

World University Debating Championships 2004, Nanyang Technological University  
Pre-Council Meeting

Date: 28<sup>th</sup> December 2003

Time: 1.04 pm-

Attendance:

1. Change of Registrar

Chair informs council that appointed Registrar, Matt Charlesworth is unable to attend Worlds and has made an executive decision to appoint Rory McKeown in his place. There were no objections to this appointment.

2. Updates to nations voting status

Chair brought to the attention of council that the criteria used to determine voting status has altered a little in the past. The constitution states that changes happen based on attendance of 2 years (**insert from constitution**) but is ambiguous as whether that includes the current year of participation.

The contention was that the 2 year rule was instantiated to ensure that changes to voting status are made based on a consistent turnout and not temporary surges, and does including the current year dilute that purpose. However not including the current year ignores the current level of participation at that worlds and that is unfair.

Motion: The voting status of nations at any particular Worlds are to be decided by including the current Worlds that they are participating in.

Proposed: Malaysia

Seconded: Israel

Motion Passes unanimously

Updates to nations' voting status:

- a) Singapore moves up from C to B
- b) Bangladesh moves up from D to C
- c) China moves up from D to C
- d) Thailand moves up from D to C
- e) Botswana moves to D
- f) Netherlands moves down from C to D

Clarification of status and voting rights: nations are eligible to vote at council as long as they are at worlds. Attendance at Pre-Council is not a pre-requisite to that.

Move to close

Proposed: Canada

Seconded: Bangladesh

3. Institutional review

The convenor for NTU, Namrata Verma, proceeded with her report on the institutions participating at Worlds. She informed council that:

- a) All institutions had fulfilled the N-1 regulation
- b) There were no violations of the 4 year-rule (maximum number of worlds as a debater). However she stressed that this was done by comparing the registration list with the database available on Colm Flynn's debating website and is by no means exhaustive, as people may have changed their names (example used was Rory a.k.a Roderick a.k.a. R McKeown)

Even though the team cap was extended to 304 teams, there were still teams outside the tab who wanted to register. Some of them came to Singapore anyway to try their luck. Due to some last-minute pull-outs, all the teams who showed up at NTU were allowed into the tab. Nevertheless, these methods to put pressure on the organiser to expand the registration list is unfair to the organisers and doesn't help them with the tournament.

Australia : Melbourne university wishes to inform council and NTU that one of their debaters is unable to attend because he had been detained at Melbourne airport because his passport had expired. Melbourne wishes to alter their team lineup, to have 4 teams and 2 adjudicators. This will put them in violation of N-1.

New Zealand : There is still a chance this person will show up if the passport problem is solved. He can then enter the tab as an adjudicator. Thus this won't be setting a precedent of allowing N-1 violations.

Malaysia : These are extenuating circumstances which should qualify Melbourne for some leeway.

Ravi : From an adjudication perspective, it is not a problem that Melbourne sends 1 less adjudicator than it has to. Though NTU would like council's opinion on whether the circumstances are indeed extenuating enough for the rule to be waived.

Rory : This will be recorded, thus Melbourne cannot keep infringing this rule as it will reflect badly on them in the future.

Australia : Circumstances are indeed extenuating and in no way did Melbourne ignore the rule. (proceeds to produce a copy of the expired passport, as proof that situation could not be avoided).

Council agreed that Melbourne's situation was unique and thus NTU agreed to let them alter the team composition and debate without any sanction.

England : Questioned the legitimacy of the Australian Legal Workshop (ALW) as an institution, as defined by Worlds Constitution.

Amanda : Offered that the ALW is a separate course in the Australian National University (ANU), similar to an Inns of Court.

Netherlands : Observed that it is participated by students of ANU and degrees are from ANU, making it part of ANU.

New Zealand : Important to sort this out because if ALW becomes part of ANU, then ANU will be in violation of the N-1 rule.

A representative of the ALW is sent for to present his case to council.

Chair announced to council that as of now they were 2 bids for Worlds 2006. They were from MMU (contact person, Sumithra) and UCD L&H (Ciaran). There would be no presentations today, but bid materials would be passed out.

Israel : Need clarification in regards to bribes and deals as part of bids. Does offering DCAs constitute as a bribe?

Ireland : It is fair, as it is still part of the bid. It doesn't matter how many DCAs you have, council cannot regulate how you compose your bid. Also, we couldn't really do anything to punish or reprimand bidders even if we knew of deals.

Croatia : Redundant discussion, because there is no more or less legitimate reason to vote for a bid, be it a DCA or be it the weather.

-Discussion closed-

The Croatian rep reminded council that they have to finalise the ESL team list and highlighted its absence from the agenda. The chair apologised for this oversight and amended the agenda. However ESL registration had not ended and thus the final list was still not complete. ESL status had been accidentally omitted from the registration process, thus creating the necessity to do it on day 2. NTU admitted and apologised for this oversight and recommended to future hosts to ensure ESL status is included in initial registration details.

The delegates from the Australian Legal Workshop (ALW) arrived to clarify their status. Their representative, Andrew Jory, explained that the ALW has a separate function from the Australian National University (ANU) in that it provides an avenue for students there to practice their law in Canberra and produces a Diploma certificate to this effect. They do however lease buildings from ANU and has an administrative agreement with ANU, in terms of processing student registration and so on. Once one is enrolled at ALW, they cease to become students of ANU. They pay different fees and cannot represent ANU.

After a brief period of questioning, Council was satisfied that ALW was independent from ANU and there were no objections to allowing them to debate as a separate institution.

