

HONENS PIANO COMPETITION

JURY RULES & MANUAL
2018 HONENS PRIZE FOR PIANO

27 August 2018
© 2018 Honens

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
HONENS INTERNATIONAL PIANO COMPETITION.....	1
THE COMPLETE PIANIST.....	1
COMPETITION PROCESS	1
Application Process	1
Quarterfinals: International Audition Round	1
Semifinals	2
Finals	2
Pianist Feedback Meetings	2
COMPETITION PRIZES	2
Cash Awards.....	2
Artist Development Program.....	2
JURY FACILITATOR	3
OFFICIAL MATHEMATICIANS	3
JURIES	3
Applicant Screening Jury.....	3
First Jury: Quarterfinals	3
Second Jury: Semifinals and Finals	3
SCORING AND RANKING SYSTEM	4
RULES GOVERNING JURIES	4
Jury Room and Meetings.....	4
Jury Etiquette.....	4
Jury Confidentiality	5
Conflict of Interest	5
Communication between Jurors and Pianists	5
Alternates.....	5
VOTING PROCEDURES	6
Applicant Screening Jury.....	6
First Jury: Quarterfinals	7
Second Jury: Semifinals and Finals	9
CONTINGENCIES	11
Addition of Special Prizes	11

HONENS INTERNATIONAL PIANO COMPETITION

The Honens International Piano Competition takes place every three years as part of the Honens Festival. The Competition searches for an emerging Complete Pianist—a 21st century artist for 21st century audiences. The Honens Prize Laureate is awarded \$100,000 CAN and an artistic and career development program valued at a half million dollars—the largest prize of its kind.

THE COMPLETE PIANIST

The Complete Pianist is a thoughtful interpreter, a consummate collaborator, an awe-inspiring virtuoso, a communicator, a risk-taking explorer, a dreamer. He/she expresses and interprets ideas from a wide cultural context and keen imagination through performances and programming choices that are informed and seasoned by a fascination for life outside the practice studio. The Complete Pianist inspires the heart and engages the intellect.

The Honens Competition discovers this unique, imaginative and informed pianist—an emerging Complete Pianist whose distinctive voice, versatility and ease as communicator demonstrate that he/she is ready for a professional career.

The Complete Pianist's interpretations are founded upon the intellectual and emotional understanding of musical text and upon his/her ability to synthesize and express such understanding so as to challenge and stir both the intellect and the emotions of the listener. This creative awareness stems not only from knowledge of a particular composition itself but, equally importantly, from a wide knowledge of related music, of musical literature as a whole, and of the other arts including, but not limited to, the visual and literary. If the resulting interpretation appears unusual and unconventional it appears so freshly and naturally. Artists taking part in the Honens International Piano Competition must also express—through their stage deportment, program design and interviews with arts journalists—sensitivity to contemporary culture and a willingness and ability to communicate effectively with audiences of today.

COMPETITION PROCESS

Application Process

Application submissions are accepted until 30 November 2017. Applicants are evaluated on their proposed Competition programming, experience relative to age and confidential reference letters. Fifty pianists are chosen to advance to the Quarterfinals.

Quarterfinals: International Audition Round

Quarterfinalists perform a 40-minute public recital in Berlin and New York City. Each pianist must perform music for solo piano from the repertoire submitted in his/her application and take part in a 10-minute English-language interview by an arts journalist. Performances and interviews are video-recorded under as similar conditions as possible. Ten pianists are chosen to advance to the Semifinals.

Semifinals

Ten Semifinalists each perform a 65-minute solo recital and a 55-minute recital that includes duo collaborations with an instrumentalist and a singer. Pianists choose their own repertoire for the solo recital; they must choose from a prescribed list of programs for the collaborative recital. Three pianists advance to the Finals.

Finals

Three Finalists perform twice: one performance with a wind ensemble and a second performance with orchestra. Pianists choose their program of chamber music from a prescribed list and may choose to perform any concerto composed after 1760. An arts journalist conducts a 15-minute English-language interview with each pianist.

