

The Meeting Minutes of Pre-Council
World Universities Debating Championships 2005
Multimedia University
December 28, 2004

Roll Call takes place at 10:02 am. World's registrar Mr. David Ham is conducting it.

Ian Lising WUDC chair welcomes everyone to the pre-council meeting of the world universities debating championships and introduces the members of the executive committee of the council and presents the agenda to the national reps.

The agendas for the pre-council meeting are as follows:

1. Voting status
2. Institution Review (the N-1 review) and see if any team is in violation of the N-1 rule.
3. The speaker Review
4. Make a special vote for the ESL quarterfinals since we have to make a change in the constitution.

Chair: at the end of the meeting we will have those who would be bidding for Worlds 2007 UBC and Sydney and mentions that they will not be giving presentation in the pre-council, but will be distributing bid materials to the reps and if any reps have any questions to them then it should be kept outside of this meeting.

Chair: This year a new rule has to be imposed on the delegates and it is called one minute rule, which means all delegates will have exactly one minute to speak on any issue, so that we can go through an issue very quickly.

Chair: Couple of questions has been raised when it comes to the question of voting status. Last year at NTU (WUDC 2004) there were some clarifications whether or not we include 2 years when we are looking at voting status. A nation must have consistent number of institutions representing in 2 consecutive years. The change, which was made at NTU (WUDC 2004) was the inclusive of the year of the championships. This means that we would use this year and Singapore worlds to determine the voting status of Nations. This was put forward to council and the council unanimously decided at NTU (WUDC 2004). Now there will be repercussions of some nations who did not understand it then, so if any reps have any questions you can place them to council and we will discuss it.

Review of Voting Status

Registrar:

Australia: status A

Canada: status A

England: status A

Ireland: status A
Japan: status A (promoted)
Malaysia: status A
Philippines: status A
USA: status A
China: status B (promoted)
Hong Kong: status B
Israel: status B (demoted from status A to B)

Ireland: Israel has asked Ireland to raise a motion on their behalf, since they could not come this year because of political connection between 2 nations (i.e. Israel & Malaysia), this year should not be used to determine their voting status, in other words their voting status should be judged by Singapore worlds & Dublin worlds.

Chair: Motion on the floor by Derek from Ireland that special exemption clause should be granted to Israel not to include Malaysian worlds to determine their voting status.

Korea: Has such motion been passed in the past?

Chair: No.

Women's Officer: we are sure Israel needs special types of visa to come to Malaysia and a lot of country has had problems in getting the visa, so if we are making an exemption for Israel, then we should make it exemption for everybody in near future.

South Africa: just want to know what exactly the political problem Israel faced?

Chair: Does any one from MMU want to answer that?

Tate: I was doing the liaison with Israel, and I think the main reason for their not coming based on the correspondence is that it would be not safe for them to come to Malaysia. The institutions of Israel individually voted and decided that they would not be coming. But the immigration process in terms of visa shouldn't have been any problem since our foreign offices were already informed about the issue, but I still think they didn't come because of the security problem.

England: Israel couldn't get the visa because of political problem, and therefore I think they should get exempted.

New Zealand: I think we should get on with the voting status and then come back to this issue.

Registrar:
New Zealand: status B (promoted)
Scotland: status B (demoted)
Singapore: status B

South Africa: status B (demoted)
Bangladesh: status C
India: status C (promoted)
Jamaica: status C
Netherlands: status C (promoted)
Thailand: status C
Botswana: status D
Croatia: status D
Indonesia: status D (promoted)
South Korea: status D
Russia: status D (demoted)

Registrar: Pakistan, Germany & Barbados has no voting status, since they weren't here last year & they have no record, which should give them a voting status. It should be noted that though they have no voting status but they still have 1 vote just like status D countries but they are not status D.

Chair: now that we are over with the voting status, we can go ahead with the discussion.

Ireland: would like to ensure that this motion is no way of criticizing MMU. Have been told by Israeli contingent it was security issues they were concerned with and they couldn't come down to barriers of such magnitude and for this reason I think that they should be exempted.

South Africa: on what basis you measure the security?

Ireland: the issue here based on Israeli correspondence is the security & immigration issues.

Equity: there are some documents from US Embassy in the website about the tournament.

Tate: that is not related with the issue here.

Sumitra: just a bit curious, in case of any event in future, because of security reasons, delegates from Malaysia don't get visa then we would also get an exemption.

New Zealand: If the Israeli Intelligence could have worked with Malaysian authorities, something could have been sorted out.

Chair: a motion is on the floor "that special exemption clause should be granted to Israel not to include Malaysian worlds to determine their voting status"

Voting takes place: note that the vote is based on previous voting status of the countries before the status change has occurred.

Country	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Count
Grand Total	22	25	6	9	62
Status A					
Australia		1			
Canada				1	
England	1				
Ireland	1				
South Africa		1			
Scotland				1	
Malaysia		1			
Philippines		1			
USA	1				
Total	3	4	0	2	9
Weighted Total	12	16	0	8	36
Status B					
Japan	1				
Hong Kong			1		
Singapore		1			
Total	1	1	1	0	3
Weighted Total	3	3	3	0	9
Status C					
China	1				
New Zealand		1			
Bangladesh	1				
Jamaica		1			
Thailand			1		
Total	2	2	1	0	5
Weighted Total	4	4	2	0	10
Status D					
Croatia	1				
India				1	
Netherlands	1				
Russia			1		
Total	2	0	1	1	4
Weighted Total	2	0	1	1	4
No Status					
Indonesia		1			
South Korea		1			
Germany	1				
Total	1	2	0	0	3
Weighted Total	1	2	0	0	3

The motion falls

Chair: now we check the institutional review which is basically the N-1 rule.

Sumitra: only Mahidol from Thailand has violated the N-1 rule

Thailand: it is the 1st time it has happened to us. One of our senior member has been in an accident with her family and that is why she couldn't make it. The other members in our team has no experience in adjudication and that is why we violated the rule. I am asking the council to give us a special exemption.

Chair: it is an issue to be decided by the host institution and they would decided if they have any problem or not.

Logan: its not a problem.

Russia: so it is the host institution who decided whether they will have any problem due to the violation of the N-1 rule.

Chair: yes. The reason we have N-1 rule in the constitution, so that we would have enough adjudicators for the tournament.

Logan: informs the council that another institution from Singapore also has violated the N-1 rule.

Singapore: informs that the adjudicator had passport problem and thus the adjudicator couldn't come. He also informs that MMU has enough adjudicators so it shouldn't be a problem.

Chair: tells the council that this is a serious issue. Even if the host has enough adjudicators the rule shouldn't be abused.

Chair: also informs the council that last year at NTU worlds 2004 there was a constitutional change, but unfortunately there wasn't any record of the votes of 2/3 of status A nations and tells the council members that they have to vote again

Registrar: informs that the motion is "That the Constitution of the World Universities Debating

Council be amended as follows:

1. Article 3 paragraph 3.a . Delete the word "eight".

2. Article 30 paragraph 4.c . Replace as follows:

Where there are, at the commencement of the preliminary rounds, at least 80 teams eligible to compete in the ESL elimination rounds, the highest sixteen ranking ESL teams will participate in the ESL Competition elimination rounds, and shall be ranked from 1st to 16th according to 4a). In any other case, the highest eight ranking ESL teams will participate in the ESL Competition elimination rounds, and shall be ranked from 1st to 8th according to 4a) 3. Article 30 paragraph 6.b . Before the words "Semi Final" insert:

Quarter Final

Country	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Count	Total Effective	
Grand Total	56	0	0	10	66	56	

Status A							
Australia	1						
Canada				1			
England	1						
Ireland	1						
Japan	1						
Malaysia	1						
Philippines	1						
USA	1						
Total	7	0	0	1	8		
Weighted Total	28	0	0	4	32		
Status B							
China	1						
Hong Kong	1						
New Zealand	1						
Scotland				1			
Singapore	1						
South Africa	1						
Total	5	0	0	1	6		
Weighted Total	15	0	0	3	18		
Status C							
Bangladesh	1						
India				1			
Jamaica	1						
Netherlands	1						
Thailand	1						
Total	4	0	0	1	5		
Weighted Total	8	0	0	2	10		
Status D							
Croatia	1						
Indonesia	1						
Russia	1						
South Korea	1						
Total	4	0	0	0	4		
Weighted Total	4	0	0	0	4		
No Status							
Germany	1						
Pakistan				1			
Total	1	0	0	1	2		
Weighted Total	1	0	0	1	2		

Motion Passes

Chair: informs the council that next meeting would start on January 01, 2006 at 10:00 am and then he informs UBC and Sydney to pass the bid materials.