#### 4. ESL Status

There was a difficulty in confirming the ESL status of teams as people were still registering. After a short discussion on whether to cap the number of teams so that Council can start processing the list, Council decided this would be unfair to the teams who had not yet had a chance to register, since registration had only opened on that day.

The New Zealand rep suggested that once available the list of ESL teams should be distributed to all regional representatives and then Council could reconvene to confirm the status. This was however decided to be logistically difficult and an unnecessary effort for one item on the agenda.

The chair then proposed that the list of ESL teams currently registered be printed out and reviewed by council. If there are new additions to the list, the Chair will confer personally with the regional representative concerned to confirm the status. If there is a possibility that the list needs to be altered, the executive will confer and decide if council needs to convene again.

#### Results of ESL list confirmation

Changes : DSLU A was confirmed as NOT ESL

There was confusion as to the status of LSE, which was on the list. The registrar was assigned to personally investigate their status.

#### 5. Other business

Chair : Does council need to act on the issue of teams who even when unable to register, fly in to the competition and force the host to accept them?

New Zealand : Specific action is not required, the council should just support the host as it does it many other matters.

Council agreed no specific action was required.

Ireland : proposed discussion on principles of a tabbing system. Other than malfunctioning programs itself, most of the confusion in past tournaments stemmed from the lack of agreement on the principles of the system.

Chair : it is on the agenda for the main council meeting.

Israel : Proposed firstly discussion on extending the 4 year rule and secondly, discussion on “hidden costs” at worlds. There have been many incidents where participants upon arrival have been informed that they have many fees to pay other than their registration fee.

Chair : slated for next council meeting.

Main Council meeting

10.48 am

1<sup>st</sup> January 2005

Novotel Apollo Hotel, Singapore

ATTENDANCE:

1. Modification in Voting Status

Russia, who was absent at Pre-Council, is promoted to C Status (2 votes)

Slovenia drops to D (1 vote).

2. Status of Turkey

Council discussed the status of Turkey, who have no teams or adjudicators registered in the tournament, but have a delegate present. According to the delegate, they would've participated if the team cap had not been reached.

Ireland : Given circumstances they should have a vote. The 1 year lapse in a way recognises that the status of these countries is still active.

New Zealand : Constitution says only all participating teams may be represented at council.

England : One could set a precedence of creating useless votes – votes for teams that are not present at the tournament – and this could lead to abuse.

Ireland : No abuse because 1 year lapse still guarantees the number of votes they should have this year.

Womens : not choice to not participate, current circumstances made it difficult to participate. Thus the interest still exists and it is fair that this interest be represented at council

Netherlands : highlighted that Section 8 of the Constitution stated that every delegate present at Council be eligible to vote.

Israel : Council should encourage participation, since they are here, they should be allowed to participate and thus vote.

Ireland : The 1 year lapse was instantiated because council tried to balance the importance of being represented while recognising the difficulty in consistently sending teams to Worlds that is held in many different places around the world.

Malaysia : if there is no contribution to the championship per se, then it would be strange to still allow them a vote.

New Zealand : This could set a dangerous precedent. This could allow anyone off the street to represent a country, then walk into council meeting and vote.

Israel : No, this is different because Turkey has been represented at Worlds before and they did try to send teams for worlds this year.

Motion : to include Turkey in this year's Council Meeting.

Proposed : USA

Seconded : Canada

Motion falls by 35-32

### 3. Ratifying minutes of last year's council meeting

New Zealand : highlighted that his vote last year against a motion proposed by Israel was noted as in support, when it was actually against the motion.

Israel : Corrected the wording of a motion they proposed last year.

Move to ratify the minutes

Proposed : Israel

Seconded : Ireland

### 4. Stellenbosch Reports

The convenor of last year's worlds, Kevin Burden, was unable to attend due to family matters and thus the report was presented by Pierre, who apologised to council on behalf of Kevin.

He summarised the running of the tournament and stated that the tournament eventually ended on a loss of 200,000 Rand. They are currently in negotiation with the University administration to absorb this loss and assured council that it will not reflect on them.

He also cleared up an item on the budget with showed subsidies were provided for local teams. These were sourced wholly from sponsors contributions and were not paid for by other participants.

Australia : What does "marketing and printing" under the budget refer to?

Pierre : Signs, phamplets, banners, ballots.

Chair : What happened to the twin giant banners of faces?

Pierre : it was auctioned to recoup losses.

Womens : Bedding refers to?

Pierre : we bought new mattresses and pillows for all the participants as it was cheaper to do this than rent it from the university for 9 days. It was donated after the competition.

- discussion was concluded and Stellenbosh report passed unanimously.-

## 5. NTU report

Convenor Namrata Verma stepped up to present the report. She started by thanking people who had congratulated her on the efficacy of the competition and then went on to highlight the major problems faced by the organisers.

- after the team cap had been reached, many teams pushed very hard to still be included in the competition and this put unnecessary pressure on the organisers
- some teams dropped out after checking in with the attendance system and after the motions had been released. This caused delays as the organisers had to look hard for swing teams. In one round, they had to put in 5 swing teams.
- Some adjudicators dropped out and changed their status to observers, while a few were selective about which rounds they wanted to adjudicate and which ones they wanted off. This should be considered a violation of the N-1 rule and NTU would like it to be enforced in that if the adjudicators drop out, so should the teams.
- In regards to socials, organisers apologised for not being able to fulfill all demands of participants. They had some trouble at the hotel and the New Year's Eve party and this was unfair to the hosts.

Bangladesh : was the 300 team cap number set randomly or one that was based on logistical constraints?

NTU : we needed a number to work with in order to plan the logistics, so it was a bit of both.

Ireland : which are the institutions that flouted the N-1 rule midway during the tournament?

