

Questions

To: All Candidates

From: Boris

1. What is your highest priority for the IAM for the next few months?

Charifa Souissi (*Note from Election Team: answers came in after deadline*): My priority is for the World Memory Championship as it would be the first one after the pandemic.

Mohamed Ramadan:

1. Attempting to expand and spread the memory sport in the Arab world.
2. Contribute to setting the rules for competitions supervised by IAM, and a number of other topics such as arbitration, partners and others.

Don Michael Vickers: The promotion of memory sports in North America and throughout the world. Also, to develop ways to bring younger people into the sport. I believe memory sports has a great opportunity to provide great value for entertainment and for education

Andrea Muzii: I applied because I think there are a lot of things to work on and to improve. So I do not see a unique priority since the aspects to work on are many (ease processes for organizers, having more competitions, better PR work, better integration and officialization of ML, clear paths to follow for newcomers, clear rules in terms of arbitring...).

Summing up I believe the priority is to decide how to deal with all these aspects by making a proper plan to follow in the next few months to implement everything that has to be implemented.

Guillaume Petit-Jean: My priority is to help the IAM team to organize the next international live and online events and to make sure we can get as much help bringing the community together and making sure these events are a success. I also want to get familiarized with the team and the different aspects of the role of a board member.

Johannes Mallow: My highest priority is to make the transition from the old board to the new one as smooth as possible by continuing with our weekly meetings to get all new members on board. In these meetings we should define our urgent tasks as well as long term goals. I would like to establish a working system where everyone can bring in their strength and do things they like to do even if they are not on the board.

Nathalie Lecordier (candidacy withdrawn) (*Note from Election Team: answered together with question #9 - Answer will be duplicated in this document*): I believe these questions are too closely related to answer separately.

After giving new board members time and opportunities to find their feet, it is important to restart championships. The break has given us the opportunity to consider whether there are parts of the system that need to be rebuilt rather than just changed. One such part is the

system of arbiters and organisers that needs to be strengthened to be able to make live championships of all types possible throughout the world. The arbiting team is working on this.

Different competitors have different needs and while some may enjoy high-participation competitors, others may prefer smaller championships. There must be room for diversity and inclusion and we cannot do that with one size fits all championships.

Simon Reinhard: The highest priorities I see are:

- world championship organization
- getting more volunteers for all the areas we are working on (Arbiting, PR, IT, ML supervisors etc...)
- getting more tournaments running after those long pandemic years
- increasing the number of national associations in order to have more organizers and to reach more people
- improving the digital aspects of our competition software (automated result gathering and uploading would be great)

Sven Wetzel: For me personal as part of the software team:
The easier handling of event data.

That includes: generating the data, entering the results and presenting the results.

Make clear what is defined as cheating. Especially in the digital form.

2. How much time do you plan to dedicate to this volunteer role?

Charifa Souissi (*Note from Election Team: answers came in after deadline*): The idea is not to dedicate a number of time, but to be available mainly in the different instances: Board meetings for example and for each new subject which occurs adding to that the principles tasks assigned.

Also, as we have channels for discussion in Slack it makes the availability easier.

Mohamed Ramadan: From 2 to 6 hours per week for the next two years.

Don Michael Vickers: I must get into details about my work schedule to answer this as accurately as possible, when I work my normal job, I work 2 weeks on 2 weeks off, working 12 hours a day with very poor internet. When I am away at work, I could manage an hour a day but I am also training 1 hour a day. So for that I will say, during the 2 weeks I work: 3 hours per week. When I am home on my days off, I will have lots of time, though I am beginning a new role where I will teach memory techniques to children, this is a part time role, so I will still have plenty of time. In my time off, I am willing to commit 8 hours per week to compensate for my lack of availability while I am not on my work rotation.

Andrea Muzii: It depends on what's necessary to do. I'll say at least on hour per week, as

mentioned in the rules. Probably more in the first weeks since I've a lot to propose.

Guillaume Petit-Jean: I am lucky because I have a flexible schedule and I have experience as a board member of an association. I am willing to dedicate one hour per week to this role if I am elected and I am ready to increase this time if needed when special occasions occur.