Pre council finishes.

Main Council Meeting

January 01, 2005

Registrar: Taking attendance

Chair: calls the meeting to order. Also requests for 1-minute silence for those who has lost their lives in the Tsunami.

Chair: informs the council that there will be several decisions to be taken and this will affect the future worlds. He also informs the council that the 1st agenda is to accept the minutes from worlds 2004. Is there any motion to pass the minutes?

Ireland: This is in relation to tabbing. It says that council gives it to host's discretion in relation to how the teams are paired and I don't think that was not discussed in the council.

Chair: any discussion on the floor?

Chair: since no objection from the council members, it should be stricken from the minutes. Any motion on the floor to pass the minutes?

Ireland: proposes to pass the minutes

Singapore: seconds the motion

Minutes pass unanimously.

Chair: now we call upon NTU representative to present the NTU Reports & Accounts

NTU Rep: mentions that the NTU tried their very best to make the Worlds in Singapore a memorable one. In the tournament they have only lost of \$ 28 which was ultimately absorbed by the university. If you see the income details most of the sponsorships were taken from the university sources and in all those cases the expense is taken care of by the university. If you also look at the expenditure detail, you will see how it was spent for food, socials & transports. Any questions?

Russia: what is GST?

NTU Rep: GST is the tax.

Malaysia: under expenditure what is tournament directions?

NTU Rep: tournament directions is for the cards you got with the bar codes, scanners and other necessary things that were used in the tournament even the thumb drives for making the tab.

Chair: thanks the NTU Rep on behalf of the world council for hosting such a wonderful and a memorable Worlds and it will go down as one of the best Worlds.

Chair: next agenda on the floor is to go strait for UCD bid defense and we invite Mr. Ciaran Lawler to the floor.

Ciaran: we are handing out the UCD reports, which already came out in the July report, and details will be discussed in the power point presentation.

The adjudication team is made up of Paul Brady who is going to be the chief adjudicator (twice worlds finalists) & the DCA's are Fiona Dewar from Scotland (IONA & Europe), Erik Eastaugh from Canada (North America & Africa) & Michael Smith from Australia (Australasia) and they will be first contact points for any sort of complaints during the tournament.

The tab will be designed by one of the sponsoring companies, system dynamics. The software will be released after the competition as a freeware & it will go through extensive stress – testing at Irish Intervarsity competitions. There will be adjudicators training and first one will happen in April 2005 and will happen for many people that can be gathered from UCD, and we will try to make it sure that they get proper adjudication training and the 2nd adjudicators training will take place in October 2005. UCD will have 25-30 extremely experienced adjudicators at its disposal.

The first phase of registration is pre-registration (June – August) and institutions would pre register with a deposit to book their places. The 2nd phase of registration would be full registration (August – October) and it can be done through credit cards online. Full registration is finally done from October – November and the extra slots for those who has pre-registered but have not paid yet would be available. The team cap is 300 and it would not be extended, there will be no late registration (since we have to know how many people are coming & according to that we need to book the hotels) & the registration fee is 345 Euro. There will be registration database and the Tab system would draw that information from the database

In terms of communications the website www.worlds2006.com has been launched & all the directors can be easily contacted through the website. As far the logistics is concerned there is detailed provisional timetable in the handout. As for the transport is concerned there will be buses to and from the hotels to all the events and it is just 3 to 5 minutes walk from the hotels to the debating venues. All dietary needs are being catered for. All the debate venues are going to be in one building under one roof, so debaters wont have to go outside since it is going to be cold. The socials are going to be premier clubs and there will be arranged tours during the competitions.

As for the sponsorships are concerned we already have over 300,000 Euro, UCD will provide 70,000 Euro & 6 companies confirmed as sponsors. Our present targets are title & international media sponsor, ESL & Masters sponsor. We from UCD are very much confident that we can do the job and will definitely can you give an exciting worlds. Now we are ready to take questions from the council members.

Women's: the developing nations forum & women's forum is in the same time with masters preliminary & public speaking preliminary and they are also in a tight schedule with socials and thus it would be difficult for the people to attend the forums.

Ciaran: as far as the timetable goes both the forums don't clash with social event. There is nothing we can do because in such an event like the worlds, we have to get everything in and you would be having always something clashing with something. Very small amount of people participate in those competitions, so we could either move the masters or the prelims and we do accept that point and we will definitely revisit the time table and see what we can about the concern.

Women's: last year (WUDC 2004) both social event & women's forum too place at the same time. This year (WUDC 2005) both the forums were in such a way and nicely placed that there were not any clashes and they were very much successful indeed. They also had a women's breakfast.

Ciaran: first thing is that we want to & see the timetable that we would be finalizing right before worlds. We have got feedback from you, and have been positive indeed and we will take your word for it. If there is a desire to have a women's breakfast then it is certainly possible, since we have 2 hotels we will further look into the matter.

UBC Bid Presentation takes place

Ted: we will be explaining to you how the tournament is going to work, how the accommodation is going to work. As regards to worlds UBC will be coming on board hugely. Right now UBC is trying to build its reputation as a world university, and by hosting the world championships is a good way to do that and they have offered us all kinds of wonderful support to run one of the best worlds ever. UBC has offered us their expertise and their professionals to work on the bid. The senior development officer from office of VP of students has decided to work with us. The debating society of having an operational budget of \$ 4000 in 2004, had an operational budget of \$ 55,000 in 2005 and by this fall we will be having an operational budget of \$ 100,000. We asked the university what they think they can gather through fund raising and the institution told us they think they can raise \$ 500,000 (Canadian). That is the kind of support we think we can rally for the worlds. This is the kind of budget we are talking about not even taking the discounts. The Sheraton wall center is the part of Sheraton International (4 star) would like to be our host sponsor. We can fit the entire tournament and also a number of events in the hotel because they one of the best meeting room and ball room facilities in the city. The delegates will be in a room designed for the number of people of that room. The other advantage of Sheraton is that they would arrange transportation to and from airport for all of their guests. The check in & registration will be taken care by the hotel. We gave you some airfares in the registration package and those fares are with the concept of not over promising. And we are promising that we will work in such a way that you can get the best airfare as possible. We will be aggressively pursuing airline sponsors especially air Canada and other air alliance so that everybody can get there. We understand that airfare can be a big burden and we are working ways in which it can be brought down. We understand that asking for sponsors inst easy so we have ways to take care of that. Vancouver is a multicultural diverse city. We have huge number of cultural and business associates in the city with regular exchanges with their home country and Vancouver. We are approaching them to sponsor specific teams to come to worlds. In effect to provide bursaries to teams who should be at worlds can make it to worlds. Secondly we have a very strong alumni network around the world. We have spoken with them and they have agreed that they would fund raise through alumni network.

Kevin Massie: what the bursaries program means that we don't allocate funds to the teams. The country reps would decide how to allocate the funds of the bursaries. The money would be in a bank account setup by the country's cultural center the reps would decide how they would want to spend that money.

Ted: I am not going to be knocking at the cultural doors in Vancouver. What we have got is a commitment from the school of business that the class on fund raising would be working on this as their class project. We ran workshop in the fund raising class. As for visas, Canada has a very open immigration visiting policy. However some countries will require visas. What are we guaranteeing you is that we will make a package for you, that we will have a letter from mayor of Vancouver, a letter from premier of British Columbia, a letter from Prime Minister of Canada, and a letter from the Governor General, our head of state. We will put those letters in a package along with the letter from the president of our university saying these are the teams who are coming. We will

particular officers who will make sure that you get to UBC. So they will write to consulates, embassies and high commissions in your country to ensure that visa process goes smoothly. Let me assure you that at this time Canada doesn't discriminate anyone regarding to International Incidents.

