

Minutes of World Council 2006 Dublin, Ireland.

Held at the Burlington Hotel, Dublin on January 1st 2006.

Council opened at 11.26.

Roll Call

The roll call was taken and delegates from the following countries were found to be in attendance:

Australia
Canada
England
Israel
Ireland
Japan
Malaysia
Phillipines
United States of America
China
Hong Kong
New Zealand
Scotland
Bangladesh
Jamaica
South Korea
Thailand
Croatia
Germany
Russia

At the time of the roll call, the following countries were not represented by a delegate:

Singapore
Republic of South Africa
India
Indonesia
Netherlands
Barbados

Worlds 2005 minutes

The Chair called the meeting to order and wished everybody a happy new year. The Chair raised the issue of the minutes from Council in 2005. He explained that many delegates had noted within the minutes errors, omissions and statements attributed to them which they did not make. The Chair suggested that a motion might be tabled to strike the written minutes and submit video minutes; the video was not yet physically present so it was agreed to pass the minutes when they arrive.

MMU Report & Accounts

The MMU Report was distributed and the final accounts were presented by Logan. The Women's Officer asked why there was a breakdown for the 2005 women's forum yet no money had been spent on it to her knowledge – Logan replied that the money

was used for organisational activities such as promotion costs. The Chair, speaking on behalf of Council, stated that MMU was only the 2nd university ever to host Worlds on such short notice after Hart House in 1982; that they had done a phenomenal job; and thanked MMU for all their hard work.

UCD Report & Accounts

The UCD report was presented by the Convenor, Ciaran Lawlor. He pledged he would present the accounts after lunch. He wanted firstly to explain the presence of a Procter & Gamble employee as an adjudicator on the final panel. The Convenor had informed P&G, the main sponsor for the tournament, that they would accept an adjudicator from their company if they had someone who was acceptably qualified. Their selection, Mr Austin Lally, had won Worlds the last time UCD hosted the tournament, in 1987. Having consulted with the Chief Adjudicator and the DCAs, the Convenor's position was that he was happy to go with it if CA was happy to go with it. The Convenor informed Council that he was prepared to follow to alternative plans: firstly, to go to ten adjudicators if necessary to avoid the sponsor's representative potentially casting a deciding vote; secondly, to explain to P&G that Mr Lally can sit as an adjudicator but cannot vote because there is a constitutional barrier to his doing so.

The Chair opened up the discussion by offering background about Princeton Worlds in 1994, in which the final panel had 4 guest adjudicators. He explained that this had led to the convention that anyone who judges a break round must have judged preliminary rounds.

England invited Alex Deane to speak: he said he understood the explanation but believed that adjudicators should have to judge preliminary rounds: firstly, to prove they understand Worlds today; secondly, to undergo the feedback and vetting process which both guarantee quality of adjudication. There was also a question of principle – while Mr Lally may be a very qualified judge, in another tournament we could end up with 2 or 3 sponsors or a politician. He also pointed out that votes can turn on one adjudicator's voice in a Worlds Final. He stated his great respect for the position of UCD and suggested Mr Lally either chair the debate or chair the panel and not vote.

The Registrar explained to Council that there was nothing in rules or constitution to govern the composition of the final panel - just a decade of practice.

Malaysia wished to echo England's sentiments, feeling that Mr Lally could be added into the final as Chair or speaker but should not take away the place of an adjudicator.

Canada asked if such a plan would be acceptable to P&G.

The Convenor replied that P&G asked if Mr Lally could chair the panel, but he had felt it should remain the role of the CA. He repeated that he would be happy to add an adjudicator and make a ten-person panel. He explained his unwillingness to go back on a decision now the man in question is flying in from China and state that he could not guarantee the response from P&G.

At this point, the Chair explained that he had invited Colm Flynn and Neill Harvey-Smith as guests with speaking rights for this World Council.

Colm Flynn talked about his experience as DCA at Stellenbosch Worlds 2003, where the sponsor had demanded an adjudicator. He explained that P&G have a long history of sponsorship and adjudication in IONA and expressed the view that a multi-billion pound business flying in one of their top 10 people, over Christmas, from China, represented a terrific commitment to the tournament.

The Registrar clarified that UCD as host had acted within the rules. He advised that if council were retrospectively to undo the decision it would be unfair, though there may be a case for inserting a new rule.

The UBC Convenor summarised that if the host had not acted outside the rules then the discussion should move to future years – particularly if Mr Lally were already on his way from China.

Canada moved to make this an issue for future tournaments, not for UCD 2006.
Seconded? Passed?

The Women's Officer thanked UCD for their work in hosting the tournament and there was warm applause from Council.