Neill (DCA) : Don't want to bring up the list because we don't want to have sanctions now. Just want to know how to respond, in case of future occurrences.

Ireland : The intention to have the list is not to punish, but to record for the future, to allow for a more solid basis for reaction.

Neill : The list is not necessary to for that. The need is to know how to react during the tournament

Bangladesh : We need to analyse the reasons behind these drop-outs and then make contingencies

NTU : Legitimate reasons were accepted (i.e. medical reasons) and expected. But there were many strange reasons, for example

- some teams were told by coaches that if they felt the going got too tough, then they could stop and quit
- some adjudicators dropped out because they felt they were too good to adjudicate rounds that they were allocated to

Malaysia : there is a need to devise a sanction or give the hosts the right to react in any way suitable, like for instance, dropping teams.

Israel : does dropping teams from the tournament make it harder or easier for the hosts? Because now they have to find swing teams.

England : we are taking too long on something we all agree is a problem.

Ntu : not asking council for a specific measure, just mandate to enforce N-1.

Chair : discussion taking too long. Hosts already have mandate and full rights to enforce N-1.

New Zealand : Questioned hosts on the absence of free or subsidised alcohol. Didn't realise alcohol was so expensive.

NTU : apologised for lack of information on that aspect

Japan : questioned why wasn't it brought to attention of participants that it was wrong to have discussions during prep time with people other than your teammate?

Neill : the panel decided that the educational aspect of conferring and discussing was more important and the unfair advantages it brought was negligible.

Japan : Had 3 responses

- a) this was brought up at council last year and was confirmed that joint preps were unfair
- b) if the focus is on educational benefits and not competitiveness, then why not allow computers
- c) this then becomes unfair to single teams (1 team only from that institution)

Neill : there is not explicit rule against a) while there is one against b). In regards to c), teams can prep with teams from other institutions.

Registrar : no basis to discuss it here, because rules don't explicitly spell it out. If there is intent to modify the rules, it must be done later.

Amanda (DCA) : would like to apologise to Sarfaraz, because they made a mistake and he was unfairly pushed down in the tab.



- Discussion ends and Council thanks hosts for a wonderful job –

## 6. Croatia presentation for bid confirmation

Presentation was by Convenor of Zagreb Worlds, Petar. He first announced the official dates of the competition to be from the 27<sup>th</sup> of December to the 5<sup>th</sup> of January, with participants leaving on the 6<sup>th</sup>. There would be a 2 day extension for participants to enjoy Croatia.

He went to list preparations done to that point

- they had organised a very successful Europeans and other large tournaments
- they had the support of the President of Croatia, University Senate, City of Zagreb and more
- the organising committee was finalised
- started negotiations with sponsors (big beer sponsor lined up!)
- there will be 3 meals a day, every day
- there were no immigration issues
- in regards to travel, they were working on flight subsidies
- the registration fee had to be increased though to 2000 Kunar, which was approximately 300 USD (up 50 USD from when the bid was put in)
- team cap is 400 teams
- website is [www.hadl.hr](http://www.hadl.hr)

Israel : there was a problem with food at europeans. Will that happen again

Petar : no, that was due to a mistake at the point when people were registering dietary preferences. Will not happen again.

Bangladesh : there is no Croatian embassy in Bangladesh and the nearest one is in India. There is a Slovenian embassy though, can a visa be arranged through them?

Petar : yes of course. We will look into it.

Registrar : Do you have a budget?

PP : Not here right now. But it is the same as the one presented last year during the bid.

Amanda : with 304 teams, we faced huge logistical burdens. What are you doing to prepare for 400?

PP : Not sure we will have 400, that is just an outer limit. Plus the N-1 rule will ensure we have enough adjudicators

Chair : What about team caps per institution?

PP : there will no team cap during pre-registration. During registration, there will be cap of three. If the tournament cap is not fulfilled, then it will be opened up to the other teams that pre-registered.

Iva : We ran the largest Europeans last year. there was a very extensive briefing and the timing of the competition was smooth. But if we feel we don't have enough manpower, we might get additional people.

England : Unworkable to not have team cap. Also, how to have confidence of CA when she didn't make the judges break this year?

PP : Iva has an extensive CV, and the N-1 rule will guarantee there will be sufficient judges.

Neill : there is a difference between having adjudicators (who might just be people who couldn't make the debating spots) and people who know their stuff. How do you plan to sort out the people, to go through their feedback or test papers and so on?

PP : There is a tab director and the software will do most of these sorting.

Netherlands : Without a cap, big institutions will send large contingents, which will make it difficult to sort chairs for panels. How do you plan to overcome this?

Iva : there were no complaints when we announced a limit of 400 last year. but if this is a problem now, it can be reduced.

Australia : What have you done specifically to train people?

PP : Must keep asking people to send experienced adjudicators, it's not just our burden to provide the best adjudication. We are currently working on perfecting the adjudication test. There will be feedback and all the other usual tools used by adjudication teams at worlds.

Womens : A question in regard to equity. How will you open up the 3 team cap after registration in a fair manner?

Ireland : if no cap, large institutions will send large groups and adj will be weakest, because he/she will be selected based on who the weakest speaker is. Since there is no financial burden, Croatia being so close, there will be a flood of these adjudicators.

PP : we want a good worlds for all. But if you send weak adjudicators, we will have to choose from those.

Iva : more than 1/3 of all adjudicators will be from IONA and we can expect many good judges from Great Britain.

Israel : if size is really an issue, then they have agreed that it can be reduced to match Singapore. Can we discuss lowering the rego for adjudicators?

Wales : discuss and decide categorically

- team cap
- institution cap
- chief adjudicator

malaysia : why should we change the status quo? Institutional caps ensure good judging.