Kevin Massie: I will talk about registration and how it goes through TAB. When you come from airport to the hotel, at front desk you will be given a form, which you must fill out before getting the room key. The form will ask questions like are you a debater or an adjudicator? If you are an adjudicator, what are your experiences? That form will be compiled by the hotel and will be given to the TAB. We will cap at 300 teams As for transport, to and from hotel it will complimentary by Sheraton, as for the 03 debate days we will be hiring shuttle coaches from the hotel to venue. We will also give you transit pass like Toronto worlds (2002) so that you can explore the city for free. As for the TAB we have a revolutionary proposal. We will take what they did in Toronto, Manila, Glasgow, Singapore, & Malaysia and put it all together, cause we don't want to re-invent the TAB when there are number of good programs already exists. These issues are manually editing data, user friendliness, instruction manuals, & error checking. As for error checking we will have a TAB where we can enter are separate computers at the same time. Then we would print out the TAB sheets in terms of number of points a team gets in alphabetical order and make them into transparencies. Error checking would be simple, we would put one transparency over other transparencies over the wall, you read through it very quickly & your error checking is done for 300 teams in less than 10 minutes. We use it in our IV's and it very highly effective. If the TAB is down, we are also prepared for the worst-case scenario. We will have a 3rd TABS room, and its going be operated by Microsoft Excel and once the rounds are going on, the high school and university volunteers will input the data in Excel, so if there is power failure, or even the TAB rooms go off, we can still pair the teams and fix the TAB later with the help of Excel. We will have random pairing with in the brackets and random pick-ups within the draw. In terms of DCA's we have not named them for a very good reason. We believe DCA's represents certain constituencies. They know who are people would be coming to worlds and those who are active on the circuit so people can choose their DCA within their constituencies and would feel comfortable with going to with a problem. So we will have an extensive regional consultation program and let the council reps have a say and will let you know just 3 months before the ratification. We will have DCA from Asia region, IONA region, 3rd and 4th DCA based on absolute qualifications. As a CA I have experienced the worlds as a council rep, as a DCA, as a competitor & as a adjudicator and therefore I know all the issues that are going to come up from all the angle. We want regional representation in the adjudication pool. The track record of Canadian adjudicators are very good. We have an excellent alumni group of adjudicators but we also want adjudicators from every corner of the world.

Questions from Council Reps.

Japan: what is schedule of the tournament, I want to know when you will have the EFL?

Kevin: One of the reason we don't have the schedule today is because we think it needs to have a lot of input. We support the idea English as a Foreign Language since Vancouver it self has four to five language and thus we are very sensitive to the idea of English as a Foreign Language. We propose to put the EFL finals in between the octos and the quarters so it can be very well attended. We want to put EFL rounds in the tournament and we think it's a decision the council should discuss and the council should take decision.

Bangladesh: the question is in relation to airfare. From Dhaka to Vancouver it is \$ 1200 (USD) and to Sydney it is \$ 800 (USD). Give a good reason why should Bangladesh vote for UBC.

Teddy: that's why we have the bursaries program and from the bursaries program you can use the fund to lower your airfare.

Kevin: we think ultimately the worlds would back to North America. Especially universities from Bangladesh, Singapore thinking long term would consider Worlds in Vancouver would be more feasible than worlds in Toronto, Boston, or Montreal.

Malaysia: how are you going to allocate these bursaries to various different countries and what are the factors you will use to disburse them and if you can manage the \$ 500,000 then what would be the cost like?

Kevin: if we get that \$ 500,000 then the rego would be \$ 50. As for the bursaries we will be contacting the Malaysian business societies. It would be directly up to you guys how you would want to distribute that fund. When we make a contact we send you an e-mail and say here is the contact and you and us will write letters to them and it will be under the reps decision on how you would want to use that fund.

Singapore: during the debate there would be complaints from debaters of developing nations and the DCA panel would have huge volume of work in that time and people might not have access to the DCA's.

Kevin: we will have developing nations officer whose sole portfolio would be to hear complaints and to relay that info to the adjudication team. But what is the biggest thing we can do is to collect the data of the people who will be coming. If we can improve the quality of who is coming as an adjudicator then we can have better pool of adjudicator.

Russia: Will you have nation caps in your tournament?

Kevin: no we will have institutional caps.

India: Have you already established the contacts of the bursaries program?

Teddy: we have begun the contact works already, we found difficult to get commitments out of people when we say we might host worlds but it's a lot easier when we say we will host worlds. But yes we have begun the contacts.

India: do you think that the responses have been positive?

Kevin: yes, very much positive.

India: what kind of registration cost will you have?

Teddy: approximately \$ 500 (CD) which is basically \$ 425 (USD). We will guarantee you that UBC worlds will be the same as MMU worlds by more than \$ 20 (USD).

India: because so many issues were raised regarding the adjudication policy at this worlds and it seems to believe it that a lot of it is not loop hole free and how will you re look it to that issue?

Kevin: there is going to be an adjudicator feedback form for all the debaters in the round. The panelist feedback form that chair would fill it up and vice versa and that would give us a massive data and then we will process the data and that would help us to resolve the issues.

India: there was an online test, which was very much basic, could you make one a bit more comprehensive?

Kevin: the online test was to figure out what is the average knowledge of adjudicators who were coming to worlds. I think it should go from a very basic level and ask more complex questions that will allow us to further stratify the adjudicator level.

Ireland: as for DCA's will you be inviting applications or you just be consulting and secondly as regard to TAB policy what type of software will you be using?

Kevin: we would follow the system as Dublin has done, we will invite applications and then check off the names you are unwilling to work with, and then you send it back to regions to decide. As for the TAB system we have been offered by the school of computer science to do a TAB for us. But we don't believe in re inventing the wheel, there are good programs out there. Dublin will have a professionally done TAB. But we want a TAB that would have manual and that is very much missing. But we want a TAB that should be easy to function cause if you are in round 8 and you made a mistake in round 4 then it should be very much easy to correct the mistake.

Philippines: we want to know the feasibility of the cost reduction schemes, especially about the sponsorships on the cultural exchanges in the past the main question is how they are ever committed to provide sponsorships to an event of this size?

Kevin: in terms of nations bursaries it is in a smaller scale, it is the individual bursary the university can much more exchange. One of the UBC largest exchange program is with NUS and also from Philippines. The beauty of the program is that it will be a Philippine cultural center will be dealing with a Philippine delegation. So it is actually a small sub set of the tournament.

Teddy: we are not asking them to sponsor 1000 people, but only 20 at a time, so it is very much feasible.

Singapore: you said you wanted a TAB where you can change the mistakes if needed, if you do something like that, wouldn't that compromise the integrity of the tournament?

Kevin: say a team who took a 3rd in round 4 that you tabbed as a 2nd but the fact is you still have to give that team a point. Whether or not we actually do it during the rounds or even after the tournament to fix the final standing that is a decision the council should make. And I think that the council needs to adopt a much more strict guide to TAB policy and if the council puts it in to the constitution and then I guess the problem would be solved.

Registrar: on the issue of nations bursaries, I am concerned that about the countries from South Asia where there are less debating infrastructure as compared to rich countries.

Teddy: we that's not the way the policy we set up works. The issue is legitimate if you are looking for sponsors in your own country, but we are not talking about business communities in home country rather in Vancouver. They are all very successful and they all have money. For example there aren't enough big business associates from England & Ireland in Vancouver. The communities are from developing nations in general and especially from debate developing nations.

Kevin: we must remember that this isn't UBC fund raising plan but rather UBC country bursary plan.

Thailand: are there big business communities from Thailand or Indonesia in Vancouver?

Kevin: they are one of the largest. The south Asian and Southeast Asian countries make up about 50% of the population of Vancouver.

Teddy: in terms for food, we will be feeding 3 times a day (with dinner), in fact once you arrive all the delegates will be taken care off very well, your transportation and as well as the meals.

Chair: wishes the UBC bid team good luck.

Sydney Bid Presentation takes place

Oliver: we are here to tell you delegates why Sydney should be a good place to host the worlds 2007. We will be discussing issues such as cost, experience, accommodation, weather, socials & reliability. We will be showing you where the money will be coming from. In fact Sydney University itself has a lot of experience in hosting very large tournaments. We have hosted Worlds 2000 and also Australasian tournaments, the largest 3 on 3 tournament in the world and that proves how much experienced we are.

As far as the accommodation is concerned we will give you all on campus. This means no more taking bus early in the morning and no early starts, so that you have more time sleeping and also enjoy the debate and from our point of view we don't have to bear logistics cost of having you transported from the hotel to the debating venue and back. Almost all participants will have their very own room on campus in one of Sydney Uni's historic and very well-appointed colleges, with others in resort-style self-contained apartments at the brand-new Sydney University Village (also on campus). All debating venues within a 2 minute leisurely stroll from accommodation under Sydney's perfect summer skies.