The Convenor ended by saying that there was a massive and growing burden to squeeze an increasing number of events into a fixed amount of time. He advised that Council should consider asking convenors to do less before mandating them to do more. He explained that the only timetable discussion now available is which night you put the set events on. This takes away the ability to be imaginative and creating mounting difficulties in getting enough staff and volunteers. He was also concerned that the burden will rule out small universities from bidding for Worlds and act as a deterrent to potential hosts.

The Chair offered formal congratulations to UCD for running an extremely efficient tournament – he praised the registration process, professionalism, welcoming and polite team and offered special thanks to Ciaran Lawlor and Morgan Shelley for their work to set up this year's World Council meeting.

The Convenor briefed that the CA and DCAs were not in attendance, as they had worked until 3 am every night. He offered to answer questions on their behalf and said they would arrive at 2.00.

UBC (Worlds 2007) Bid Defence

The Chair announced that the UBC Bid had been ratified by the Executive Committee and invited the Council now to vote on full confirmation.

UBC presented their bid:

Teddy Harrison, the UBC Convenor introduced himself and team: Kevin Massie as Chief Adjudicator, Derek Lande and Alex Deane, the two present Deputy Chief Adjudicators – apologies were passed on for Tim Sonnreich, the third DCA – also Miranda Weigler, the Deputy Convenor and Joanna Nairn, the UBC equity officer.

The UBC Convenor said a few words about Vancouver the city, its suitability for worlds, its having been rated both the best place to live and the best location for business conferences by the Economist magazine. He highlighted the great support UBC were receiving from their university and Tourism Vancouver. He then introduced a video about the city and facilities.

The UBC Convenor explained he had sent over two reports as required including the ratification report; at Council he wanted to focus on their new ideas about equity.

He introduced Joanna Nairn. She explained that her post entailed changing the role and powers of the equity officer way beyond that of the women's officer, based on the experience of debating in Canada. She stressed that the 2007 CA has done a lot of work in this field, including writing the code of conduct, and that he had wanted the role expanded. She gave three reasons for the change: firstly, that equity is not only about women because there are lots of grounds for discrimination, among them ESL, language, ethnicity, sexual orientation, so there remain big gaps if only women's issues are considered; secondly, that she needs to be part of the organising committee to deal with issues as they arise not afterwards; thirdly, that she will have equal power with the DCAs while retaining oversight narrowly on equity. Joanna outlined issues where she expected to have an active role, including ranking adjudicators, vetting motions, and pro-actively seeking good women adjudicators. She had heard the idea of "women-friendly adjudication" mooted and wanted to explore what this might mean. Also she would be involved in vetting all events, helping with forums, looking at official publications, looking at security issues – to make sure Worlds feels more friendly to women e.g. men and women's hockey teams playing on screen. She will also set up procedures such that if anyone feels uncomfortable, she can be contacted at all times, with a runner if she is not available, as well as anonymous email and a permanent channel on CB radio. In addition, she will handle all equity complaints, deal with logistical staff and liase with the women's officer. She will be involved in the weekly meetings up to the beginning of the tournament and be part of the daily debrief during the tournament.

The UBC Convenor said he hoped people could see his team take equity very seriously. He then introduced the UBC CA to talk about tabulation.

The UBC CA told Council that he had appointed Wayne Chu from Carleton to run the tab and hoped to use the UCD tab. He expressed how impressed he had been by the UCD tab and the easy interface. He then introduced the credentials of his DCAs. Next, he talked through the adjudication training programme – which has produced studio quality DVDs featuring Ian Lising, Jeremy Brier and Amanda Wolthuizen adjudicating debates for training purposes. He said the DVDs would be ready for distribution the following day and offered to take orders. The UBC CA explained that these materials would be used with alumni adjudicators to develop a strong judging pool, working on expectations, criteria and speaker points, putting in an immense amount of time to get them ready for 2007 standards. He stressed his progress and further commitment to travel around the US, Canada, Europeans, US BP Champs to promote BP and BP adjudication over the run-up to Worlds.

The UBC Convenor explained Miranda Weigler's role as Deputy Convenor and her credentials. He named other members of the organising committee and their roles

from finance through socials and logistics to fundraising. He reported on the BP Championships hosted by UBC between October 14th – 16th, 2005. He talked about logistics, which he describes as on course: they have a contract with the hotel signed and this includes all accommodation, socials and break rounds. They also have agreements with the university to underwrite their costs.

There then followed a DVD presentation about the Sheraton hotel. The UBC Convenor presented the budget and explained that previous typographical errors had been corrected. He pointed to the grand total of \$771,010 aiming at \$800,000 required to ensure all contingencies were met. He explained that this amount might change dramatically downwards if services can be secured at lower cost during the year. He set out that the largest single portion of cost is the hotel, which is covered by registration costs. He further demonstrated that, with the university commitment of \$100,000, the fundraising total was now lower. He restated that UBC had insured liability and underwritten the event so risk is borne by the university.

