.	Conclusions challenged		2	1
4.	Quality of the opposition		3	1
5.	Quality of the presentation, relevance		2	2
6.	Discussion with the Reporter: relevant questions asked		2	2
7.	: understanding of the problem understood		2	1
8.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills		2	–
9.	Discussion with the reviewer (if no discussion maximal score)		1	1
		Sum of points:	20	14

ID	509	Team	EGO GENERATION	Reviewer	

Scoring of the review		**Max**	**Оценка**
1.	Detailed evaluation of the Report given	3	3
2.	Detailed evaluation of the Opposition given	3	3
3.	Relevant questions to the Reporter asked in discussion	2	1
4.	Relevant questions to the Opponent asked in discussion	1	–
5.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills	1	1
	Sum of points:	10	8

Signature: _____

International Young Naturalists' Tournament

www.iynt2013.com

Personal protocol for a juror Alexander Sigeev

Date	09.05	SF	3	Group	D	Stage	2	Problem	4

ID	515	Team	Samanyolu	Reporter	

Scoring of the Report		Max 16	Grade
Contents of the report (theory and experiment)			
1.	Performed measurements of conduct	5	3
2.	Quant data, theory, read references	5	1
3.	Correctly ident samples	6	5
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.	Overall impression	4	2
9.	Quality of the presentation, relevance	3	1
10.	Discussion with the opponent (if no discussion maximal score)	4	1
11.	Discussion with the reviewer (if no discussion maximal score)	1	0
12.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills	1	0
13.	Concluding remarks of the Reporter	1	1
	Sum of points:	30	14

ID	509	Team	Eco generation	Opponent	

Scoring of the opposition			Max	Grade
1.	Contents well analysed:	strong sides highlighted	3	2
2.		considerable shortcomings noted	3	2
3.	Conclusions challenged		2	1
4.	Quality of the opposition		3	2
5.	Quality of the presentation, relevance		2	1
6.	Discussion with the Reporter: relevant questions asked		2	1
7.	: understanding of the problem understood		2	2
8.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills		2	1
9.	Discussion with the reviewer (if no discussion maximal score)		1	1
		Sum of points:	20	13

ID	509	Team	Eco generation	Reviewer	

Scoring of the review		Max	Оценка
1.	Detailed evaluation of the Report given	3	3
2.	Detailed evaluation of the Opposition given	3	3
3.	Relevant questions to the Reporter asked in discussion	2	1
4.	Relevant questions to the Opponent asked in discussion	1	1
5.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills	1	0
	Sum of points:	10	8

Signature: _____

International Young Naturalists' Tournament

www.iynt2013.com

Personal protocol for a juror Evgeniy Oleinik

Date	3.05	SF	3	Group	D	Stage	2	Problem	4

ID	515	Team	SAMANYOLU	Reporter	~~Berfin~~ ~~Eyüpcan~~ Beyza Doğan

Scoring of the Report		Max 16	Grade
Contents of the report (theory and experiment)			
1.	Performed measurements of conductivities	5	2
2.	Compared quantitative data, offered theory, read refer.	5	~~3~~ 2
3.	Correctly identified data	6	4
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.	Overall impression	4	2
9.	Quality of the presentation, relevance	3	1
10.	Discussion with the opponent (if no discussion maximal score)	4	1
11.	Discussion with the reviewer (if no discussion maximal score)	1	0
12.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills	1	0
13.	Concluding remarks of the Reporter	1	0
	Sum of points:	30	12

ID	509	Team	ECO GENERATION	Opponent	

Scoring of the opposition		Max	Grade
1.	Contents well analysed: strong sides highlighted	3	2
2.	considerable shortcomings noted	3	3
3.	Conclusions challenged	2	1
4.	Quality of the opposition	3	1
5.	Quality of the presentation, relevance	2	1
6.	Discussion with the Reporter: relevant questions asked	2	2
7.	: understanding of the problem understood	2	2
8.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills	2	1
9.	Discussion with the reviewer (if no discussion maximal score)	1	1
	Sum of points:	20	14

ID		Team		Reviewer	

Scoring of the review		Max	Оценка
1.	Detailed evaluation of the Report given	3	2
2.	Detailed evaluation of the Opposition given	3	2
3.	Relevant questions to the Reporter asked in discussion	2	2
4.	Relevant questions to the Opponent asked in discussion	1	1
5.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills	1	1
	Sum of points:	10	8