The weather in Sydney at that time of the year will be great with sunshine and we will have the best social programs for the delegates with the New Year in Sydney harbour. Social events taking in the very best of Sydney's nightlife, from sparkling Darling Harbour to a sassy "barefoot and black tie" sunset cocktail party on one of Sydney's golden beaches and our very own private party island in the middle of Sydney Harbour!

Now in terms of cost our Rego is \$ 380 (USD) and it bears for 5 meals a day (3 major meals plus morning & afternoon tea). We are not worrying about sponsorships because we are very much confident that we are getting them and we already got \$ 50,000 from the university. When we say that we have got the experience we mean that we have hosted worlds before, we have a big alumni and as well adjudication team, it has a strong financial management and it provided CA (chief adjudicator) for Australs 2004. The chief adjudicator for Sydney 2007 is Amanda Woulthouzien. She was the DCA in Worlds 2004 at NTU and she has an excellent knowledge on adjudication.

David: I will be the tournament director of the Sydney 2007 worlds and I was also the tournament director of Australs. Thus I have a lot of experience dealing with a lot of teams. What we also propose is that we will use the TAB that was used in worlds 2004 at NTU, Singapore. We will use the system that unanimously ratified by the council at worlds 2004 and by next week we will send the manual to every delegates of TAB system. We will make sure that every single adjudicator in the tournament play with the TAB software.

Amanda: we will use the TAB system that was used at worlds 2004, NTU. There is a system in that TAB that how the adjudicators are being allocated in the rounds and we will show that to the adjudicators. So every time a draw comes out we will have it checked and re-checked electronically and as well as manually. At NTU worlds it was

our idea of judges feedback on judges and it has worked wonderfully and we will definitely using that again. As for DCA's I want to have a mixture of premier DCA and new DCA. I know there has been a lot of discussion in women's forum about gender representation and I am very much open to those kind of issues especially about female judges, female debaters.

Amanda (Deputy Convener): Australia has a strong stance about promoting women especially in debating and adjudicating. We also realize a lot of issues regarding women in debating and adjudicating in different countries in the world and we will take all of them into account. In the beginning of the tournament we will have a women forum where we will bring some outstanding female guest speakers and they will tell you the problems they have faced and how you can tackle those sorts of problems. The university of Sydney Union has a very strong stand against any behavior that contributes to basic sexual harassment policy and it will be ready to take any action if needed.

Questions from Council Reps.

Ireland: a lot of things has changed in 3 days time. The adjudication has changed within 03 days quite substantially, you also said you will be having 5 member chief adjudication panel with 3 from Austral-Asia, how come so many changes in last 3 days?

Oliver: yes 3 days ago we had a 6 member adjudication policy but then when we prepared our bid we didn't have experienced adjudication available to us even though Sydney Union has a deep pool of adjudicators, but now we have realized that we have so we took advantage of it and thus we realize to have a great tournament you must have an experienced adjudication panel and that is the confidence you have on Sydney.

Ireland: but your policy is 5 member panel 3 from Austral-Asia, how can you explain that?

Amanda (CA): at the moment I have in mind to have 3 to 4 DCA's. As the worlds is getting bigger and bigger every one is looking for visibility and thus we want to have DCA's who are there who are capable of helping people. I plan to have some highly experienced DCA's and a new DCA.

Ireland: have you promised anyone for DCA yet?

Amanda (CA): No.

Singapore: Alex Croft is the worlds 2004 best speaker and austral asian chief adjudicator, how come you have never consulted him for the position of Chief Adjudicator?

Oliver: Alex is getting married next year, we approached them and they have said they would be there if circumstances needed them, so we have approached Amanda and she has agreed.

Canada: in regards to registration cost you said you have fixed sponsorships and fixed costs and that is roughly about \$ 500 (Canadian), worst case scenario. So I am wondering if there is any way of reducing the Rego as compared to what UBC has proposed?

Oliver: The moment we will have more sponsorships we will try to decrease the Rego just like UBC has proposed and we are very confident

Women's: I have 2 questions. 1st is about the guest speaker and it happened at Stellenbosch 2 years ago and it was that successful and the 2nd question is about Women's night, what is it, what do we do here?

Amanda (Deputy Convener): Infact it was part of our policy to have a guest speaker and it worked out well in the Australs. They would come and talk to you about the problems they have faced and how to tackle those problems in the Women Forum and as for the 2nd question it is night where we will discuss women issues and what we want to do is to celebrate women in debating and adjudicating.

Japan: will the EFL rounds be held independently and the second question whether or not the motions would be written down or not.

Oliver: The EFL rounds would be held separate to any other event. Just like we had in Australs this year yes the motions would be written down so that you can see and understand them.

Malaysia: how are you going to ensure that EFL rounds and finals because the schedules are very tight any way because now you will have ESL rounds and EFL rounds and the main draw.

Oliver: ESL & EFL are separate issues. We will be making sure the debating have different time slots when we are running the tournament.

Equity: This time we had over 80 ESL teams and that is why we had an ESL quarter finals so are you have an ESL quarterfinals too?

Oliver: Of course if we have over 80 ESL teams we will definitely have an ESL quarter finals.

Equity: on which date do you propose to have the quarter finals?

Oliver: The same way it has been run at MMU.

Netherlands: The registration fee of the worst case scenario is quite expensive for us even what UBC has proposed is also expensive. Even looking for sponsorships is quite unjustified. So have you done anything on bursaries so you could lower down the Rego.

Oliver: we don't think it is important for us to have bursaries. We will do it like we did in Sydney 2000 by looking for sponsorships.

Philippines: There was an issue at Sydney Australs last year underage people weren't allowed to enter socials, I think New South Wales banned minors from entering into bars, and so how would you comment on that.

Oliver: Yes New South Wales do not allow minors from entering into bars, but that doesn't mean that minors can not be there where alcohol is being served. We will make sure that minors can enter the socials in Sydney 2007.

Ireland: The budget you have presented is it based on Sydney 2000 and how well the the sponsorship drive is going on?

Oliver: No it isn't based on Sydney 2000 its based on what we have learned from Sydney 2000. Sydney 2000 was an exceptional event and we got plenty of sponsors and for the current drive we have about \$ 105,000.

Women's: the prices we see here, are they 30% inclusive discount or are they without 30% discount.

Oliver: No they are with 30% discount so that is the actual price you would pay.

Chair: I want to know if ESL teams be eligible for EFL and vice versa and how does the relationship takes place?

Oliver: There is no world universities debating council recommendation policy, its just that Sydney 2007 policy we will be having.

England: our concern is that the Ashes series will take place in that time and therefore the availability of flights would be less and that would increase our cost.

Oliver: we will be working with the airlines to make sure that you will be getting the tickets. Yes both events will take place in 2007, but we will definitely be working with the airlines.

Korea: what is the point of EFL division that you are creating like the masters if you just going to have the same teams basically winning ESL and what value does it have.

Amanda (CA): they would extra training before the main competition starts and its all about having some extra practice.

Ireland: In terms of logistical point of view the first point is to organize an EFL break not to mention the EFL practice rounds and even though you may find there is no harm to this, but the 1st priority is EFL break isn't scheduling is going to be a massive issue to look after.

Oliver: we leave that for the world's council to decided 3 weeks before the tournament begins.

Malaysia: I think the status quo of what Sydney doing to give an additional event that is already there. People who register themselves as an EFL team register like some sort of honor system, I think teams who has a good proficiency in English shouldn't register for ESL, they should realize the it is for some one else.

Chair thanks Sydney bid team for presentation.

Chair: asks the council reps, if there are any questions to ask both the bidders.

Russia: will any one of you would bid for 2008 in case either Sydney or UBC lost

Oliver: There will be no way that Sydney Union will bid for 2008

Teddy: I cant guarantee you that there will people still around at UBC to bid for worlds 2008, cause Kevin Massie wouldn't be there and many people wouldn't be there.

Indonesia: what have you in mind for developing nations forum for both Sydney and UBC for worlds 2007?

Oliver: Its not for Australia to say that what are to be discussed in the forum. The people attending the forum will decide what to discuss or not.