Neill : issue is not just the cap. There is no response on how you are planning to deal with logistics in adjudication room, only response is that tab director will do it. Plus the non-existence of a budget, makes it very hard to put faith into them.

PP : we have the experience and have done it before. The budget is fine as most of the sponsors have already confirmed with us.

Amanda : her specific concern is that she doesn't think Iva can do the job.

England : Stated that they have no confidence in the ability of Croatia to do run an efficient tournament.

Israel : Similar issues were raised last year in regards to Singapore's bid. Iva has more experience than Ravi. If there are no problems with the DCAs, then it should be allowed to pass.

Amanda : Admitted there was similar discussion last year, but at the end of that meeting, council did have confidence in the Singapore adjudication team.

Registrar : There is no budget, how can we assess the progress and stability of the organisation. Can it really be possible that nothing has changed in a year?

PP : Apologised for lack of budget. Re-affirmed that all sponsorship was confirmed that there was very little to worry about.

Wales : Logistics can be sorted out, just problem with CA. Will you still run the tournament if the CA had to be changed?

Motion : No confidence in Croatia's bid

Proposed : England

Seconded : New Zealand

Proposal for silent ballots

Proposed : New Zealand

Seconded : Malaysia

Motion passes 40-21 with 3 abstentions

Netherlands : Difficult to run a fair re-bidding process, in view of short notice to other bidders and emotional tension in the room. Could council reconvene at a different time?

Canada : What time frame should we use to decide when the next meeting is to be held. Could we ask potential bidders how much time they need?

Croatia : announced to council that they do not intend to re-bid for 2005.

Neill : Agreed it had to happen another day, the overly emotional environment today might create prejudice against bidders.

Croatia : Clarified that they have thought it through and decided to not re-bid not because they were emotionally affected. Not re-bidding is the final decision.

Ireland : is it practically possible to have this meeting on another day?

Registrar : it can't be done today because country reps will need to consult with their teams.

Motion : reconvene tomorrow evening after quarterfinals

Proposed : England

Seconded : New Zealand

NTU : confirmed there will be time tomorrow for the meeting, as long as council members are willing to skip the social event.

Chair clarified that the special meeting will be just for the purpose of sorting out bids, for 2005 and 2006.

Ireland : asked for an expression of interest to bid for 2005 from anyone in the room. This was not to conduct the bid now, but just to evaluate the scene for tomorrow.

Malaysia : On behalf of Multimedia University Malaysia, if there are no other bidders for 2005, they will step up.

Ireland : L&H expresses that they will not be bidding for 2005.

Recess from 1.37 to 2.45

## 7. Ratification of adjudication guidelines

Chair explained that while there was an oral tradition for adjudication rules and standards, there were no explicit records of this anywhere and that created a lot of ambiguity. There is a need for a guideline, to be adopted by worlds council.

Chair presented to council a guideline that had been composed by Omar Sallahuddin, Praba Ganesan, Steve Johnson and himself.

Israel : There is no information in the document on how to prioritise different aspects of the debate.

Chair : We didn't want to put that in, because it might create prejudice against certain styles of debating.

Ireland : Do we really need to ratify or adopt these guidelines? Do we then restrict the evolution of Worlds debating, in that it becomes too rigid?

Chair : It is not to restrict the growth, but to address the necessity for a common understanding on the most basic principles.

South Korea : if the fear is indeed that it will too restrictive, then we can keep it general. This document will be very useful in developing new adjudicators.

South Africa : The guidelines can also be updated regularly to reflect whatever changes that have occurred. It will be useful for new and fresh adjudicators, older ones will most likely ignore these specific merits.

Registrar : We cannot make some adjudicators follow these rules and allow others to flaunt them. Teams will complain about double standards. Perhaps adjudication panels should devise their own guidelines, prior to each Worlds tournament.

Canada : Specific comments on document ; section 6 : the description there makes it seem like only 2 sides are involved in the debate (gov and opp). There is no acknowledgement of top and bottom halves.

Chair : Noted

Neill : good idea if adjudication panel released their guidelines every year, based on changes that happened the year before.

Motion : To ratify this document as official guidelines for adjudication

Proposed : USA

Seconded :Scotland

Move for Roll Call vote

Proposed : Malaysia

Seconded : Canada

Motion carries by 42 to 16 with 7 abstentions

Motion : Guidelines are to be discussed through whatever medium necessary and 1 month before the competition the updated version must be published for all to view.

Proposed : South Africa

Seconded : Malaysia

Motion carried unanimously

## 8. Official Tabulation System

NTU presented their tabulation software and discussed in detail how it works. It was designed based on tab principles outlined as Article 31, by Michael Smith. They then presented a demonstration of this software.

Issues highlighted during discussion about tab software

- is there a maximum limit on the number of teams?
  - no
- can it run on a remote server?
  - yes
- can you make changes to the teams after the draw is run?
  - No, you would have to edit the database directly through the back-end
- Will it highlight and point out mistakes?
  - yes
- how feasible is it to make modification if you want to use some other algorithm to perform the power pairing?
  - It is simple. You would just have to change 1 module.

Motion : WUDCC recommends the use of this tab for future rounds of this competition but hosts are not forced to use this.

Proposed : Ireland

Seconded : England

WUDCC offers official word of thanks to NTU tab team.

Michael Smith then explains his contribution, the codification of how to tab rounds. It would be a useful guideline for all hosts to follow, because if individuals kept redefining how to tab rounds, it could cause significant misunderstanding and chaos.

There was a short discussion on whether it would be better to rank teams based on speaker points and perform the draws that way, or to draw up the match-ups randomly (which is how the NTU Tab worked).