Johannes Mallow: It is not a matter of pure time to me. It's rather a matter of doing things consistently and ongoing in order to get a good rhythm.

Nathalie Lecordier (candidacy withdrawn): There are too many unknowns to be able to answer such a question clearly and accurately, as the previous term shows. None of us could have expected a pandemic that would last the whole of our term.

Flexibility is required but so is the ability to say no at times. Balancing one's other commitments with the sometimes changing needs of a volunteer role given that both may be affected by curve balls is a very fine art.

However, based on what I was able to do in the last term I would say 15 – 45 minutes a day in an average week to keep abreast of the major mareas I am involved in on Slack and an hour or two more for meetings with the board or the arbiting team. However, there have been so many non-average weeks, that it is difficult to even calculate a meaningful average, as in the last two years there have been weeks with a 0-5 hour input and others with a good 15-20 to respond to the aforementioned changing needs.

There is possibly an overlap with arbiting to a greater extent than as a competitor. An arbiter who is a board member needs to bear that in mind when making a decision as an arbiter and to consider the implications of an individual decision as part of the greater picture, so to a certain extent being both an arbiter and a board member can occupy most of one's waking day when out in arbit.

Simon Reinhard: As much as necessary to get things done. Sometimes that can be quite significant, e.g. regarding the world championship, but things need to be done and we must bring things forward.

Sven Wetzel: First I would say 8H/week.
This can be raised depending on the needs for that position.
That I am at the moment not fully aware of.

3. How much time do you expect from other board members to commit?

Charifa Souissi (Note from Election Team: answers came in after deadline): I expect that every member do the same as I want to do, if each one do a task and is available, work would be easier and with better quality.

Mohamed Ramadan: At least 2 hours per.

Don Michael Vickers: I understand things come up, and people are busy with work and their

own personal lives. I suspect like myself, the other applicants will be more available on some weeks than others. I expect an honest effort and to at least reach 2 hours per week when possible.

Andrea Muzii: I expect at least one hour per week, more at the beginning as I previously mentioned.

Guillaume Petit-Jean: It is difficult to say because we all have different lives and schedules. I am wishing other board members will contribute on a weekly basis but from my previous experience I also know that people invest as much time as they possibly can and that we all have different priorities. It is not a problem to have different involvements from members when we are talking about unpaid and voluntary work. To me, anyone willing to spend time and putting effort in such a role is already a big win for the association and the community.

Johannes Mallow: I expect from all of us in the board that we get this one hour meeting each week running. This plus what it needs to do specific tasks.

Nathalie Lecordier (candidacy withdrawn): They are volunteers with their own strengths, needs and commitments. I would not presume to tell others how long their piece of string is. It was hard enough defining my own!

Simon Reinhard: Everybody has their own commitments and responsibilities, of course. I will be happy if they invest time to advance things and if some cannot do this because of private or job reasons, even for longer stretches of time, then this is simply the way things are and everybody will accept that.

Sven Wetzel: I expect that time that is needed to complete their projects/tasks. That includes also to get in contact with others of the board.

When you want a number, I would say 1 Hour/Month.

4. Whom would you give your vote for chairperson of the board?

Charifa Souissi (*Note from Election Team: answers came in after deadline*): To the person who has most time to handle all the instances and of course had the required wisdom to lead the board to take the best decision.

Mohamed Ramadan: I will vote for Simon Reinhard.

Don Michael Vickers: While I respect the qualifications and applications of all other board applicants, the choice for me is Simon Reinhard. Simon, has the experience, knowledge and passion to be the perfect choice for chairperson. I have also seen videos of Simon speaking and he commands the room eloquently, when Simon speaks you hang on to every word. Simon is a true leader.

Andrea Muzii: -

Guillaume Petit-Jean: I believe my vote might go to Andrea Muzii for his dedication, his hard

work and the great communication and recognition he is giving our sport.

Johannes Mallow: Running the IAM is a huge responsibility and a hard job and I know that it was often not visible to people outside the board what is going on and what everyone was contributing. Simon has done a great job to keep things running and without him there wouldn't have been much at all. Someone who has the overview and always keeps pushing himself back to the track even when things seem to stand still is needed for this position. I would vote for Simon again.