Teddy: we will definitely have a look a developing nationas forum at UBC Worlds. We have seen that there were motions such as McCarthyism which though has no relations to developing nations forum but we have motions where it concentrates to one particular area and I believe that in developing nations forum it will be a good place to discuss those issues.

Voting Takes Place

Country	UBC	SYD	Abstain	Absent	Count	Total Effective	
Grand Total	39	23	1	3	66	62	
Status A							
Australia		1					
Canada	1						
England	1						
Ireland	1						
Japan	1						
Malaysia		1					
Philippines		1					
USA	1						
Total	5	3	0	0	8		
Weighted	20	12	0	0	32		

Total							
Status B							
China				1			
Hong Kong		1					
New Zealand		1					
Scotland	1						
Singapore	1						
South Africa	1						
Total	3	2	0	1	6		
Weighted Total	9	6	0	3	18		
Status C							
Bangladesh	1						
India	1						
Jamaica		1					
Netherlands	1						
Thailand		1					
Total	3	2	0	0	5		
Weighted Total	6	4	0	0	10		
Status D							
Croatia	1						
Indonesia		1					
Russia			1				
South Korea	1						
Total	2	1	1	0	4		
Weighted Total	2	1	1	0	4		
No Status							
Germany	1						
Pakistan	1						
Total	2	0	0	0	2		
Weighted Total	2	0	0	0	2		

Chair: wishes Sydney for good presentation and Congratulates UBC for winning the Bid.

Chair: informs the council delegates that the next agenda is MMU adjudication. If any one wishes to ask questions they may begin.

Japan: there were some motions which were quite tough especially the one about McCarthyism and the way it is worded we founded it to be quite confusing. I think the motions which are given should be understood by all the teams.

Logan: the adjudication team spent a lot of time in preparing the motions. We tried to make the motions as clear and competitive as possible. If any the motions unfortunately hampered any ones performance for that I apologize.

Chair: in Melbourne 94 Worlds, there was a motion on Neo McCarthyism and what they wanted to say was what Neo McCarthyism meant as a Metaphoric statement and so it made it clear. I am not saying that what MMU should have done but in terms of making complicated motions in future it could be used as an option.

Jeremy Brier: I think McCarthyism is a translatable & a very famous term and we thought every team in the debating tournament would have heard it. Another point I wasn't point out is about cultural diversity. The NAFTA debate required a discussion in perspective to South America, outsourcing is between developing and developed worlds. The debate between EU & Africa is about EU & Africa relationship and I believe that cultural diversity has been reflected in this tournament.

Women's: Kevin said that the adjudication feedback was based on some organic process. Don't you think that feedback would be a problem.

Logan: we cant have something which is too rigid. The moment you become too strong it may set bad example and sets the tournament. Some teams have won and some has lost but we don't think there wasn't any problem with the feedback.

Women's: there was not any way to have feedback form about other adjudicators like they had at NTU worlds 2004.

Jeremy: I totally agree and that is why I have said please write down what you want to say and give it to us. We did say that.

Women's: my point is that don't you think there should have been concrete adjudication feedback form?

Logan: sometimes it works and sometimes it doesn't. we felt this time that we put people that you have not spoken with before and when they had allegations we looked at the rooms and sued a sort of balance techniques.

Women's: there were some indications of gender biased in adjudication. What have you done with those issues?

Logan: any complaint or issues that was brought to us we have delat with it very seriously.

Canada: this is in brief to the motions, have 2 questions. One on imperial debate concept and second, do you think it gives a hybrid of knowledge.

Jeremy: In McCarthyism debate, all you have to know what the term means and the whole debate can be on anti-terrorism. Yes I do believe in this level of competition any team should be able to discuss anti-terrorism either on the empirical level or the policy level.

South Korea: part of the problem was language in some motions like positive discrimination and in terms of McCarthyism it requires a certain level of history.

Jeremy: there are certain terms that are very much being constantly used such as positive discrimination for last 5 to 10 years in the world and I am sure any debater would understand those simple words.

Equity: the motions given should be very clear, it doesn't have to be so much sophisticated.

Logan: we tried to make the motions very clear and very much distinctive and but it was a trade off with some motions.

South Africa: the motions which are to be given should be very much basic which can be understood by all the teams.

Malaysia: everyone is coming from countries with different cultural background, for example from china, the Asean countries. The motions should be such that it becomes acceptable to all cultures.

Bangladesh: a question to Logan, in one of the rounds the chair didn't give oral feedback but his panelist gave. Can they do it?

Logan: I guess the chair had descent.

Jeremy: giving oral feedback is definitely the duty of the chair, but we are sorry if anything such happened that way, but it's the job of the chair to give the oral feedback.

Chair: asks the council reps the discussion now is not the frustration of adjudication but rather it's the policy made by the adjudication team, so please stay focused.

Russia: going back to vocations, the problem was not of having little knowledge but rather it is the linguistic problem and it becomes a problem for EFL speakers such as motions like "vocational training".

Jeremy: Vocational relating to vocation. Its not a jurgen it's a word.

Hong Kong: in the adjudication feedback form there is a question " do you want to speak to the A team"? some wrote yes but we could never get to talk to the A team.

Jeremy: it is quite impossible to get out there and seek everyone, we do our best and it is a two way connection and any one could have come and spoken to us.

Pakistan: I think the standard of motions reflect the standard of World Debate Championships.

Singapore: I think from the experience from Australs the types of motions given are in a very standard form and I think its up to the DCA's to make the motions and uphold the standard.

Ciaran: when you start talking things like EU & NAFTA you do need a huge level of knowledge and database.

Equity: certain people gave me claims about adjudicators, I got the details and the profiles of the rounds and gave it to the adjudication team and would like to know how did you process that information and what were the outcomes.

Jeremy: we got a piece of paper from the Equity on the busiest time of day 03 with the name of the chair. We did talk with the chair of that round. But I don't think this is matter which should be complained to world's council. We get hundreds and hundreds of complaints and we are giving 100% in dealing with it and we also didn't know that we have to inform you.

Equity: I can understand your pressure, but you shouldn't promise that you will take care of it immediately and secondly if I don't have enough information how can I perform my job as an equity officer.

Chair: hosting the worlds in a year time takes a lot of hard work. Would like to thank Logan, Jeremy and Kevin for a wonderful job they have performed.

Chair: now we shall go through the committee reports.

Chair: after that extraordinary meeting we had last year (NTU 2004) that brought us to a new process of having 06 months review which Ciaran and his team has done a wonderful job. The reason for including this into the report is to make a constitutional change.

Registrar: The Article 15.1 reads "on meeting during a round of championships, the council shall consider bids to host future championships two years in advance. Successful bids shall be ratified automatically at the meeting of the council during round following one year later. If the said condition has not been satisfied, bids shall be reopened without prejudice to any bidder". Now Article 15.1 will be "on meeting during a round of championships, the council shall consider bids to host future championships two years in advance". And we will have a new Article 15.3 "the chair of the organizing committee shall supply a report to the committee 6 months before the council meeting at which the bid is to be confirmed. On the basis of the report the regional representatives will vote on

the host nation. If the majority of the regional representatives indicates that they have critical concerns on the level of host's preparedness, then the bid shall reopen without prejudice to any bidder. In other case the bid shall be confirmed automatically.

Kevin Massie: does this mean we have to pass our ratification bid by June / July ?

Chair: no it means that the report you have made in 6 months which was mandated at Worlds 2004 is the same thing which we would be looking at in 6 months. The reason why this should be clear is because Iva was a very good friend and it was very hard thing for all of us to watch what happened at NTU Worlds 2004. And say for example if UBC couldn't have confirm their bid by any chance, then we would be on the rush to look for new bidders. Rather than solving the problem in the council it can be done 06 months prior to defending the bid, then a lot of problems can be solved.

Ireland: do disagree with the idea, but think, it should be 03 months rather than 06 months before the championships.

Chair: well it is an issue needs to be discussed, but that was my primary report.

Registrar: the worlds website is up. The results from previous worlds has yet not been updated but on the process. Have been contacted by Leonfim Kofilham who is a businessman and an Erasmus Alumni who provides the web domain for the website for free. The issue arises because couple years ago, the worlds name was hijacked by Turkey. He asked us that we pay for the domain we are using. Final point which needs to be emphasized about the constitutional amendments. If one wish amend a constitution, it should be properly worded and them amended.