- Using random allocations ensured a fairer distribution of positions, while not being too unfair to teams as they were still in the same bracket
- Random draws though do not reflect the standard of the round and may be punishing teams by placing them in rounds that are too tough for them.

The discussion was inconclusive. It was decided that this would be left to the host.

Motion : ratify and accept Article 31 into the constitution

Proposed : England

Seconded : Australia

Passes unanimously

## 9. Incorporation of Worlds

The chair brought up this issue for discussion. He highlighted that some confusion had been created by other competitions that labelled themselves similarly to the WUDC (World Debating Tournament, held in Istanbul in 2003). Incorporating the WUDC would protect the name. However, incorporating WUDC could also make it easier for people to throw lawsuits at the WUDC, since now there is a legal entity to sue.

Ireland : Can't the WUDC be sued even if we are not incorporated?

Registrar : It does not have a legal representation, as in it is not a legally registered body, thus it cannot be sued as a body. Though it is possible to sue hosts or universities.

Australia : If there is grievance, it is still possible to sue individuals. Incorporation can actually protect individuals. But where would be incorporate?

South Korea : is incorporation the only way to protect the name?

Canada : Cannot trademark because body does not exist legally. It can be done by an individual, but that is also dangerous.

Malaysia : Since the organisers of the other tournament admitted their mistake, apologised and expressed no interest in hijacking the tournament, is there really a need for this?

Australia : there was a similar concern in AIDA in the past, when some teams threatened to sue over eligibility issues. It might be something WUDCC should look into for the future.

Ireland : Propose further research into this issue

Council, through a mixture of unofficial nominations and volunteering, selected Michael Smith, Rory McKeown and Jeremy Brier to investigate this issue and propose recommendations at the next Council meeting.

## 10. Executive reports

a) Secretary : nothing specific to report

b) Registrar : nothing specific to report

Chair highlighted the contributions of Matthew Charlesworth especially in regards to maintaining the worlds mailing lists. Council officially recognised these contributions and lauded him for them

#### d) Women's Officer

She reported that she had conducted a survey and subsequently published a paper that was distributed to everyone. there were some issues that emerged from the women's forum that she wished to share with Council:

- there was insufficient time to dress before some social events, as too much time was spent travelling and the schedule was too tight
- found some sexual humour inappropriate
- topic setting – some topics made women and other minorities feel uncomfortable
- felt some bias towards debating style, as some judges seem to favour confrontational styles rather than speeches based on analysis.
- Social activities that focused on drinking isolated women and enforced the “blokey” or male dominated nature of debating

On the women's officer, the forum decided that it has to be a woman and she should be elected by female representatives from each country.

#### Tournament issues

- there was only 1 women's forum, when they had requested for 2. It was furthermore held during lunch which resulted in poor attendance. There should've been better publicity and a social aspect to the forum as well.
- The women's officer should've been introduced at the beginning of the competition
- There should be a code of conduct that is distributed to all. There should also be someone or a body to enforce it.
- Adjudication test – there was only 1 female and this enforced a mindset that females are poorer debaters.
- Equity officer – to deal with all kinds of discrimination issues. this person would be especially useful in vetting social venues to decide if it would be acceptable for all participants.
- Room pairings – there was some discomfort in having to room with males
- Safety – it was difficult to move about freely without feeling unsafe, especially since moving between venues meant taking long cab rides. Stellenbosch was good in that aspect because there were security visibly patrolling the area.
- Timing – perhaps the tournament should have an extra day, to handle other events like the women's forum, the public speaking and an extra ESL round if required.

#### Targets for next year

- to compile statistics relating to performance and participation of women in worlds



On a final note, the role and office of the women's officers needs to be included in the constitution.

Namrata Verma : A Code of Conduct is quite useless because people will commit offences anyway. For example, people know vandalism is wrong, yet it still happens.

Secretary : The Code of Conduct is for subtler issues, where there is a misunderstanding on exactly what discrimination is or could be.

New Zealand : It also makes enforcement of harassment more feasible.

Registrar : The cross –cultural issues at worlds make it difficult to create a unified code.

England : the unified code of conduct is the law, this becomes redundant. The minority officer is also a little redundant, since everyone at worlds is a minority.

Women's : this is not about whether a law exists or not. It is about how to define the subtle issues and avoid it from happening.

Amanda : COC would end up being too soft if it's about making everyone comfortable and yet not being too hard. If the focus is punishment, then we should use the law. It might be better to define this based on a specific discussion.

South Korea : have discussion or forum at the start of the tournament and define COC from there.

Wales : would it be dangerous if there were too many gray areas, left open to interpretation that people could use to accuse or implicate others?

Registrar : Equity officer would be useful as a channel to share complaints. This is not just limited to complaints against people, but about tournament, like for example the complaints about the motions in Toronto worlds.

Amanda : Need to distinct issues with the tournament and with the championships. Issues with the tournament should be brought up to the Tournament Director.

Australia : Suggested that it might be better to have a Participant Liason Officer, who then becomes a point person for all issues, like exists at the Australasian championships.

Ireland : Questioned if this sets a precedent of direct involvement by the council into the organisation committee.

Women's : Suggests codifying the position, but maintaining it as a recommendation to future hosts and not a binding requirement.

Motion : Articles 28 be modified to include subsection e), to create a Equity Officer as part of the WUDC Council.

Proposed : USA

Seconded : Ireland

Australia moves for roll call, seconded Malaysia.

Motion carries by 45 to 13, with 16 abstentions.

Other Business

To improve quality of adjudication, recommend to future hosts to charge less for adjudicators outside the N-1.