Signature: Oleinik

International Young Naturalists' Tournament

www.iynt2013.com

Personal protocol for a juror Guram Mikaberidze

Date	03.05	SF	3	Group	D	Stage	2	Problem	4

ID	515	Team	Samanyolu	Reporter	~~Betul Tyigun~~ Reyza Doğan

Scoring of the Report Contents of the report (theory and experiment)		Max 16	Grade
1.			5
2.			2,5
3.			3,~~5~~
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.	Overall impression	4	1
9.	Quality of the presentation, relevance	3	1
10.	Discussion with the opponent (if no discussion maximal score)	4	0
11.	Discussion with the reviewer (if no discussion maximal score)	1	0
12.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills	1	0
13.	Concluding remarks of the Reporter	1	0
	Sum of points:	30	13

ID	509	Team		Opponent	Dimitriu Eugeniu

Scoring of the opposition			Max	Grade
1.	Contents well analysed:	strong sides highlighted	3	1,5
2.		considerable shortcomings noted	3	2
3.	Conclusions challenged		2	1
4.	Quality of the opposition		3	~~1,5~~ 2
5.	Quality of the presentation, relevance		2	2
6.	Discussion with the Reporter: relevant questions asked		2	2
7.		: understanding of the problem understood	2	1
8.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills		2	1
9.	Discussion with the reviewer (if no discussion maximal score)		1	0,5
		Sum of points:	20	13

How do you know?

ID	509	Team		Reviewer	Raischi Mihaela Lana

Scoring of the review		Max	Оценка
1.	Detailed evaluation of the Report given	3	3
2.	Detailed evaluation of the Opposition given	3	2
3.	Relevant questions to the Reporter asked in discussion	2	0
4.	Relevant questions to the Opponent asked in discussion	1	0
5.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills	1	1
	Sum of points:	10	6

Signature: _____

International Young Naturalists' Tournament

www.iynt2013.com

Personal protocol for a juror Sertaç EROĞLU

Date	03.05.2013	SF	3	Group	20	Stage	1	Problem	9

ID	509	Team	ECO GENERATION	Reporter	Vladlena HORNET

Scoring of the Report		**Max 16**	**Grade**
Contents of the report (theory and experiment)			
1.	Compared various fertilizers based on their physical and chem. prp.	8	5
2.	Application of the fertilizers	8	5
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.	Overall impression	4	3
9.	Quality of the presentation, relevance	3	2
10.	Discussion with the opponent (if no discussion maximal score)	4	4
11.	Discussion with the reviewer (if no discussion maximal score)	1	1
12.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills	1	1
13.	Concluding remarks of the Reporter	1	1
	Sum of points:	30	22

ID	515	Team	SAHANYOLU	Opponent	Betül İYİGÜN

Scoring of the opposition			**Max**	**Grade**
1.	Contents well analysed:	strong sides highlighted	3	2
2.		considerable shortcomings noted	3	1
3.	Conclusions challenged		2	1
4.	Quality of the opposition		3	1
5.	Quality of the presentation, relevance		2	1
6.	Discussion with the Reporter: relevant questions asked		2	1
7.		: understanding of the problem understood	2	2
8.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills		2	1
9.	Discussion with the reviewer (if no discussion maximal score)		1	1
		Sum of points:	20	11

ID	515	Team	SAHANYOLU	Reviewer	Verda SAĞLAM

Scoring of the review		**Max**	**Оценка**
1.	Detailed evaluation of the Report given	3	2
2.	Detailed evaluation of the Opposition given	3	2
3.	Relevant questions to the Reporter asked in discussion	2	1
4.	Relevant questions to the Opponent asked in discussion	1	1
5.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills	1	1
	Sum of points:	10	7

Signature: _____

International Young Naturalists' Tournament

www.iynt2013.com

Personal protocol for a juror Natalia Borodina

Date	3.05	SF	3	Group	D	Stage	1	Problem	9

ID	509	Team	EGO GENERATION.	Reporter	

Scoring of the Report Contents of the report (theory and experiment)		Max 16	Grade
1.			8
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.	Overall impression	4	2
9.	Quality of the presentation, relevance	3	2
10.	Discussion with the opponent (if no discussion maximal score)	4	2
11.	Discussion with the reviewer (if no discussion maximal score)	1	1
12.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills	1	–
13.	Concluding remarks of the Reporter	1	1
	Sum of points:	30	16

ID	515	Team	SAMANYOLY ~~BAHCESEHIR~~	Opponent	

Scoring of the opposition		Max	Grade
1.	Contents well analysed: strong sides highlighted	3	1
2.	considerable shortcomings noted	3	1
3.	Conclusions challenged	2	1
4.	Quality of the opposition	3	1
5.	Quality of the presentation, relevance	2	1
6.	Discussion with the Reporter: relevant questions asked	2	1
7.	: understanding of the problem understood	2	1
8.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills	2	–
9.	Discussion with the reviewer (if no discussion maximal score)	1	–
	Sum of points:	20	7