Women's: a lot of things have happened. A lot of styles has been briefed and discussed especially those in the international styles. One doesn't have to speak like Jeremy Brier to win debates. Generally women in debates have been very good including the women's breakfast. We definitely want to see the adjudication feedback form. In the new years party there were some people who were behaving in such a manner, it kind of looked scary and it's the responsibility of everyone to make sure that the situation don't go out of hand. Now let us look at some statistics of women in the main break.

Worlds 2004: 16 teams male – male, 13 male – female

Worlds 2003: 18 teams male – male, 12 teams male – female, 2 teams female – female

Worlds 2002: 20 teams male-male, 11 teams male-female

Worlds 2001: 20 teams male-male, 8 teams male-female, 3 teams female-female

Secretary: it's my 1sttime sitting as the secretary in the worlds council. My main priority to is to deliver the meeting minutes on time and we are recording the whole council meeting so that we can have an accurate minutes.

Equity: the first wish to do is to provide a database and to give info on what is BP format. We have very active debate countries in central Asia and yet we don't have participation

from those countries. I have a lot of debate DVD's and would ask the councils permission to upload them into the website. Many people are looking for videos and its becoming difficult for my part to supply them. Also have visited the developing nations forum and some of the issues raised there were relating to discrimination and would ask the council to look into the matter. The other subject in the developing nation's forum is EFL and those who suffer from language are now enjoying ESL.

Iona: nothing to report that much, was in contact with the welsh debating union a few weeks ago and hopefully we will be having the welsh team coming to worlds in Dublin. The EU championships are being hosted by Cork and if any one wish to come we will invite them on breaking basis.

Oceania: participation has been very much steady from Australia's point of view. Participation from New Zealand has been increasing. Local intervarsity tournaments are growing strongly and we had the largest Australs in 2004. We had people like Jeremy come to the tournaments and we have seen the participation of international teams increasing.

America's: 2 things to report. We have been trying get a vibrant debating competition with US. Last year (2004) we had CUSID BP championships and we had international teams participating, it was a success and got positive feedback.

Africa: we had national championships in South Africa and there was teams from Botswana taking part at Stellenbosch.

Europe: the EUDC restructured itself last year (2204). We are adopting a system where the EU council would take European Executives from Iona. First time an ESL team won the championships at the Europeans.

Jeremy Brier: compared to day 1, day 2 and day 3 ran pretty smoothly. The rest of the tournament is expected good to go, exciting motions and good debates.

Chair: now we can go back to constitutional review and we have a bulk of discussions to do. The 1st agenda is the 4 year rule, which is the grandfather clause and invite any delegates would like to speak about it.

It is dropped from agenda since no delegate spoke about it.

Chair: next agenda is discussion during the motion prep with others/coaches/and use of digital devices.

South Korea: would like to change article 1.3.3 of the world parliamentary debating rules with the exception of electronic dictionary would be accepted during the preparation of the motion.

Canada: would also like to support the use of laptops.

Chair: let's stick to the electronic dictionary first.

Ireland: there may be economic and financial barriers to this problem. One team may have the financial advantage and can afford but another team coming from a poor country may not have that advantage. In other words the access to certain technology is limited to certain people.

England: a paper dictionary does the same job as an electronic one.

South Korea: a true dictionary for example a paper one can be quite cumbersome and its quite heavy to carry around. The second thing is that people are carrying mobile phones and if they want to cheat they can since they have the technology to do so. There are teams who would want to use an electronic dictionary so they can interpret the motion.

USA: we should define what an electronic dictionary is and make sure that it would not be an electronic encyclopedia.

Equity: no body wants to see a messy debate because certain didn't understand the motion. It would be impossible to have a debate if there are teams with serious language problem.

Canada: since there are no restrictions on printed materials, then there shouldn't be any problem with electronic dictionary.

Ciaran: if there is going to be a differentiation between a book and an electronic dictionary then the same principle would apply to matter files and big folders and everything is in printed form.

Ireland: certain electronic dictionaries look like GSM mobile phones. So we need to visually inspect them and check them to see that they are electronic dictionary only. Some dictionaries may have access to internet.

Registrar: if you are going to ban on the grounds of advantages for rich countries, then you should also ban oxford dictionary as well. Lat 2 worlds has allowed it and it was done by the org comm. So just trust them.

Singapore: it seems ok and practical to use the electronic dictionary. If any one is using it more than several minutes, only then you can get suspicious, but see no problem with it.

Scotland: the economic point of having an electronic dictionary is totally nonsense.

South Korea: first of all don't support laptops. Secondly there are teams who has no idea on what the motion is especially motions like McCarthyism, positive discrimination and these kids needs them more.

Australia: there are definitely some linguistic barriers and we should allow electronic dictionary.

New Zealand: laptops shouldn't be allowed but see no problem with an electronic dictionary.

Ciaran: one gets 15 minute prep time for the motions and if some one is using an electronic dictionary then they can also access the internet.

South Africa: if the basic function is just to translate the word in the motion, then it should be allowed.

Equity: if the students are suspiciously looking at a dictionary and think its cheating then in that case you have the Japanese teams breaking the ESL.

Malaysia: definitely if it is for translational purposes and for those who has linguistic barriers then it can be allowed.

Chair: a motion in the floor. Article 1.3.3 "the use of electronic equipment with the exception of an electronic dictionary is prohibited during the preparation".

Moved: Malaysia

Second: Russia

Country	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Count	Total Effective	
Grand Total	48	11	1	6	66	59	
Status A							
Australia	1						
Canada	1						
England		1					
Ireland		1					
Japan	1						
Malaysia	1						
Philippines	1						
USA	1						
Total	6	2	0	0	8		
Weighted Total	24	8	0	0	32		
Status B							
China				1			
Hong Kong	1						
New Zealand	1						
Scotland		1					
Singapore	1						
South Africa	1						
Total	4	1	0	1	6		
Weighted Total	12	3	0	3	18		

Status C							
Bangladesh	1						
India				1			
Jamaica	1						
Netherlands	1						
Thailand	1						
Total	4	0	0	1	5		
Weighted Total	8	0	0	2	10		
Status D							
Croatia	1						
Indonesia	1						
Russia	1						
South Korea	1						
Total	4	0	0	0	4		
Weighted Total	4	0	0	0	4		
No Status							
Germany				1			
Pakistan			1				
Total	0	0	1	1	2		
Weighted Total	0	0	1	1	2		

Motion Passes (48-11).

Chair: next discussion on the floor is electronic devices inclusive of laptops.

Kevin Massie: can we move to strike a rule, that it can be allowed at host's discretion.

Chair: lets discuss on the provision of electronic devices.

South Africa: with a laptop you can surf the internet and that would be really unfair.

England: even if you don't have internet access but one say and have a limit on how much one can carry in the laptop.

Australia: in a debate we would like to see more of an analysis rather than more of matter, so no point of having laptops.

Women's: not every one has access to laptops. It would be unfair for those who can not afford a laptop.

Ireland: most of our debaters don't have laptops. Even if they do it would take several hundred euro to register for the internet.

Canada: I deny the fact that debaters would have the environment to go through the internet. The laptop would be used to basically to carry the matter file.

Chair: motion on the floor “to remove the clause of electronic devices”

Moved: Canada

Second: none

Motion Falls.

Chair: next issue is preparing with others / coaches. There is nothing of this such either in the rule or in the constitution. Its just an understanding at worlds that such things should be carried out.

USA: don't think there aren't any negative consequences in preparing with others.

England: debating is a team sport not an institutional sport, so it is very wrong to have group prep.

Singapore: say on motions like NAFTA one team gets hold of an American team and gets necessary strategies and information that is unfair for the rest 3 teams. Its your ability to perform and that's what debating is all about.

Ciaran: for motions like McCarthyism people may talk to other teams. In Dublin we will not enforce the policy unless the council mandates and we will enforce it. We feel in principle group prep should go on.

Equity: some bigger problem to this issue is that not many teams have coaches who are very much experienced with world championships and there are few people who are more experienced in BP format, hence would support group prep.

South Korea: if you really want to get rid of coaching and group prep, then make a clear policy and if you do group prep you will get an automatic 4th. People will be scared, we must make a choice, either enforce it or don't.

Philippines: what would happen if you had 3 teams from the same institutions in one debate and they rig the entire debate and it would be unfortunate for the 4th team.