Pianist Feedback Meetings

Pianists remain in Calgary for one day after the Finals to discuss questions of their own technique and musicianship with members of the Jury, publicists and arts managers.

COMPETITION PRIZES

The Honens Prize for Piano—the largest cash award and most comprehensive artistic and career development program in the world of international music competitions—is presented to one exceptional pianist who best represents the philosophy of the Complete Pianist. Only one Honens Prize Laureate is named each Competition; ties are not permitted.

All ten pianists invited to Calgary as Semifinalists are eligible to receive a cash award as long as they stay through to the Competition's conclusion and take part in feedback meetings.

Cash Awards

Honens Prize Laureate (one) \$100,000 CAD	Audience Award (one) \$5,000 CAD
Finalists: Raeburn Prizes (two) \$10,000 CAD each	Semifinalists (seven) \$2,500 CAD each

Artist Development Program

The Honens Prize Laureate is awarded an artistic and career development program valued at a half million dollars (CAN). The program includes: worldwide representation for three years; debut recitals in career-building markets that have previously included Berlin, London, Munich, New York, Paris and Toronto; residencies at The Banff Centre to prepare repertoire for recordings and special projects; coaching and mentorship opportunities with established touring artists and production; and production, release and promotion of a professional recording. The Artist Development Program is tailored to the Honens Prize Laureate's goals with input from Honens' administration and advisors.

JURY FACILITATOR

Honens' Artistic Director or equivalent acts as Jury Facilitator. He/she has the right at any time to remind Juries of criteria for the choice of pianists and prizewinners in order to maintain the integrity of the process and of the Competition. He/she may invite discussion at any time. He/she is a voting member of the Applicant Screening Jury, but may not vote during any subsequent stage of the Competition.

OFFICIAL MATHEMATICIANS

One or two Official Mathematicians monitor and regulate the voting process and scoring procedures to ensure absolute fairness. They attend deliberations of First and Second Juries and assist the Jury Facilitator in conducting a perfectly fair Jury process. They do not vote and are not invited to discuss pianists with the Juries. The Jury Facilitator may ask the Official Mathematician(s) to lead discussions on topics of scoring or voting procedures, and to clarify scores and the information that they convey about pianists' rankings.

JURIES

The Honens Juries include concert pianists and other individuals from the musical world who play a meaningful role in a concert artist's career. These include: artist managers, collaborative musicians, concert and festival presenters and producers, conductors and recording professionals. All jurors have extensive knowledge of the piano literature and represent and/or are aware of the qualities an artist must possess in order to build and sustain a career in today's musical world.

Applicant Screening Jury

The Applicant Screening Jury, made up of four members including Honens' Artistic Director or equivalent, evaluates candidate applications based on proposed Competition programming, experience relative to age, and reference letters. After evaluations are made independently through Honens' online application platform, the Jury meets by teleconference to confirm the 50 pianists chosen to advance to the Quarterfinals.

First Jury: Quarterfinals

The First Jury, made up of four members, meets at The Banff Centre for a week to evaluate the 50 Quarterfinal recitals and candidate interviews. The Jury selects ten pianists to advance to the Semifinals.

Second Jury: Semifinals and Finals

The Second Jury, made up of seven members, selects the three Finalists and the Honens Prize Laureate from Semifinals and Finals performances, and the Finals interview with an arts journalist. The Competition's guest collaborating artists—the Semifinals instrumentalist and singer and the Finals collaborative wind ensemble and orchestra conductor—meet with the Jury during deliberations of their respective rounds to give impressions of each pianist prior to scoring. They are invited to discuss the entire collaborative experience—from rehearsal through performance.

SCORING AND RANKING SYSTEM

Honens' scoring and ranking system was specially devised by Dr. Ernest Enns, Professor Emeritus of Mathematics and Statistics at the University of Calgary, and Dr. Moses Renert, Founder of Renert School in Calgary. It ensures results that give equal weight and equal voice to each juror.

Jurors score each performance and interview separately. Scores are weighted and converted to rankings. Scores are not carried forward from the Application Screening to the Quarterfinals, nor from the Quarterfinals to the Semifinals. Scores in the Semifinals and Finals are combined for a cumulative ranking.