Proposed : Ireland

Seconded : Israel

South Africa : Is it about cost or quality?

Amanda : People will send more and necessarily better adjudicators.

England : Suggested a reduced participation fee for class A adjudicators, as defined by the CA.

Women's : Shouldn't be up to CA, count those who broke before, as adjudicators.

Amanda : Problem is there are a lot more new people than older ones who want to keep coming back.

South Africa : Discounts may help, but need an objective standard, else may seem biased.

Israel : It wouldn't really help, because these people would have to register first, that means they can already pay, so affordability is not an issue.

Amanda : Don't wait for them to register, you invite them.

Israel : This increases the risk of creating bias.

England : yes, but bias towards good adjudication.

Registrar : This is decision of host and they should decide how they want to perform this selection. Council cannot do this for them

Ireland withdraws motion.

Motion : Increase the ESL break to 16

Proposed : Botswana  
Seconded : South Africa

Botswana : A larger break increases the opportunity for ESL teams to break, and subsequently gives themselves more value to take back home. This translate to better chances to get funding etc.

New Zealand : The problem is actually the ESL pool is diluted with people that don't actually belong there. What we need to do is devise more accurate criteria.

Registrar : Agree the rules are vague, but not all people in the ESL groupings are cheats. Having only 8 out of 100 teams (as it were in NTU, with more than 100 ESL teams) is not enough. Perhaps the break numbers should be contingent on the number of ESL teams.

Japan : It would be better to create an EFL grouping rather than expand the ESL. EFL countries are where the students use English only for debating. It is studied as a Foreign Language, not a Second Language.

Botswana : there is inherent unfairness, because the main break allows for 32 teams while the ESL only allows for 8.

Chair : in the past, there was no ESL break at all. The organisers would just highlight the top ESL team. Only from Manila worlds, did the ESL Semi-finals begin. There is very little time within the tournament schedule to practically hold these additional rounds.

Netherlands : On 3 levels

- a) suggest defining the break size to be proportional to the number of ESL teams in the competition.
- b) How do we create a distinction between the EFL and ESL?
- c) In regards to timing, perhaps this should be prioritised over other events (socials)

Canada : suggests setting a 10% standard, to ensure at least 10% of the teams present make the break. Thus if there 40 teams or less, then only 4 teams break. If there are more than 40 but less 80 teams, 8 teams break. If there are 81 or more teams, 16 teams break. 16 is the maximum cap.

Ranjan (DCA) : the 16<sup>th</sup> team will be in the hundreds. What about the quality of this team to begin with?

Malaysia : That is a very patronising comment. It is wrong to assume firstly that the 16<sup>th</sup> team will be in the hundreds and secondly that they will automatically be of poor quality.

South Korea : it is unfair to make statements like that, as that is what enforces the perspective that these teams are bad and of poor quality.

Netherlands : Even if the quality is low, it doesn't really matter since that is the reflection of the ESL competition. This is about participation.

Motion : ESL break should be 16 if there are 81 or more ESL teams and 8 if there are less than 81 teams.

Proposed : Botswana

Seconded : Bangladesh

Motion passes :

Other material

Council briefly takes a look at remaining issues. issues that may be discussed quickly are brought to the table while the rest are slated for next year.

1. ireland : constitution requires DCA to judge at least one previous worlds. This has been ignored for years and has been useless

Motion : remove requirement in constitution for DCA to have judged at Worlds before

Proposed : Ireland

Seconded : England

Passes unanimously

2. Change 4 year participation rule to one based on number of breaks.
  - move to next year's council meeting
3. Changes in registration fees upon arrival at tournament
  - move to next year's council meeting
4. extend tournament by one day, to make space for satellite competitions and events
  - move to next year's council meeting
5. Addition to article 3 of the constitution – every debater who want to take part in the competition should be able to attend without having to bear uneven or unfair burdens
  - Rejected. Council did not think it was an issue.
6. Consistency in terms of rules concerning preparation for debates (group prep, electronic equipment etc)
  - issue to be discussed personally with convenor of next year's tournament and whatever rules they are using are to be made explicit
7. N-1 to be enforced throughout the tournament
  - : Ireland
  - Seconded : England

Unanimous

8. Council officially thanks Colm Flynn for his contributions to the WUDC, most notably through his website.

No regional reports.

Elections

a) Chair

Ireland propose Ian Lising (seconded by Scotland)

There were no other nominations, Ian retains his position as Chair.

Council thanks Ian for his undying love and commitment to Worlds debating.

b) Secretary

Philippines propose Logan (seconded by Ireland)

There were no other nominations, Logan retains his position as Secretary.

c) Registrar

Ireland proposes David Ham (seconded by Croatia)

There were no other nominations, David is the new Registrar.

d) Women's Officer

Israel proposes Miranda Weigler (seconded by Wales)

Bangladesh proposes Suzuki Masako (seconded by South Korea)

By 38 votes to 26, Miranda retains her position as Women's Officer.

e) Equity Officer

Canada proposes Rory McKeown (seconded by Wales)

Australia proposes Suzuki Masako (seconded by South Korea)

By 40 votes to 24, Masako is the new Equity Officer.

Meeting ends at 6.37

Next meeting, 7 pm, 2<sup>nd</sup> of January 2004

Worlds Council Meeting Part II  
Novotel Apollo Hotel  
2<sup>nd</sup> January 2004  
9.07 pm

Chair calls for order and calls for bids.

Motion : Croatia would like to bid for WUDC 2005  
Proposed : Croatia  
Seconded : Israel

Petar presents the bid to council. There is more information this time, including the tournament schedule and budget (there is a projected shortfall of 126, 725.50 Kunar).