Nathalie Leeoordier (candidacy withdrawn): Firstly, this would depend on whom was elected. Secondly, even elected representatives are entitled to exercise their own judgement in accordance with their conscience.

Nevertheless, I do have clear ideas as to what I believe constitutes a good chairperson in a situation that requires being both a representative and a leader. For example if a board member needs to be aware that personal comments may be taken as representing the whole organisation, a chairperson needs to be even more vigilant. Leadership of such a diverse group includes skills such as bringing the best out of each member while having an overall vision.

Simon Reinhard: I have been chairperson during the current term and I would have the intention to stand again if I am elected and if the newly elected members would be in favor of that. But I am sure that everybody else would do a great job in that position.

Sven Wetzel: I would vote for Simon Reinhard.
Without him I would not be part of the IAM.

To: those who compete themselves as memory athletes

From: Boris

5. Do you see a possible conflict of interest if you are a board member and decide/discuss on rules of the sport or details such as prize money distribution? If yes, how do you plan to deal with that?

Charifa Souissi (Note from Election Team: answers came in after deadline): Actually, I am not competing as I am more concentrate in arbiting.

Mohamed Ramadan: Yes, it happens because we are human and may sometimes act for our own good. If that happens, I will try to look at it from the side of the public interest and its impact on the future of the sport as a whole, and if I can't, I can avoid discussing this matter and I prefer that, to make a decision not aimed at personal interest.

Don Michael Vickers: Interesting question here, as I have yet to compete in person yet. While my skills are growing as an athlete, I believe I can only compete with the best players in the Words events. This is potentially a conflict of interest but I believe in this discussion for prize money, I would look at the more experienced members who have been there before to

help me on this subject, such as Simon.

Andrea Muzii: I don't see conflicts. Actually I think that an athlete can better understand what are the needs and the things to work on since ultimately the goal is to improve the competitor's experience (and learn things for organizers).

If there are aspects that are clearly in conflict (like price money distribution) I'm ready to take a step back in these discussions.

Guillaume Petit-Jean: I have never seen it as a problem to be a competitor and on the board as long as the discussions for rules and prize money are done in a group. This is why we have these elections and we have a board and not just one leader taking all the decisions. Having been part of many discussions already regarding rules and organization, I have seen how much people on the board take these topics seriously and how much they sometimes disagree. I don't feel it's an issue. I do believe however we should be careful as a competitor when we take decisions on the spot, like during a match and especially if we are directly involved. I would for example recommend that a competitor would remove himself from any discussion pertaining to one of his match or a competition he's part of.

Johannes Mallow: In a rather small organization with a few people constantly trying to work things out it is not possible to exclude anyone who is willing to help. So competitors will organize competitions in the future as well. So from this point of view there might be always a potential conflict of interests. However with guidelines and keeping in mind the main interest of the IAM, namely bringing the sport forward, everyone should be able to decide if he/she might have this conflict and if he/she therefore takes him/herself a bit back in a specific situation. Beside this we should continue by asking a wider range of people for their opinion on crucial topics.

On a personal note: As being a competitor, organizer, supervisor and broadcaster for such a long time I feel quite confident about separating between an objective or a personal perspective. I have, can and will make decisions against my personal interest if it fits the main purpose of the IAM and the sport better. I encourage everyone out there to remind me of that if I'm not doing this.

Nathalie Lecordier (candidacy withdrawn): I would actually feel more strongly about this question than about how much time people spend, as such conflicts of interest affect the whole community, whereas different people can spend very different amounts of time and still contribute greatly. Notwithstanding, competitors contribute invaluable insights and the board of an organisation such as ours needs to be able to see issues from more than one angle.

Simon Reinhard: That is of course not an easy question to answer. When there was no IAM, there was the old federation. A lot of things were bad there. People discussed among themselves, nobody from the athlete community was part of it. Then the athletes managed to pressurize the old leadership into adding an athlete representative to their gremium. I was very happy that Boris, who is asking this question, proposed me for the role when he was still president of MemoryXL, thank you for your trust back then. What I learned in that role was that it is vital to have the athlete perspective heard during discussions. Arbiters and organizers focus on completely different matters which might at times be impractical or

even harmful to competitors because they do not take crucial things into account.