ID	515	Team	SAMANYOLU	Reviewer	

Scoring of the review		Max	Оценка
1.	Detailed evaluation of the Report given	3	1
2.	Detailed evaluation of the Opposition given	3	1
3.	Relevant questions to the Reporter asked in discussion	2	1
4.	Relevant questions to the Opponent asked in discussion	1	–
5.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills	1	–
	Sum of points:	10	3

Signature: Нбор

International Young Naturalists' Tournament

www.iynt2013.com

Personal protocol for a juror Evgeniy Oleinik

Date	3.05.	SF	3	Group	D	Stage	1	Problem	9

ID	509	Team	Eco Generation	Reporter	Vladlena Hornet

Scoring of the Report		Max 16	Grade
Contents of the report (theory and experiment)			
1.	Compared various fertilizers on their physical and ch	8	5
2.	Application of the fertilizers	8	3
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.	Overall impression	4	2
9.	Quality of the presentation, relevance	3	1
10.	Discussion with the opponent (if no discussion maximal score)	4	3
11.	Discussion with the reviewer (if no discussion maximal score)	1	1
12.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills	1	1
13.	Concluding remarks of the Reporter	1	1
	Sum of points:	30	17

ID	515	Team	SAMANYOLU	Opponent	Betul Iyigun

Scoring of the opposition		Max	Grade
1.	Contents well analysed: strong sides highlighted	3	2
2.	considerable shortcomings noted	3	1
3.	Conclusions challenged	2	0
4.	Quality of the opposition	3	1
5.	Quality of the presentation, relevance	2	1
6.	Discussion with the Reporter: relevant questions asked	2	1
7.	: understanding of the problem understood	2	0
8.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills	2	0
9.	Discussion with the reviewer (if no discussion maximal score)	1	1
	Sum of points:	20	7

ID	515	Team	SAMANYOLU	Reviewer	Verda Saglam

Scoring of the review		Max	Оценка
1.	Detailed evaluation of the Report given	3	1
2.	Detailed evaluation of the Opposition given	3	0
3.	Relevant questions to the Reporter asked in discussion	2	1
4.	Relevant questions to the Opponent asked in discussion	1	0
5.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills	1	0
	Sum of points:	10	2

Signature: Oleinik

International Young Naturalists' Tournament

www.iynt2013.com

Personal protocol for a juror Alexander Sigeev

Date	07.05	SF	3	Group		Stage	1	Problem	9

ID	509	Team	Eco generation	Reporter	Vladlena Hornet

Scoring of the Report		Max 16	Grade
Contents of the report (theory and experiment)			
1.	Comparing various textil. phys/chem props	8	4
2.	Application of fertilizers	8	2
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.	Overall impression	4	3
9.	Quality of the presentation, relevance	3	2
10.	Discussion with the opponent (if no discussion maximal score)	4	3
11.	Discussion with the reviewer (if no discussion maximal score)	1	1
12.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills	1	1
13.	Concluding remarks of the Reporter	1	1
	Sum of points:	30	17

ID	515	Team	Samanyolu	Opponent	Betul Iyigun

Scoring of the opposition			Max	Grade
1.	Contents well analysed:	strong sides highlighted	3	1
2.		considerable shortcomings noted	3	2
3.	Conclusions challenged		2	0
4.	Quality of the opposition		3	1
5.	Quality of the presentation, relevance		2	1
6.	Discussion with the Reporter: relevant questions asked		2	1
7.		: understanding of the problem understood	2	0
8.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills		2	1
9.	Discussion with the reviewer (if no discussion maximal score)		1	1
		Sum of points:	20	8

ID	515	Team	Saman yolu.	Reviewer	Verda Saglam

Scoring of the review		Max	Оценка
1.	Detailed evaluation of the Report given	3	1
2.	Detailed evaluation of the Opposition given	3	0
3.	Relevant questions to the Reporter asked in discussion	2	1
4.	Relevant questions to the Opponent asked in discussion	1	0
5.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills	1	1
	Sum of points:	10	3