Quarterfinals scores are weighted as follows:

Recital: 90%

Interview: 10%

Semifinals and Finals scores are weighted as follows:

Semifinals solo recital: 30%

Semifinals collaborative recital: 30%

Finals chamber music recital: 15%

Finals concerto performance: 15%

Finals interview: 10%

RULES GOVERNING JURIES

The following rules ensure that the Honens Competition is as fair as possible and that it leads the competition world by reputation. Should any of the following rules be broken, the Jury Facilitator may, at his/her discretion, relieve a Jury member of his/her duties and/or disqualify a pianist or pianists taking part.

Jury Room and Meetings

All official Jury meetings are closed except to jurors, the Official Mathematician(s), interpreters if needed, the Jury Facilitator and the Director of Career & Competition Planning or equivalent. Jurors may not invite guests to join Jury meetings or, in the case of the Second Jury, into the designated Jury meeting room under any circumstance. The collaborating artists from the Semifinals and Finals also attend their respective deliberation meetings. The official language of Jury meetings is English.

Jury Etiquette

Jurors must remain silent and undemonstrative during Competition performances. The Applicant Screening Jury sees all materials that are submitted by applicants. The First and Second Juries see only each pianist's biography, age, nationality and performance program as printed in the official Jury binder and the official Competition program book. Jurors may not research any pianist in advance of the Competition. It is the responsibility of each juror to make and keep comprehensive notes about all Competition performances in his/her binder. The notes should be designed to help both at the time of voting and, in the case of the Second Jury, at the meetings with pianists on the day following the presentation of awards.

Jury Confidentiality

Jury proceedings are confidential. Jurors may not discuss any aspect of proceedings or of pianists' performances with each other or with other persons except during the official meetings. Others present at Jury proceedings are prohibited from discussing any aspect of proceedings with anyone at any time. It is the responsibility of the Jury Facilitator to announce the decisions of the Second Jury after the Semifinals and Finals.

Individual and/or composite votes may not be publicly disclosed. Nothing written in the binders by Jury members may be publicly disclosed before, during or after the Competition. The binders and their contents remain the property of Honens and will be destroyed immediately after Quarterfinals and Finals deliberations.

Conflict of Interest

Should any juror have or have had previously a professional or personal relationship with a pianist whose application or recorded or live performance he/she is judging, he/she must notify the Jury Facilitator prior to his/her respective stage of adjudication. It will be the responsibility of the Jury Facilitator to rule whether the member should or should not vote on that pianist's performance, taking into account the closeness and time of such relationship. In a case where the relationship is or has been that of regular or occasional teacher and student within the previous five years, the Jury Facilitator must rule that the member may not vote on that pianist's application or performance. The Jury Facilitator will inform the remaining jurors of any declaration of conflict, whether or not it is ruled as such.

Communication between Jurors and Pianists

There will be no communication of any kind between Jury members and Competition pianists until the announcement of the Honens Prize Laureate.

All members of the Second Jury remain in Calgary for the morning following the conclusion of the Competition in order to provide feedback to the pianists. Jurors are free to share their knowledge and expertise as they see fit, and the pianists have the opportunity to discuss with individual jurors questions relating to their own technique and musicianship.

Should a pianist attempt to communicate with a member of any Jury, either during or prior to the announcement of the Laureate, said juror must inform the Jury Facilitator. The pianist in question may be subject to disqualification at the discretion of the Jury Facilitator.

Alternates

The First Jury chooses three alternates in ranked order, one or more of whom may be invited to the Semifinals should any pianists chosen withdraw. Honens notifies the alternate pianists as soon as the Jury has made its decision, and asks for immediate confirmation of acceptance as an alternate.

VOTING PROCEDURES

Jurors vote by secret ballot using the online application scoring system and/or official ballot papers. The process at each deliberation meeting is based on the 'Optimal Jury Scoring System' copyright number 459777 by Ernest Enns and Moses Renert, and is monitored and regulated by the Official Mathematician(s) to ensure absolute fairness.