In regards to adjudication, Petar informs council that Iva has withdrawn as Chief Adjudicator, contrary to his personal wishes as well as the wishes of the organising committee. Another person will be appointed to the panel and one of the 4 people will then be promoted to CA.

Registrar : Will you choose the CA from the existing DCAs or the new person chosen?

PP : from the 4 people, it could be the new person or one of the existing 3

Registrar : if the numbers don't reach 800, how do you plan to scale back on fixed expenses?

PP : Expenses are scaled per capita. Changes to the fixed expenses can be made 1 month before.

England : Where is the evidence of approved sponsorship?

PP produces letters from Croatian President, University Senate and City of Zagreb.

England : These letters do not mention the money promised and are not proof that you have sufficient funding. On a second note, none of your DCAs are willing to take over as CA and neither is the person you have called and asked.

PP : We've fixed the team cap to 5 per institution and 300 teams altogether. In regards to adjudicators, 24 hours is too short a notice to find a replacement.

Malaysia : Voices support for Iva and disappointment at her withdrawal. Comments that the report on infrastructure and logistics seem satisfactory. Questioned as to whether the DCAs have been informed about the current situation. And if they have, why aren't they at the council meeting?

Amanda : Asked again why neither Wu Meng nor Nick Pachecho were at council, seeing the need to defend the adjudication process. Stressed the importance of maintaining credible adjudication, and even the perspective of credible adjudication. Highlighted as example, that NTU adjudication team were already being criticised on CUSID mailing list. Asked explicitly who this 4<sup>th</sup> person for adjudication team was

Pp : The person is Andy Hume

New Zealand : Raised concerns on whether the extra 2 days of excursions will be paid using the registration fee. At bid last year, it was announced that the excursions would be funded fully by the tourism ministry, why is it now included on the budget as an expense?

PP : The trips won't cost you extra, it's included in the registration

NZ : Will we be paying for the excursions ourselves?

PP : Not all of it, only for the lunches and some other small expenses. Through the rego, no additional costs are required.

Miranda : 1) If the tournament is shortened to save costs, it will have to be done early enough to give people enough time to re-arrange their flights. 2) There is no Women's Forum on the schedule. 3) All male adjudication team, how would you handle bias?

PP : 1) We won't cut out the extra days, only unnecessary elements of the tournament. But it is very unlikely that it will happen. 2) Forgot to include the Women's Forum, will slot it in. 3) Sorry, just can't please everyone.

England : Commented that the plans seem to be developed as the discussion progressed, not beforehand. Questioned as to why the DCAs were not present, and whether they had explicitly refused to be at council to defend the bid.

PP : Replied that they hadn't refused. It is not their responsibility to be there, they don't need to be there.

Australia : 1)Of opinion that DCAs should be there to get their word on credibility of adjudication processes, else issue cannot be resolved.2) Why are the free days mandatory and not by choice? Everyone has to stay, because they are automatically paying for it.

NTU rep: Going to look for DCAs from social function and bring them to council meeting.

Canada : Calculated that without the 2 additional days, each person saves USD 26.

New Zealand : 1) USD 26 is substantial for people paying themselves. 2) Cannot support the bid unless we know who the CA is and the CA is there.

Wales calls for recess, seconded by Israel

---recess for 15 minutes---

Motion : to award the bid for WUDC 2005 to Croatia

1. Philippines
2. Singapore

PP : Didn't invite the DCAs to council because it an unpleasant environment and didn't want them to go through what Iva went through.

Move for silent ballots

1. Wales
2. Scotland

Jamaica : Questioned if Wu Meng and Nick were not there because they have no confidence or they are afraid of being chastised?

Amanda : On behalf of Wu Meng, said Wu Meng was not at council because he was not contacted by Croatia and was not updated on what happened at council. Nick said he was also not contacted and won't be coming to council. They were both reported to be very, very, very uncertain about the bid.

Scotland : Asked if Andy has been contacted and what his response was?

PP : Replied that he was not the one contacting him, that was being done by people in Zagreb.

Vote on Motion:

Motion falls

21 – for

29 – against

16 – abstentions

Chair Re-Opens Bids for 2005

MMU announces intention to bid for 2005

Israel : asks if there are any other institutions who will bid, to rescue Israel?

Ian : Already asked for bids, it is not necessary to repeat it.

MMU Begins Presentation

Presentation Conducted by Sumithra Rajendra (Bid Director) and Praba Ganesan



Sumithra : Had and still have no intention of competing against Croatia, stepping in now to fill the vacuum. The details of the Bid is the same as if it were to be held in 2006, except the rego will have to be increased from 250 USD to 300 USD.

Slovenia : On accessibility, will participants from Serbia and Montenegro be able to attend?

Sumithra : yes of course.

Israel : on accessibility, tried calling up Malaysian embassy, but calls were not entertained. Managed to find out though that

- Home Ministry approval will be required for each person to enter Malaysia
- Approval process takes 9 months
- It costs 2000 Malaysian Ringgit (500USD)

Ireland : If Israel has to pay exorbitant costs, can MMU subsidise their expenses?

Sumithra : Many participants have to pay huge amounts for visa fees, cannot afford to sustain trend of subsidising travel costs.

India : have to pay exorbitant visa fees wherever we travel.

Netherlands : What about adjudication? Will it be credible?

Registrar : The alumni looks very small, where would you source adjudicators from?

Sumithra : We have a detailed adjudication plan, which Praba will present, but briefly, there is a huge pool in Australasia that we can source from.

Australia : Fully supports MMU's bid, based on previous experience of their hosting capabilities. Don't see a problem in regards to adjudication.