In the IAM Board, we have organizers, arbiters and competitors. everybody is providing their unique perspective. Not having competitors allowed during rule discussions would leave an important aspect out. For larger rule changes, the Board is consulting the memory community about their opinion. We did that for example before the introduction of the new Images discipline and for the IAM Level system and much valuable feedback was given.

In the end, it will always be about trust: if a voter trusts a person to have their best interests in mind, then they should vote for them. We are all doing this as volunteers, without payment, and are investing large amounts of our spare time because we wanted to create and want to maintain something better than what came before.

Regarding prize money distribution, in the discussions that I recall, every athlete was in favor of a flatter prize money distribution, even though that would maybe reduce the share they might get, because a flatter distribution is better for all athletes. We have also regularly mentioned to organizers that travel packages (not necessarily for the best athletes, but e.g. for a number of persons per region) would be a good thing. Prize money should allow as many people as feasible to attend an event. It would be a good thing to treat prize money distributions similar to significant rule changes in the future and involve the memory community in that topic and ask them what kind of distribution they prefer, in particular with regards to the World Championship.

Sven Wetzel: You can go the strict way and forbid such conflict. But that would mean to cut out persons that burn for memory sport. In my eyes that would be sad.

As I understand the goals of the IAM, the rules are needed to be decided in a democratic way.

Alone of that fact we solve a part of the problem:
I can only propose rules.

Also the rules exist to give everybody the same chance to win.
That concept should not be changed.

To: all previous board members (Charifa, Mohamed, Nathalie, Johannes, Simon)

From: Boris

6. Thank you for being on our previous board. As for the whole World, it certainly have been tough two years. In your opinion, how did the IAM board perform? What went well and what not so much? What did you learn?

Charifa Souissi (*Note from Election Team: answers came in after deadline*): Yes it was tough two years, many situations were to handle especially when an event must to be done on site

and we have to respect health measures for instance, but in the main time, I see that it was the opportunity to test the remote work in organization, arbiting. Also testing events non ranked.

Mohamed Ramadan: Yes, they were two very difficult years, but I think that the memory has developed a lot in these two years, and we were able to hold many competitions remotely and set the rules that govern their integrity, such as

1. Remote MLC.
2. IAM African Open.
3. IAM Egypt Open.
4. World Tour.

I think we are going in the right direction to make remote competitions more like live competitions.

Johannes Mallow: I think that everyone was affected hard by the pandemic. It was not clear how championships would work at all and how we could still run them. The World was a bit "frozen" and I think so was the board too. In the last 6-12 month things were taking off more and more and with the digital World Tour the IAM and its members implemented a totally new concept that gave people from around the World the chance to compete again and even produced a World Champion with Alex Mullen. More regular meetings as we have done them in the last couple of month will help the next board to work on our vision in a more consequent way.

Nathalie Lecordier (candidacy withdrawn): Yes, it has been tough at times, really tough, and for each of us in different ways. And yet, I feel we were creative, we worked well with Memory League to create and run innovative events and we are now moving forward with physical championships again.

What went well? Communication has improved and thereby cooperation. We have been able to improve our use of Slack, not only for discussions amongst ourselves but to make preparation for championships far more efficient for example. Written communication helps record keeping and gives greater flexibility when communicating with board members in other time zones. On a personal level, this has enabled me to be more active in day-to-day discussions.

And yet, it would be dishonest to see all positive performance purely as a group effort. Individuals add their own spark, such as Johannes getting the World Tour on its feet and the arbiting team helping me to preserve my sanity.

The downside? Sometimes it was tempting to spend more time than intended on board activities but on the whole I have learnt to plan my time better, even when I had to spend most of the day at my computer.

Being a bit technologically challenged is probably a terminal condition, but on the whole I am probably less challenged than I was 2 years ago.