The Chair asked whether registration was to be done by the Sheraton? The UBC CA explained they had an existing system set up to take card payments so it would be easy to re-engineer database to facilitate payment.

The Registrar asked how much registration would cost. UBC confirmed \$540, higher than when they bid due to a change in the value of the Canadian dollar on the back of rising oil prices – they had decided to raise the price and offer more rather than cutting back on provision.

The Convenor asked about the team cap for UBC Worlds. The UBC CA answered that it was 300, with an aim to stick at that number but with room for flexibility just like UCD. If they are forced to go above the cap slightly, university will soak up the cost.

The UBC Convenor reported that their interactive website will be up in January 2006. The UBC CA said that the date of opening registration depended on the will of Council after their discussions about registration. The Chair clarified that there was no discussion about that planned so UBC said they would proceed. There will be a two-step system for registration: an early October deposit to hold the spot, with payment for the remainder in November. The UBC Convenor stated that an adjudicator cap was unlikely but would depend on the situation. The Chair made clear that the n-1 rule would be discussed by Council and UBC said they would defer to that decision. The UBC Convenor stated that they have been working hard on generating funding for developing nations' travel costs. He also reported that UBC were scheduling carefully to avoid clashes between events and ensure the ESL final and Worlds final are on the same day.

A motion was tabled to confirm the UBC bid. Canada moved, Israel seconded, passed unanimously.

At 13.00, the Chair proposed a short break of 15 minutes to allow the Assumption University (AU) bid to set up their presentation. At 13.11, the presentation began: Emma Masterson introduced herself and showed a video presentation of the AU campus, city of Bangkok and facilities.

Emma outlined the strengths of AU: having hosted the largest ever All-Asians two years ago, they had gone from nothing to having over 100 members in 5 years. She presented the bid document, setting out registration fees of \$350US and a team cap of 350. She outlined the transport plans, including an airport pick-up and buses to all venues. The accommodation will be in two parts – first on campus then the new year at a beach resort an hour and a half away. The on-campus facilities include 1500 rooms, restaurants, and amenities. The off-campus stay is at the world's largest resort complex. She pledged the schedule would have 2 free days to allow sightseeing in Bangkok, and promised 3 meals a day with all dietary needs accounted for, noting that beer costs \$1.50. Adjudication will include CA Rajesh Krishnan, DCAs Kylie Lane, Ciaran Lawlor, Joanna Nairn, Beth O'Connor as well as ACA Ravi Prajapati to coordinate between the adjudication team and the organising committee. Emma explained their plans to use the two-year period to develop adjudication training programmes, free for Thai adjudicators, sending out AU judges to major international tournaments to gain experience. AU will use the UCD tab for the third time running. In the tournament, adjudicator allocation will be determined by the test, experience and feedback. She ended with an outline of Thailand the country and its benefits: the climate, favourable exchange rates and people.

IONA suggested denominating the registration fee in the local currency given the risk of any sudden devaluation to the organisers.

Europe asked about hotel standards: is it necessary to move given the apparently fantastic university accommodation? Europe also asked whether the extra day could be optional at the end of the tournament to help students who must take time off to attend Worlds.

The Chair asked whether 350 teams could be placed within a single hall for announcements. AU answered that 4000 people can be accommodated in the largest area.

Europe asked how flexible the adjudicator cap would be? AU committed to consider this over the coming years.

Colm Flynn commended AU on the quality of the bid and their keenness to contact people and get input on their bid.

The Chair added that all this work had been done in less than a month, to warm applause from Council members.

Netherlands asked how the money would be guaranteed. AU replied that the university would provide support as it did All-Asians with \$100k. Netherlands further asked why registration would take place in the last month before the tournament. AU said they had since learned that they would need to offer a longer registration period.

Bangladesh expressed concern at not appearing on the list of countries with waived visa applications; AU said the intention of the list was to show how accessible the country was and pledged to get commitments from the foreign ministry with regard to other countries.

The Registrar stated concerns about local capacity, as AU has only 100 members and the tournament is close to mid-terms: will they have enough people? Who on the ground will run the tournament from day to day? AU replied that the university will allow organisers to postpone their midterms, they have two years to recruit and plan extra people and will also run a BP tournament to boost experience. Furthermore, the prospective CA flies to Bangkok often on business and they have an ACA in place.