Praba : In regards to adjudication, MMU will be conducting seminars and other programs in the build up to worlds, in order to develop the adjudication pool. They will also sustain communication within regions to keep tabs on the adjudication pools there.

Ireland : what is the tournament team cap? Who are the DCAs?

Sumithra : The team cap is 300 and DCAs will be announced later. There will be 3 DCAs.

Registrar : Recommend getting advice from NTU Adjudication panel.

Women's Officer : What's the Women's Debate?

Sumithra : A debate featuring only selected women from the competition, to demonstrate female debating. Usually held during Australs.

Canada : What is the institutional cap?

Sumithra : 5 teams per institution.

Chair : with less time now, can you still sustain, or even increase, the support you have?

Sumithra : Yes, that is not a problem. MMU administration initially wanted to bid for 2005.

USA : What about Logan's credibility?

Amanda : Fully support Logan's credibility as an individual person as well as qualified adjudicator. MMU is committed to training and adjudication like no other institution.

Motion : To accept Malaysia's bid for Worlds 2005

Proposed : Ireland

Seconded : England

Israel : Even if we can come to Malaysia, will Worlds then become an exclusionary competition? Principle behind Worlds will be seriously infringed upon. Not having a Worlds competition is not the issue, because that was not the issue when talking about Croatia.

Sumithra : Will do everything we can to get everyone in and confident we can do that.

England : Supportive of Israel's point, but also very supportive of MMU's bid. Have complete faith that MMU will run good tournament.

Israel : We planned to bid, and if we did, the difference would be Israel is inclusionary but Malaysia is exclusionary.

New Zealand : Unfair of Noga to play "My government is better than your government".

Praba : In regards to safety, Malaysia is a very safe city, compared to other cosmopolitan cities in its scale.

Bangladesh : Bangladeshi ambassador was kidnapped a few days ago from his home. That is very dangerous, what can you do about it?

Praba : Where is your ambassador now?

Bangladesh : he was returned safely.

Israel : it may not be MMU's fault, but still the WUDC needs to have a position.

Ireland : Security seems fine and immigration issue keeps going back and forth. Cut discussion and vote.

Motion to end discussion:

Proposed : ireland

Seconded : Philippines

Motion passes 38 – 26

Move for 5 minute recess

Proposed : Netherlands

Seconded : Slovenia

Motion Passed Unanimously

Return from Recess and Vote on Motion for Worlds 2005

Motion : To accept Malaysia's bid for Worlds 2005

Proposed : Ireland

Seconded : England

Motion passes 44 – 7 with 13 abstentions

Council congratulates MMU.

Sumithra thanks council for their faith.

Motion : Recommend but not bind MMU com to offset prohibitive visa costs that participants may incur.

Note that this is unique and not to set a precedence for future Worlds

Proposed : Ireland

Seconded : New Zealand

Scotland : Unfair to do it, because it will create a huge strain upon the committee.

Ireland : Recommendation only, not binding

Israel : Discussed this with Sumithra, she said if costs exceed 50 USD, the committee will consider subsidising it.

Move to vote

Move : New Zealand

Seconded : South Korea

Motion carries 28 – 5 with 31 abstentions

Canada : Because Worlds will be held in the same region for 2 years in a row, this will affect the voting status of nations and also might result in over representation of nations. Propose an exemption of lapse rule

Motion : Count Worlds 2005 and Worlds 2004 as one worlds in terms of calculating voting status. Take the best showing out of those two worlds.

Proposed : Canada

Seconded : Croatia

New Zealand : Unfair nations who will miss out on the upgrade of voting status. Unfair to punish them, just because it is close and easier for them to attend.

Scotland : Will have to buy plane tickets in June, but current budget catered for Croatian worlds, thus making it very difficult to buy tickets.

Australia : When Worlds was held in UK and Ireland 2 years in a row, did that have an effect on the voting status?

Chair : No, because there was no voting status then.

Malaysia : Mandate at this meeting is discussing bids, are we digressing?

Chair : no, because this is related to bids and important to members.

New Zealand : Symphatise with scotland, but this doesn't effect many countries like canada, usa, south africa and so on, and will be unfair to them.

Ireland : Might have unfair effect for countries that are right next to each other.

Womens : Are we changing constitution?

Chair : no, just creating an exemption to it.

New Zealand : But in effect this is ignoring effect of constitution, doesn't it then make it a constitutional issue?

Canada : Making constitutional exemption clause, that will require absolute majority

Move to vote

Proposed : Canada

Seconded : Ireland

Motion falls 30 – 34

Motion : To not downgrade voting status after WUDC 2005

Proposed : Ireland

Seconded : Scotland

New Zealand : This is an arbitrary decision.

Motion falls 30 – 34

Propose open bidding for Worlds 2006

Proposed : USA

Seconded : Netherlands

Ireland : L&H UCC has a bid to present

Ciaron Lawlor presents bid. States rego will be 345 Euros.

Registrar : Two debating societies in UCC, can the other one take part if you host?

Ciaron : Yes, unless WUDC Council objects

South Africa : Can you get airlines to subsidise?

Ciaron : Will work on it, but no guarantees.

Move to vote

Proposed : Wales

Seconded : England

Ireland wins unanimously

Chair : Needs to elect new secretary as Logan will be involved in MMU next year as part of host committee.

Sarafaraz from Bangladesh nominated for secretary.

Proposed : India

Seconded : Australia

Jamaica : Will Malaysia's bid need to be ratified later?

Chair : No precedent for this and no opportunity to ratify later. Assume ratified.

Ireland : Propose to talk about email voting next year.

Ian concludes meeting with brief speech about the spirit of worlds debating and building friendships.