Simon Reinhard: It definitely have been two very hard years for everybody and I think it is a testament to the potential of mankind that we have managed to develop vaccines and that

people have managed to stay mostly rational and patient during this marathon of a pandemic.

The Board consists, not very surprisingly, of human beings. We are all impacted by the negative effects of the pandemic. That led to a decrease in activity. Fewer meetings, fewer updates. I am not proud of that because we had intended to inform the memory community more often about what we are doing. We always wanted to be an open association and not something where everything happens behind closed doors. Since a few weeks, we are meeting again and we are also publishing updates and summaries about those meetings in the News section of our homepage iam-memory.org. It feels like, just in time for Spring, things are moving again :).

What I am proud of is that we, despite it feeling harder to get things done in the current global environment, managed to realize Hannes' great idea of the Memory League World Tour. In addition to the few memory tournaments that were possible to hold during the pandemic, this online cooperation with our friends of Memory League (Simon Orton, Josh Cohen, Issa Cohen) gave the exciting Memory League format a whole new structure with a world ranking, a League and four big tournaments that everybody had a chance to qualify for. It was much work and I have personally, like many other members, invested much time to make this happen and we are all very happy how it turned out.

7. In its first post the previous board promised: "The board continues to prioritise transparency in our work and resolves to share regular updates with the memory community." Do you think this promise to the community was kept with one update from the board and four tournament related posts in those two years?

Charifa Souissi (*Note from Election Team: answers came in after deadline*): As already said, it was tough two years. No one expected things would be like what it was at the beginning of the term. As we just began, a pandemic began also, so we had new unexpected challenges to handle. In meantime, I think it was more than one update published if this what you mean and also it was non ranked events adding to those ranked like Remote African Memory Championship. Adding to that, our contribution on Memory league events since April 2020 as it was the main online activity serving the community during this period.

This means also that it was big learning done to see what to improve to be more visible to the community.

Mohamed Ramadan: It was fulfilled but not all the time.

A few posts have been published, but we must not forget that there is, for example, a complete file that was prepared and discussed for the rules of the World Tour last year. Memory in the presence of COVID-19 and others.

Johannes Mallow: Dear Boris, thank you for simulating a wider range of possible kind of press questions. First of all I think that the phrase "but you promised" might work better in a more private or let's say family based context. I'm pretty sure you have heard or will hear these words more often in the next 1-2 decades. However in a more professional context I think it's rather that we set our self goals and announce them to show people what we are

aiming for. So let me rephrase your question before answering it in a way I would like to communicate with people when I would be on the next board again:

"In its first post the previous board set the following goal: "The board continues to prioritise transparency in our work and resolves to share regular updates with the memory community." This morning I carefully checked your website: I just found one board and four tournament related posts there and I feel it is obvious that you didn't quite achieve your self set goal to share regular updates with the memory community What do you think about this and how do you think you can improve on this in the future?"

Dear Boris, thank you for this question. I think you are right and I'm not happy that we didn't do more in this regard. I think this is a good reminder that we need to improve on our communication channels. However please also take into account that we are all volunteers who were also facing consequences of the last two years pandemic in our jobs and our private lives. I would like to add that on our FB page there have been several updates on competitions from organizers and the community. By moderating the page I feel that the board contributed to these updates even though it didn't post them by itself. However more visible communication activity is something we should work on. For this but also other things not only board members but everyone is welcome to offer their help.

One idea that came to my mind would be a regular Zoom session which people from the community can attend asking their questions directly to 1-2 board members. Maybe once a month would be possible.

Nathalie Lecordier (candidacy withdrawn) (*Note from Election Team: answered together with question #8 - Answer will be duplicated in this document*): It's often possible to do more than one actually did but is the alternative of offering to do next to nothing in order to have no promise to break really any better? On the other hand, like many leaders elected before March 2020, we did not promise explicitly to do our best for the memory sports community through an unprecedented global situation.

Now, however, we can work on having more to report and learn from our experience of online championships to consider to what extent online competitions can be supervised sufficiently carefully to ensure fair and accurate results.

Simon Reinhard: I would like to refer to my answer to question 6 on that one. Already before this question was asked, we had started to hold weekly meetings again and are providing summaries. We have all the intention to do better in the future :).