Applicant Screening Jury

Applications must be complete, as stipulated in the Application Manual, in order to be presented to the Applicant Screening Jury. Applications are treated as confidential. Each juror evaluates online application submissions independently. The Jury meets for a briefing by the Jury Facilitator before evaluating applicant submissions and again after completion of the independent evaluations for final deliberations. Jurors may take part in these meetings by teleconference.

The voting and tabulating procedures follow:

1. Each juror receives 'evaluator' login credentials for the Competition's online application platform. Jurors score each pianist's application independently using the natural numbers 1 to 50, 1 being the score for a pianist who has, in the juror's opinion, the least to recommend him/her, 50 for one who he/she feels best represents the Competition's artistic philosophy and appears to ready to embark on a professional career in music. Each juror decides his/her own scale of grading without reference to other jurors; however, scores must be kept within the set numerical parameters. Decimal scores are not allowed; there will therefore inevitably be ties in each individual juror's scores.
2. Once all applications have been evaluated, by a deadline set and communicated to the Jury by the Jury Facilitator, Honens' Director of Competition & Career Planning (or equivalent) provides all scores with names of eligible pianists ('the slate') to the Official Mathematician(s).
3. If the Jury Facilitator has ruled that any juror is ineligible to vote for a particular pianist because of a prior relationship, the Official Mathematician(s) will calculate a score for that pianist. He/she will do this by evaluating the ranking of that pianist as if the juror in question had not scored any of the pianists. The Official Mathematician(s) will then assign scores to the juror's ballots that will maintain the same ranking. This maintains the integrity of the scoring and ranking process both for the pianist concerned and for all other candidates.
4. After scoring all candidates, the Official Mathematician(s) converts the results of the combined scores, including the ties, into rankings.
5. The method of conversion from scores to ranks is as follows: the highest score of each juror receives rank 1, the second highest score rank 2, and so on. When ties arise, as they inevitably will, the scores are given equal rank in such a way as to preserve the ranking of those with ranks above and below. For example, if the fifth, sixth and seventh highest scores of a juror are tied, each will receive rank 6, i.e. the average of ranks 5, 6 and 7. The eighth highest score of that juror will then receive rank 8. Similarly, if the first and second highest scores are tied, each receives rank 1.5. The next highest score receives rank 3.
6. The Official Mathematician(s) creates two slates, the first containing 36 names, the second 24 names. To create these slates, the Official Mathematician(s) writes in order the names of those pianists that appear in the top ranking of the majority of the jurors, then those in the top two rankings, then those in the top three rankings of the majority of the jurors and so on until an ordered list of 60 names has been obtained. The names of the first 36 pianists, in alphabetical order, are the 'first slate' and they are invited to take part in the Quarterfinals. The remaining 24, in alphabetical order, form the 'residual slate'. The Official Mathematician(s) gives the names on both slates to the Jury in advance of its deliberation meeting.

7. At the deliberation meeting, the Jury Facilitator asks each juror whether there is a pianist not on either slate whom he/she feels strongly ought nevertheless to be considered. Each juror has the right to add one name to the residual slate. (Assuming all four jurors nominate an additional pianist, the number of names on the residual slate will reach a maximum of 28. Fourteen pianists are ultimately chosen from the residual slate to take part in the Quarterfinals, bringing the total to 50 in all.)
8. The Jury Facilitator invites each juror who has added a name to state briefly why the added pianist ought in his/her view to be considered. The Jury Facilitator may also invite general discussion on the added or other pianists if he thinks it appropriate.
9. Each juror receives a ballot paper containing the names of the pianists on the residual slate. He/she then scores the pianists on the slate using the natural numbers 1 as the lowest to 20 for the highest possible score. Ties are allowed.
10. Each juror gives his/her unsigned residual slate ballot paper to the Official Mathematician(s) who combines the results and produces a list in ranked order of those ranking in the top 20.
11. The names of the pianists ranking in the top ten of the residual slate ballot are added to the initial list of 36 from the first slate ballot, and they too are invited to take part in the Quarterfinals, now making a total of 46.
12. The Jury Facilitator invites discussion of the remainder, i.e. those who ranked 11 to 20. If the Jury wishes to re-order the ranking, then the Jury Facilitator will call for a vote by show of hands to determine the final ranking. Should no majority be attained, the ranking reached by the original vote stands.
13. The names of the top four ranked pianists chosen by this final process are added to the 46 already chosen, to make the required total of 50.