Croatia: what happens if you get a resolution like McCarthyism or vocational training and you don't know what it means then if I consult with my own teams from my institution, will that be prep with others.

South Africa: if some one is caught in a group prep and we have marked that team with an automatic 4th without even hearing the debate, is that justified?

England: first of all there is huge difference of going to an individual rather than going to huge group of people. Secondly it's up to us how we would want to enforce the

punishment and thirdly it's also the job of the DCA'S since they are friends with the debaters and they can also tell them not to group prep.

Ireland: if 2 teams are closely sitting together and speaking in their native language, how someone would know what they are talking about.

USA: the question still is how would one enforce the policy? You have the CA & the DCA's in an auditorium with 600 debaters, it's not possible to monitor them all.

Netherlands: there will be some people who may be cheating with digital devices. If we see more than 2 people sitting down for 5 to 10 minutes, then we can get hold of them.

Canada: once you create a sanction to this issue and people would know that, that it self would be a threat to people.

New Zealand: we are intelligent people and the DCA'S should be able to make that distinction between someone asking a question or doing a group prep.

Malaysia: as for the enforcement goes you would have 250 more adjudicators other than the CA and the DCA's. yet you may have 2 or more people having a conversation in their own language. What we need to tell them that it is an individual team performance and there should be no group prep. The punishments don't have to be that you get an automatic 4th.

Kevin Massie: giving this responsibility to the DCA's is a huge burden. I am not against the principle, but don't think there is no way to enforce it.

Women's" I would say if teams are caught in a group prep they will be automatically become non breaking status.

South Africa: if we are going to vote for this, could some one define what the motion is going to be and what sort of punishment mechanism will be there.

Chair: we will make a new rule article 1.3.4 under preparation

OCENIA: debating is about one team trying to fake another team and its not institutional benefit. Then again its on the discretion of DCA's to see if there is a problem and see how will they tackle it.

Ciaran: you have 250 adjudicators who will looking for teams who will be doing group prep and that is a huge burden for the DCA's to investigate and not to mention the adjudicators them selves have their institutional bondage. If you are going to make teams non breaking then teams also should have the right to complaint about other teams discussing.

USA: if someone asks about McCarthyism but doesn't ask for argument shouldn't lose the round for that. To define and understand a resolution is far more important than how you do in a round.

England: it should also be self enforcement; people should realize that if they do it, then they are cheats.

Kevin Massie: people use cell phones in the prep time, it happened at every worlds. We see a lot of people breaking the rules and we must have norm for it.

Ireland: first of all who will actually prosecute the cases? If we have open motions, teams will sit around and will talk in native languages and ultimately some will cheat.

Chair: the motion on the floor is to be inserted as article 1.3.4 in the world parliamentary debating rules "members must not confer other than team member in the preparation time".

All the delegates in favor
Motion passes unanimously.

Malaysia: would like to add in section 1.3.4, "any violation of this rule will turn them to non breaking status".

Equity: in the hall there will be runners who can complaint to the DCA.

Jeremy: conversations happen all the time, people may borrow pencils, and then every single conversations has to be investigated.

Registrar: it is in the rules that debate should start in 15 minutes after the motion has been given, not using any mobile phones and it's the responsibility of the adjudication team to enforce it.

Malaysia: would like to withdraw the motion.

Chair: since worlds 96 at cork there has been an understanding that motions should be closed in nature. This understanding has passed on from generation to generation, but has come to my attention that it is not in the rule nor in the constitution.

Ireland: It should be unambiguously worded and should give a clear and a general direction of the debate.

Chair: there has been time when the motions were open ended and saw how dangerous that can be.

USA: once a motion has been given can it be changed?

Chair: yes but only under special circumstances. At NTU worlds 2004 motion were given before decaling the position hence it was changed.

Ciaran: can we have an enforced comedy round?

Chair: in Manila 99 we had a motion that THB that Asean should back ANWAR. Many thought it was a funny motion but still it was a serious debate.

Russia: there should be guidelines on how to make motions. If no guidelines exists then we could have serious problem.

Ireland: it should be enforced in such a way that motions should give direction of the debate.

Chair: Motion on the floor in the rules under article 4.2.1 that “Motions should be unambiguously worded that it gives a clear intended direction of the debate”.

Moved: Ireland

Seconded: Scotland

Motion passes unanimously.

Chair: the next agenda is bid ratification.

Registrar: “The chair of the organizing committee of the successful bid shall supply a report 03 months before the council meeting of where the bid is to be confirmed. On the basis of the report acquired, Regional Representatives under article 28.2 will vote on the host institution. If the majority of Regional Representatives indicates that they have critical concerns about the bid, the bid shall be reopened without any prejudice. In any other case the bid shall be confirmed automatically”.

Jeremy: my particular point is that it is very easy to disguise on papers.

New Zealand: at worlds 2004, what happened was a terrible thing and there were reasons why we felt that Croatia was having problems hosting it. They didn't have their DCA's confirmed.

Ciaran: we can never say to potential sponsors that there is nothing to worry about and you can commit to us. Sponsors has asked us whether or not we have our bid confirmed or not, and we said probably, and they told us to come back in January. If the council decided after the round of championships to take it away from them it becomes a serious risk.

Registrar: don't think that we should dig out the council vote now. Looking at what executives does there is a tendency that reports are prepared at the end of the year, so they may not take it seriously. If the executives stops the bid, that means bids would be reopened without prejudice and council can still reaffirm the bid.

Ireland: the risk of that would be that universities would still go for a re bid.

Registrar: The article 15 of the constitution would be read as follows:

1. On meeting during a Round of the Championship, the Council shall consider bids to host future Championships two years in advance.

2. All bids shall be submitted in writing and shall be signed by a sponsor. Bids may be signed by one or more seconders. A bid shall state the College and Society which will host the Championship, the dates of the Round, the debating procedures to be followed, and any relevant financial or other information.

3. The Chair of the Executive Organising Committee of the successful bid shall supply a report to the Committee. The report shall be provided at least 3 months before the Council meeting at which the bid is to be confirmed.

4 On the basis of the report provided, the regional representatives appointed under article 28(2) will vote on the readiness of the host institution. If a majority of the regional representatives indicate that they have critical concerns about the hosts level of preparedness then the Committee shall invite further bids which may be considered by Council. In any other case the bid shall be considered to be endorsed by the Committee.

5 The Chair of the Executive Organizing Committee of the successful bid shall present a report to the Council meeting at the Championships one year before the Championships which they are to host. If the Council has critical concerns about the ability of the hosts to hold the Championships then it may vote to reopen the bidding without prejudice to any bidder. In any other case the bid shall be considered to be ratified by Council.

6 The Committee vote specified in paragraph 4 shall be conducted in a manner specified by the Registrar.

Chair: the developing nation's forum was successful and we should also put it in the constitution under article 10.K "Ensuring that there is a developing debating nations' meeting at the tournament which would be open to all participants in the championship"

All the delegates in favor
Motions pass unanimously.

Equity: I get many complaints from teams of English as a second language and they are the most suffering people. Currently the criteria for ESL are:

- i. What country you live in?
- ii. The language of instruction in schools.
- iii. Whether you speak English at home?
- iv. Feel any difficulties when debating in English.

The 4th criteria seems very vague. Every one uses the last criteria to get into ESL. I would support the second criteria for the determination of ESL.

England: does this mean we have to check all the teams and find out whether they are ESL or not?

Chair: we do that in the tournament.

New Zealand: we have been discussing the ESL issue for last 2 years or so. In New Zealand we have institutions with Maori as the language of instruction. So I believe that we must see the language of instruction is English.

Netherlands: I don't think any ESL teams out here know what are the criteria's for ESL. If we have people who had English in their primary and secondary school, speak with their friends in English, have debated before shouldn't register themselves as an ESL.

Singapore: even though if the language of instruction is in English there may be people who understands English well but may not express them.

Registrar: the key issue here is to inform the teams the criteria's of ESL.

Ciaran: the main thing that will still exist is lying and people would lie which can not be detected and also who would want to break as an ESL?

Equity: I don't insists that we stick with the 2nd criteria, But it's the diverse situation we have, but still the status quo is wrong. There are people who got 2nd prize in ESL and later informed me that there 1st language was English. This has to stop and would like to propose a motion that will force this kind of teams out of ESL bracket and join the main break.