To: All Candidates

From: Sylle

8. What do you think would be ways of going from the covid-time PR drought (having competitions results and even new World Records not being reported) to having a more efficient way of informing members of memory-related news and reaching for new

audiences?

Charifa Souissi (*Note from Election Team: answers came in after deadline*): I think we can work on a special posts or updates adding to the board meeting updates

Mohamed Ramadan: I saw a big glitch in this matter recently and I think we should work on it more to make all updates happen as soon as possible.

Don Michael Vickers: Greater social media presence of the IAM accounts, posts and videos congratulating those with new records and if the record holder is willing to conduct an interview with them to be posted on our social media accounts. I also think it would be great to send out a monthly newsletter informing members of memory-related news, new records, events, tips, techniques, interviews with athletes etc.

I also believe that it is odd we have a much higher number of males in our sport compared to females, despite having some incredible female athletes (Katie Kermode, Munkhshur and Enkhshur Narmandakh, Rowaa Ashraf, Sayaka Hokazano, Celine de Luca, Melanie Hollein, Ewelina Pres, etc), I am sure there are many others who I either forgot or are not memoryleague players. If I am being honest, I am unsure of how to attract more females to our sport, but it is clear that gender doesn't matter in our sport and we should promote the accomplishments of these incredible female athletes.

To reach new audiences, I believe our community should engage in publishing difficult/fun challenges such as Braden Adams memorizing 70 decks of Cards or Sylvain Arvidieu memorizing a deck of cards in ice cold water in Sweden(you are a mad man), memory sports are fun, let's display that to the world. Perhaps a monthly challenge.

I believe that a lot of people who see what we do believe we simply have a "photographic" memory and that they cannot do what we can do. However, we know with training and techniques we can accomplish amazing memory feats, we need to find a way to demonstrate the basics of what we do to these people who believe it cannot be done. My suggestions:

- A volunteer "trainer" at these events to teach memory basics.
- Promotional materials to get started, for example "memorize 50 digits of pi with the major system".

Andrea Muzii: I think it's a good idea to assign roles to specific people. So to have for example 1/2 board members in charge of PR stuff which is definitely something that was neglected in these past two years.

If an activity is supposed to be done by anybody the result is often that nobody do that since it's not specifically required for him to do that.

Guillaume Petit-Jean: I believe communication and staying in touch with the community is key. I feel that we could do more as an international association to use the existing channels at our disposal to better communicate with our members and the memory community as a whole. I can see that things are looking up and that many event are being planned or taking place already this year which is great news. Most of the community these days and IAM members are either on Memory League or Artofmemory forum. I think the IAM should use

these great platforms for official communications and make sure important information and records are brought to everyone's attention. Facebook is getting less and less mainstream, other social networks require almost a full time job. From what I have seen, Memory League and AOM forum are the place to be and where people really go regularly.

Johannes Mallow: The IAM website should be more up to date and of course we should play our current social media channels better. For that we need motivated people who are enjoying writing stuff or creating material. Furthermore I think creating a list of all possible resources we have in the memory sports community could help us to find new ways to reach more people. We are many people from around the World and many of us have contacts to the media or other resources. Why not bringing these together? Also having more coverage from live competitions could help to raise the awareness for the sport.

On a personal side note: I will try to contribute to this by myself by growing my own channels on YT and Twitch.

Nathalie Lecordier (candidacy withdrawn) (Note from Election Team: answered together with question #7 - Answer will be duplicated in this document): It's often possible to do more than one actually did but is the alternative of offering to do next to nothing in order to have no promise to break really any better? On the other hand, like many leaders elected before March 2020, we did not promise explicitly to do our best for the memory sports community through an unprecedented global situation.

Now, however, we can work on having more to report and learn from our experience of online championships to consider to what extent online competitions can be supervised sufficiently carefully to ensure fair and accurate results.

Simon Reinhard: That is true. We need a larger PR team with more people shouldering tasks, so that if a few have problems to handle tasks due to own obligations, others can help out. Expanding the circle of helpers will be crucial in the coming weeks to enable the new Board to hit the ground running.