Signature: _____

International Young Naturalists' Tournament

www.iynt2013.com

Personal protocol for a juror Guram Mikaberidze

Date	03.05	SF	3	Group	D	Stage	1	Problem	9

ID	509	Team	Eco Generation	Reporter	Vladlena Hornet

Scoring of the Report		**Max 16**	**Grade**
Contents of the report (theory and experiment)			
1.			6
2.			1
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.	Overall impression	4	3
9.	Quality of the presentation, relevance	3	3
10.	Discussion with the opponent (if no discussion maximal score)	4	4
11.	Discussion with the reviewer (if no discussion maximal score)	1	1
12.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills	1	0
13.	Concluding remarks of the Reporter	1	1
	Sum of points:	30	19

ID	515	Team	SAMANYOLU	Opponent	Betül Tyigün

Scoring of the opposition		**Max**	**Grade**
1.	Contents well analysed: strong sides highlighted	3	3
2.	considerable shortcomings noted	3	3
3.	Conclusions challenged	2	0
4.	Quality of the opposition	3	1
5.	Quality of the presentation, relevance	2	0
6.	Discussion with the Reporter: relevant questions asked	2	1
7.	: understanding of the problem understood	2	0
8.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills	2	0
9.	Discussion with the reviewer (if no discussion maximal score)	1	1
	Sum of points:	20	9

ID	515	Team	SAMANYOLU	Reviewer	Verda Saglam

Scoring of the review		**Max**	**Оценка**
1.	Detailed evaluation of the Report given	3	0,5
2.	Detailed evaluation of the Opposition given	3	0,5
3.	Relevant questions to the Reporter asked in discussion	2	0,5
4.	Relevant questions to the Opponent asked in discussion	1	0,5
5.	Quality of the discussion, polemics skills	1	0
	Sum of points:	10	2

Signature: _____

YOUNG NATURALISTS' TOURNAMENT
ESKIŞEHIR
APRIL 30 – MAY 5 2013

FIGHT ATTENDANTS' PROTOCOL (2-team Science Fight)

Date	03.05	SF	3	Group	D	Problems	9,4

Table # 1. History of earlier Science Fights (indicate the IDs and the numbers of the problems)

ID	Team's name	Appearance as:			Rejections
		Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	
509	Eco Generation	7	6	3	
515	SAMANYOLU	5	8	3	

Table # 2. Challenges, rejections and sequence of roles (indicate the IDs and the numbers of the problems)

Stage	Challenge	Rejection	Team ID	Team ID
1	9		Reporter	Opponent Reviewer
2	4		Opponent Reviewer	Reporter

Table # 3. Jurors' grades (G)

Name of the juror	ID 509			ID 515			Signature
	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev	
1. Serbes Erdoğlu	22	14	8	11	11	7	
2. Natalia Borodina	16	14	8	16	7	3	
3. Evgeniy Obelnik	17	14	8	12	7	2	
4. Alexander Sigeev	17	13	8	14	8	3	
5. Guram Mikaberidze	19	13	6	13	9	2	
6.							
7.							
8.							
9.							
Average grade (P)							

To calculate the average grade (P) the two extreme grades (min and max) are removed and replaced with their arithmetic mean. The mean of all grades is then calculated and rounded with a precision of 0.1.

Table # 4. Resulting grades of the teams (rounded with a precision of 0.1)

ID	Name of team	RC	Appearance as:			Sum	Place
			Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer		
509	Eco Generation						
515	SAMANYOLU						

Fight assistant _____ / _____ / **Chairperson** Guram Mikaberidze/

Jurors for SF3

Note: rooms have amended labeling

A

Jeyhun Jabarov (chair, TL)
Ismail Kiran
Marina Sergeeva
Ersin Karademir
Sergey Sabaev (TL)
Dina Izadi (TL)

B

Louis De-La Rey Heins (chair, TL)
Ekaterina Mendeleeva
Pinar Aytar
Hakan Dal
Diana Kovtunova (TL)
Siarhei Seniuk (TL)

C (2 teams)

Mladen Matev (chair, TL)
Ilya Martchenko
Alina Astakhova
Emel Algin
Boras Boljiev (TL)
Timothy Timur (TL)

D (2 teams)

Guram Mikaberidze (chair, TL)
Ahmet Cabuk Sigeev Alexander
~~Mehmet Sahin~~
Natalia Borodina (TL)
Evgeniy Oleinik (TL)
Celalettin Baykul (Serkaç ERÖĞLU)

E

Valentin Lobyshev (chair)
Dursun Eser
Alexander Mamoiko
Ozge Ozsen
Igor Evtodiev (TL)
~~Alexander Sigeev~~

F

Vladimir Vanovskiy (chair)
Naime Arslan
Ayset Yurt
Sergey Zelenin (TL)
Antoaneta Nikolova (TL)
Fatih Akai (TL)