Singapore: even in Singapore, Malaysia & Philippines there are people who can not speak proper English. They may understand it but it becomes difficult for them to express it.

Netherlands: there are some teams in South East Asia who has been taught in English all their life and it becomes unfair for these teams to participate in ESL.

South Africa: is there any way of conducting English assessment test to identify who are ESL or not?

Malaysia: if any institution develops themselves and they think they have achieved English at a good level, then they should register themselves as an ESL. MMU don't register themselves as an ESL.

Ireland: even if you spoke English for the entire education there still be gap there and it is for them ESL should be and what about a break for EFL, English as foreign language?

Netherlands: the council first must decide what are the criteria's for ESL and only then people would realize when to join ESL and when not to join ESL and the criteria's should be more public and transparent to the teams when they register.

New Zealand: I think the council should force teams who do not qualify out of ESL break and opt to main break.

USA: the whole program for the ESL is to build the English for those teams who are weak in it, so that they can participate in the main break.

Registrar: I think that council should mandate to future hosts that they bring to every participant's the actual set of criteria's before registering them for ESL.

Philippines: how would you determine the spoken English, would you ask them to bring their school diploma and grades in the English classes and how will it be enforced?

South Africa: during the registration process we should ask the teams whether they are ESL or EFL.

Singapore: if any teams think they good enough to break then language shouldn't be any problem and they wouldn't register themselves as an ESL.

Equity: once again I want to remind you that these teams are abusing ESL and real ESL or EFL teams are not getting the chance.

Australia: would like to recognize ESL that these teams are doing something harder than the rest of the teams but they have to do it so good and have to break the main break but if you going to give some one the chance to choose between ESL or main break, they will choose ESL since it is like a safety net.

South Korea: since I deal with a lot of students as a coach, Australia's version of safety net, is the main problem now and secondly Kevin Moar's solution is the most sensible till now, and many of the teams who use the safety net do want to use that cause then they have to opt for the main break.

Equity: we must have a rule which would say if people don't meet the criteria's for ESL they should opt to main break. Secondly to give council to approve that ESL finalists are really as ESL teams, because in the pre-council we get so many teams signing up for ESL and we can not check all of them and I oppose the motion that teams will either choose ESL or main break.

England: once they choose the option either ESL or the main break it will be quite tough for you to cancel teams from ESL even if they don't qualify and secondly we can determine by seeing the name of the school to determine if they are ESL or not.

Chair: It will be very tough to determine if they are ESL or not by just seeing the name of the school.

Netherlands: there are teams who is coming to worlds for the 1st time and they do not how good they are compared to other teams and it would be very much unfair for them to make a choice and force them to EFL, ESL or the main break.

New Zealand: move with the motion article 22.8.e “when an ESL teams register for the championships they may be forced to choose either ESL or the main competition.”

Moved: New Zealand
 Seconded: South Africa

Country	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Count	Total Effective
Grand Total	21	27	11	7	66	48
Status A						
Australia		1				
Canada			1			
England	1					
Ireland			1			
Japan		1				
Malaysia	1					
Philippines		1				
USA		1				
Total	2	4	2	0	8	
Weighted Total	8	16	8	0	32	
Status B						
China				1		
Hong Kong		1				
New Zealand	1					
Scotland			1			
Singapore	1					
South Africa	1					
Total	3	1	1	1	6	
Weighted Total	9	3	3	3	18	
Status C						
Bangladesh	1					
India				1		
Jamaica		1				
Netherlands		1				
Thailand		1				
Total	1	3	0	1	5	
Weighted Total	2	6	0	2	10	
Status D						
Croatia		1				
Indonesia	1					

Russia		1					
South Korea	1						
Total	2	2	0	0	4		
Weighted Total	2	2	0	0	4		
No Status							
Germany				1			
Pakistan				1			
Total	0	0	0	2	2		
Weighted Total	0	0	0	2	2		

Motion Falls.

South Africa: there are teams who are abusing the system and we need to out a stop to it.

Australia: when a team registers for ESL the council should ask them on what grounds you match ESL according to the criteria's and they have to explain how they would match.

Registrar: in the registration form the teams fill up they have to give in brief description why they are ESL so they can be actually honest.

Netherlands: when the teams fill up the registration forms ask questions on the language of instruction in the secondary school, ask them what was the second language their parents used in their homes.

Registrar: when filling out forms there will be questions regarding if you are ESL or not. If they are then they would have to explain why you feel disadvantage in debating in English and that would really force them to think about it and forces them to lie if they want to be in ESL or not.

Kevin Massie: like to propose a motion: ESL speakers shall provide a detailed description of the criteria's of which the ESL status will be given".

Moved: Canada

Seconded: Australia

Motion passed unanimously.

Equity: what about who will cheat by abusing ESL in future tournaments?

Kevin Massie: we should check in the pre-council meeting, and that would approved by the council.

Chair: you know how pre-council goes and it will be really long.

Equity: we can take the list in the pre-council and can go over it and may take 15 minutes and it can be done at pre-council and we would eliminate someone if they are using those criteria illegally.

Ireland: we had this discussion every year for last 03 years would like to close this discussion.

Croatia: why don't we strike of the fourth clause of article 22.8.b.4

Registrar: a motion on the floor that clause in article 22.8.b.4 be deleted from the constitution.

Moved: Croatia

Seconded: none

Motion Falls.

Chair: the next agenda is about payment for the WUDC website

Ireland: are you saying that host nation should be paying for the WUDC website?

Ciaran: I don't think paying 7 euro would be such a great deal but the bigger issue the council needs to deal is whether or not host should pay for the website and should be in the agenda for future tournaments.

Chair: the motion on the floor is "make a committee that will investigate the website issue".

Moved: Ireland

Seconded: Canada

Chair: now the elections will take place. Are there any nominations on the floor for chair?

Ireland: like to nominate Ian Lising

Seconded: Malaysia

Ian Lising retains his Chair in WUDC

Chair: Are there any nominations for registrar?

Malaysia: like to nominate David Ham

Seconded: Australia

David Ham retains as Registrar of WUDC

Chair: Are there any nominations for secretary?

New Zealand: would like to nominate Sarfaraz

Seconded: Ireland

Sarfaraz Ahmed retains as Secretary WUDC

Chair: Are there any nominations for women's officer?

Ireland: would like to nominate Miranda

Seconded: New Zealand

Miranda retains as Women's officer in WUDC

Chair: Are there any nominations for equity officer?

New Zealand: like to nominate Stalin (Bangladesh Rep)

Seconded: Canada

South Korea: like to nominate Masako Suzuki

Seconded: New Zealand

Chair: gives them 1 minute time to present a speech

Stalin: have hosted the largest IUUC and have a greater vision for South Asian Debating Development especially in India and Sri Lanka.

Masako: I couldn't finish some of the job as the equity officer and that's is why I need more time especially establishing database for everybody and I am asking the council to have me re-elected.

Country	Stalin	Masako	Abstain	Absent	Count	Total Effective
Grand Total	6	41	7	12	66	47
Status A						
Australia		1				
Canada			1			
England		1				
Ireland	1					
Japan		1				
Malaysia		1				
Philippines		1				
USA		1				
Total	1	6	1	0	8	
Weighted Total	4	24	4	0	32	
Status B						
China				1		
Hong Kong				1		
New Zealand			1			
Scotland		1				
Singapore		1				
South Africa		1				
Total	0	3	1	2	6	
Weighted Total	0	9	3	6	18	
Status C						
Bangladesh	1					
India				1		
Jamaica		1				
Netherlands		1				
Thailand		1				
Total	1	3	0	1	5	
Weighted Total	2	6	0	2	10	

Total							
Status D							
Croatia				1			
Indonesia		1					
Russia				1			
South Korea		1					
Total	0	2	0	2	4		
Weighted Total	0	2	0	2	4		
No Status							
Germany				1			
Pakistan				1			
Total	0	0	0	2	2		
Weighted Total	0	0	0	2	2		

Masako wins (41 – 6)

Ian Lising world council chair asks the country reps to elect their regional reps with in 1st January 2005. He congratulates the reps who their represented countries and regions very well and on behalf of the executive and world council he thanks them. The chair wishes the reps thanks for their time and asks them not be afraid to get to know each other.

Jeremy: on behalf of MMU we thank Ian and Sarfaraz for running worlds council very well.