Sven Wetzel: For the competition results I would refer to the easier entering of the event data (like results) - see answer of question 1.

My observation is that we have a good pr team.

The shift to be mostly online has hit almost everybody hard.

That changed the pr market and the interests of persons.

Therefore we should look what is now in use.

And if we need to look in other media and/or platform to promote the news and make cross references.

This way we reach new audiences and members.

9. What would you strive for the most: having high-participation competitions, having a lot more live competitions every year or having a high density of high-performing athletes at selected competitions (continental and world events)?

Charifa Souissi (*Note from Election Team: answers came in after deadline*): I guess it is difficult to choose just one of these suggestions, the better is a combine between all of them.

Mohamed Ramadan: What matters to me in the first place is quality and integrity, not numbers of competitors or competitions, the number will increase with time if we maintain fair play and free competition.

Don Michael Vickers: Having more live competitions, specifically in North America, where the sport needs to grow. While it is great to have our best compete, I am more concerned about growth. In addition, I'd like to see more disciplines marketed towards kids, one idea I have here is to rework Words to make them simpler for kids, in a specific Kids Words event (nouns, simple adjectives like blue, tall etc.). I believe it is important to reach this market so we can continue to grow now and in the future.

Andrea Muzii: I think having more live competitions is the best thing since (if combined with a good PR work and improvements on other aspects) the other things will probably follow.

Especially if we have live ML competitions since ML is clearly the most populated part of Memory Sports and following this path can be an optimal solution to have more participants, spectators, competitions, sponsors...

Guillaume Petit-Jean: I think the two of them go hand in hand. The more competitors attend a competition, the more chances we have of a high standard and great champions being there breaking records. I think reaching big numbers and having a high headcount for continental and world events reflects a lot on our community and the public perception of our sport.

Regarding the number of live competitions: it's hard to control this outcome as most competitions and national initiatives launched by either individuals or national associations. The IAM can of course help these competitions with data sets, organisation and arbiters but the IAM itself cannot organize the whole event.

I believe the IAM should focus its efforts on the world championship (and the World ML tour to some extent), which are the most competitive and well-known events linked to the IAM.

Johannes Mallow: To spread the word more we need both. We need more live and regional competitions to give more people the chance to start and experience the sport. On the other hand we need high achievers and super stars to attract people to go to these competitions in the first place. As long as we have the capacities in terms of venue space, arbiters etc. I'm fine with having many people in a World Championship. However I believe that quality is needed as well to grow the sport.

In addition I think online competitions like we had them in the last year have the biggest potential to go viral at some point.

Nathalie Leeordier (candidacy withdrawn): I believe these questions are too closely related to answer separately.

After giving new board members time and opportunities to find their feet, it is important to restart championships. The break has given us the opportunity to consider whether there are parts of the system that need to be rebuilt rather than just changed. One such part is the system of arbiters and organisers that needs to be strengthened to be able to make live championships of all types possible throughout the world. The arbiting team is working on this.

Different competitors have different needs and while some may enjoy high-participation competitors, others may prefer smaller championships. There must be room for diversity and inclusion and we cannot do that with one size fits all championships.

Simon Reinhard: All of these are desirable goals: high participation and a high density of high-performing athletes will make it easier to attract media interest and thus maybe also sponsorship for organizers, in turn again allowing better competitions for everybody. And having more live competitions would mean more opportunities for people to get to know the sport and to develop their own passion for it, like us. I think all those goals are interconnected, and coupled with an expansion of the capabilities of our competition software, we should strive for all of them to provide athletes around the world with a great way to experience memory sports.

Sven Wetzel: I would strive for a mix of the options.

Live competitions are part of memory sport.
I see them as good pr in the sense:
come and see what you are able to do.

More (live) competitions can mean more overlapping of competitions.
Or the changing of the length of competitions.

A point to take into this discussion at the moment is that we are not able to say how the political events affect travelling.

High-participation is the key to spread the word about the memory sport.

And also to have high performer in events.

But to set the focus only to high performer would mean to violate a goal of the IAM:
to bring memory sport to everybody.
A new person would possibly not want to compete against only the high performer.