First Jury: Quarterfinals

The First Jury views the 50 Quarterfinal recital and interview videos, and chooses ten pianists to advance to the Semifinals.

The voting and tabulating procedures follow:

1. When viewing of videotaped performances and interviews have been completed, each juror receives two ballot papers, each containing the names of all pianists reviewed (the 'slate'). One ballot is used for scoring the 40-minute solo recital, the second is used for scoring the interview with an arts journalist.
2. Each juror scores the pianists on the slate using the natural numbers 1 to 30, 1 being the score for a pianist who has, in the juror's opinion, the least to recommend him/her, 30 for one of extremely high accomplishment. Each juror decides his/her own scale of grading without reference to other Jury members; however, scores must be kept within the set numerical parameters. Decimal scores are not allowed; there will therefore inevitably be ties in each individual juror's scores.
3. If the Jury Facilitator has ruled that any individual juror is ineligible to vote for a particular pianist because of a prior relationship, the Official Mathematician(s) will calculate a score for that pianist. He/she will do this by evaluating the ranking of that pianist as if the juror in question had not scored any of the pianists. The Official Mathematician(s) will then assign scores to the juror's ballots that will maintain the same ranking. This maintains the integrity of the scoring and ranking process both for the pianist concerned and for all the other competing pianists.

4. Each juror gives his/her completed, unsigned ballot papers to the Official Mathematician(s) who converts the results of the combined votes, including the ties, into rankings in accordance with the ballots. Scores are weighted 90% for the solo recital and 10% for the interview.
5. The method of conversion from scores to ranks is as follows: the highest score of each juror receives rank 1, the second highest score rank 2, and so on. When ties arise, as they inevitably will, the scores are given equal rank in such a way as to preserve the ranking of those with ranks above and below. For example, if the fifth, sixth and seventh highest scores of a juror are tied, each will receive rank 6, i.e. the average of ranks 5, 6 and 7. The eighth highest score of that juror will then receive rank 8. Similarly, if the first and second highest scores are tied, each receives rank 1.5. The next highest score receives rank 3.
6. The Official Mathematician(s) next creates two slates, one for the recital and one for the interview recital. These two components of the Competition are weighted 90% and 10% respectively and are thus combined into a single slate. The Official Mathematician(s) takes this combined slate and from it constructs two lists. The top seven ranked pianists are from the 'first slate'; these pianists are named Semifinalists. The next six names (those pianists ranking 8 to 13) form the 'residual slate'. Both slates are presented to the Jury in alphabetical order.
7. The Jury Facilitator asks each juror whether there is a pianist not on either slate whom he/she feels strongly ought nevertheless to be considered. Each juror has the right to add one name to the residual slate. (Assuming all four jurors nominate an additional pianist, the number of names on the residual slate will reach a maximum of ten. Three pianists are ultimately chosen from the residual slate to take part in the Semifinals, bringing the total to ten in all.)
8. The Jury Facilitator invites each juror who has added a name to state briefly why the added pianist ought in his/her view to be considered. The Jury Facilitator may also invite general discussion on the added or other pianists if he thinks it appropriate.
9. Each juror receives a ballot paper containing the names of the pianists on the residual slate. He/she then scores the pianists on the slate using the natural numbers 1 as the lowest to 10 for the highest possible score. Ties are allowed.
10. Each juror gives his/her unsigned residual slate ballot paper to the Official Mathematician(s), who combines the results and produces a list in ranked order of those ranking in the top six.
11. The Jury Facilitator invites discussion of the list. If a majority of jurors decide that the ranking ought to be different, a reordering is allowable. The Official Mathematician(s) will list the possibilities that can change the final outcome. Voting on this list is by a show of hands. Should there be no majority, the ranking reached by the original vote stands.
12. The names of the top three ranked pianists chosen by this process are added to the seven already chosen, to make the required total of ten Semifinalists.
13. The remaining three pianists will be invited (in order of ranking) as alternates should a Semifinalist withdraw from the Competition. The Jury Facilitator invites discussion to determine if their ranking ought to be different (voting is by a show of hands). Should there be no majority, the ranking reached by the original vote stands. The names, in order, of the pianists chosen by this final process become the list of alternates.

Second Jury: Semifinals and Finals

The Second Jury evaluates the Semifinals and Finals performances and the Finals interview with an arts journalist to ultimately identify the Honens Prize Laureate. The Jury also provides valuable feedback to all pianists taking part in the Semifinals.

The voting and tabulating procedures follow:

1. Immediately after all Semifinal performances, the Second Jury convenes in the Official Jury Room, where it is joined by the Semifinals collaborating musicians. These artists are invited to share impressions of their collaborative experiences with each pianist, from first impressions and rehearsals through performances. Jurors may ask questions of the collaborative musicians but must keep their own impressions to themselves.
2. The collaborating musicians leave the Jury Room and jurors receive two ballots, one for the solo recital and one for the collaborative recital. Jurors score each pianist's performances on the respective ballots using the natural numbers from 1 (lowest possible score) to 20 (highest possible score). Each juror decides his/her own scale of grading without reference to other Jury members; however, scores must be kept within the set numerical parameters. Ties are allowed, which means that the same score may be assigned to more than one pianist. The same method of scoring is used for both ballots. The jurors give their completed, signed ballots to the Official Mathematician(s).
3. If the Jury Facilitator has ruled that any individual juror is ineligible to vote for a particular Semifinalist because of a prior relationship, the Official Mathematician(s) will calculate a score for that Semifinalist. He/she will do this by evaluating the ranking of that Semifinalist as if the juror in question had not scored any of the Semifinalists. The Official Mathematician(s) will then assign a score to the juror's ballot that will maintain the same ranking for the Semifinalist. This procedure maintains the integrity of the scoring and ranking process both for the Semifinalist concerned and for all other Semifinalists.
4. The Official Mathematician(s) analyzes the scores in the designated tabulation room. They start by converting the scores from the ballots for the solo recital and the collaborative recital into rankings. The Mathematician(s) uses a majority system to arrive at a ranked list of the Semifinalists. They then analyze the list to determine how close successive pianists are to each other in the jurors' scoring. Based on the proximity of the top rankings, the Mathematician(s) then place up to two pianists into the Finalists slate and up to four pianists into the Residual slate.
5. The Official Mathematician(s) presents the Finalists Slate and the Residual Slate to the Jury. The Jury Facilitator asks the Official Mathematician(s) to explain any special insights that arise from the scores and rankings.
6. The Jury Facilitator asks each juror whether there is a pianist not on either slate whom he/she feels strongly ought nevertheless to be considered as a Finalist. Each juror has the right to add one name to the Residual Slate.
7. The Jury Facilitator invites discussion on every Semifinalist on the Residual Slate, and gives the jurors equal opportunity to discuss each of these Semifinalists. Discussion of pianists on the Finalists Slate or of pianists who are not on either slate is not permitted. If a Semifinalist was added to the Residual Slate by a juror, discussion of that Semifinalist starts with the juror's brief explanation of why that Semifinalist ought in his/her view be considered.
8. After all jurors had the opportunity to share their views of the Semifinalists on the Residual Slate, each juror receives a ballot containing the names of all pianists on the Residual Slate. He/she then scores these pianists using the natural numbers from 1 (lowest possible score) to 10 (highest possible score).

9. Each juror gives his/her signed ballot to the Official Mathematician(s) who combines the results and produce a list in order of ranking. The Official Mathematician(s) presents the list to the Jury. The Jury Facilitator asks the Official Mathematician(s) to discuss any special insights that arise from the scores and rankings.
10. The Jury Facilitator invites discussion of the list. If a majority of jurors decide that the ranking ought to be different, a reordering is possible. The Official Mathematician(s) will outline the possibilities that can change the final outcome. Jurors then use a secret ballot to select their chosen possibility. Should there be no majority on the alternate possibilities, the ranking reached by the original vote stands.
11. The name of the top ranked pianist(s) chosen by this process is added to the existing Finalists Slate in order to obtain a list with three pianists.
12. At a time after the Semifinals, to be arranged by the Competition administration, the jurors convene to view the 15-minute videotaped interviews of the three Finalists with an arts journalist.
13. After viewing all interviews, each juror receives a ballot listing the names of the Finalists. He/she scores the interview using the natural numbers 1 (lowest possible score) to 5 (highest possible score). Ties are allowed. Each juror gives his/her completed and signed ballot to the Official Mathematician(s).
14. After the completion of the Finals round, the jurors convene in the Jury Room and are joined by the collaborating musicians and conductor of the Finals performances. The collaborative musicians and conductor are invited to share their impressions of each pianist, from first impressions and rehearsals through performances. Jurors may ask questions of the collaborating musicians and conductor but must keep their own impressions to themselves. Discussion is limited to 15 minutes. The collaborating musicians and conductor leave the Jury Room before scoring begins.
15. Each juror receives two ballots listing the names of the Finalists, one for the chamber music performance and a second for the performance of concerto. He/she scores the performances, taking into account the comments of the collaborating musicians and conductor, using the natural numbers from 1 (lowest possible score) to 5 (highest possible score). Each juror gives his/her completed, unsigned ballot papers to the Official Mathematician(s).
16. The Official Mathematician(s) tabulates the votes in a private, designated room while the Jury is free to discuss the performances that have just taken place. As before, the Official Mathematician(s) converts the scores from the Finals ballot papers into rankings. They then combine the rankings from the solo recital and collaborative recitals from the Semifinals, the chamber music and concerto performances from the Finals, and the Finals interview, weighting them 30%, 30%, 15%, 15% and 10% respectively, to produce a list of the three Finalists in ranked order, with whatever ties that may have appeared.
17. In order to maintain the integrity of the process and of the Competition, the Jury Facilitator reminds the Jury of criteria for the choice of the Honens Prize Laureate. The Official Mathematician(s) presents the ranked list of Finalists and discuss insights that arise from the scores and rankings.
18. The Jury Facilitator asks each juror whether there is a pianist whom he/she feels strongly ought to be considered Honens Prize Laureate instead of the pianist who has ranked first. Each juror has the right to suggest one name. The Jury Facilitator then invites discussion on the top ranked Finalist and any suggested Finalists, and gives the jurors equal opportunity to discuss all of these pianists in turn. If a Finalist in contention for the Honens Prize Laureate was suggested by one or more jurors, discussion of that Finalist starts with these jurors' brief explanations of why that Finalist ought in their view be considered.

19. Only one pianist will be named Honens Prize Laureate. The Official Mathematician(s) outlines the possibilities that can change the final outcome. Jurors then use a secret ballot to select their chosen possibility. Should there be no majority on any of the alternate possibilities, the ranking reached by the original vote stands.

CONTINGENCIES

Although the majority of contingencies have been covered in this Jury Manual, there may be instances when Juries or the Official Mathematician(s) find no specific direction on how to act. In such instances the Jury Facilitator has the authority to make a ruling to address the contingency, and in such instances the Jury Facilitator's ruling is final and irrevocable.

Honens will, from time to time, update the Jury Manual to ensure clarity and to maintain standards of equality and fairness. Updates will be posted at honens.com.

Addition of Special Prizes

The Board of Directors of The Esther Honens International Piano Competition Foundation may at its discretion decide to establish other special prizes. In such a case, the following procedure will be used for choosing the winner:

Each member of the Second Jury receives a ballot listing the names of all pianists eligible for the special prize. Each juror puts a mark beside the name of the pianist who he/she feels should win the prize. Each juror gives his/her completed, signed ballot to the Official Mathematician(s). The pianist with the most votes wins the prize and will be revealed to the Jury during the final deliberation preceding the presentation of awards. In the case of a tie, the Jury Facilitator calls for a run-off vote by secret ballot at the final Jury deliberations in order to establish a sole winner.