Croatia returned to asking why more countries do not appear on the visa list. AU explained they will work out a visa package with the foreign ministry who are very supportive. To reassure Council, the Prime Minister of Thailand supports the bid. Next year they hope to have concrete letters of assurance.

The Equity Officer commented that she backed their organisational abilities from All-Asians, which had included a bus escort. She asked whether the number of judges planned in your bid document was not too few to cover the number of teams. AU noted the issue and pledged to raise the number to whatever was sufficient.

IONA added that the current Convenor had never been to Worlds before the UCD bid was made – every account of All-Asians was that it was logistically amazing with the same organisational team.

Singapore talked about his experience as part of the organising committee for Worlds 2004, with 130 people on the ground during the tournament; he thought 100 a good estimate of manpower.

Canada praised the AU bid and asked what their stance would be on equity? AU committed to take a similar stance to that adopted by UBC for Worlds 2007.

The Women's Officer asked where breakfast was funded within the budget. AU replied that it was included in the room cost. She asked where Masters preliminaries, Worlds Council and a women's event were in the schedule? AU reassured that these events will be provided but the current plan is an incomplete schedule. She further asked about safeguards over the beach party, after incidents leading to deportation at previous events of its type. AU replied that safety was important and a strong stance will be taken on any misdemeanours including the harshest available penalties.

The Registrar felt reassured by answers on logistics, but was concerned that the high team cap runs the risk of a shallow adjudication pool like MMU Worlds 2005. He suggested lowering the team cap to ensure good judging. AU maintained that, for the time being, they would continue with their training plans and try to pull in more experienced judges from Singapore and Malaysia.

Europe returned to the schedule, noting that making the tournament a day shorter would save money and asking why the ESU final was to be held on the day before? AU reiterated that they would change the schedule over the next two years and pointed out that no extra cost was entailed.

Malaysia commented that MMU Worlds 2005 did not get as many adjudicators as wanted because a) they only had a year to prepare and b) people had been to

Singapore the year before. Based on his experience in the CA team at All-Asians, he described them as dedicated, with good leadership and predicted an excellent Worlds.

Asia said that AU had done an outstanding job at All-Asians and boasted the most impressive campus anywhere in the world. He predicted that the judging pool would continue to grow in north-east Asia.

South Africa said that Worlds in Thailand represented a great opportunity, as its affordability was greater than Ireland or Canada.

A motion was tabled to accept the bid of Assumption University for Worlds 2008: Israel proposed, Australia seconded, passed unanimously.

The Chair thanked AU for all their hard work in getting a bid together in such a short space of time and wished them well with further preparations.

Special Business

Colm Flynn made an announcement that, after consideration, he was going to continue his website, with an aspiration to reach its 10-year mark in February 2007. It now amounts to 4 gigabytes, containing information and documentation about the history of Worlds back to TUSA in the late 1970s, including overviews, letters, articles and emails from former winners. It has the last UCD bid and council information right through to present day. Colm had contacted as many people as possible and now felt it was time to hand over the history of Worlds. He placed it under the care the Registrar to take over and maintain.

The Chair noted that Colm's contribution to securing the history of worldwide debating was such that the term "flynning" had been coined. He commended Colm's tremendous professionalism as Chair and Registrar, voluntary positions where he had worked so hard over the years. As recognition of his unique and long-standing contribution to debating and to Worlds, the Chair announced that the World Debating Council was to confer upon Colm Flynn its first ever Order of Distinction. An engraved shield was presented to Colm by the Chair and Council rose to its feet in acclamation.

Committee Reports

Chair: The Chair reported that, should he remain in post, he will create a document outlining how to bid for and run Worlds. The last year had proved the toughest for getting a bid together. He warned that Worlds was getting more complex and bigger every year, so people need to help to know what they are getting into and guide them through the process. He reported that the new online ratification process for UBC had worked well.

Registrar: The Registrar expressed plans to introduce a new online voting procedure: all delegates would be responsible for being on the right list, ensuring continued representation and appointing a successor. If anyone wanted to change the constitution, he reminded that it was necessary to present a proper constitutional amendment to allow clarity and facilitate compliance.

Secretary: The Secretary was not present.

Women's: The Women's Officer reported that it was the best year so far for women, with not a single equity issue brought to her – and congratulated UCD. She laid out the findings of the Women's Forum: a) there had been concern about scheduling – with the women's event scheduled against another event, though she did not think anything could have been done about that this year; b) representation in adjudication: there had been a consensus that it was vitally important that women were present in the adjudication core; if not enough women apply as DCAs, then the host should be responsible for recruiting women to get sufficient representation to ensure equal representation past the break; there should be effort to vet promising second chairs to get them over the line and that this would take the form of a formal recommendation to Council; c) they recommended that teams fill out feedback about chairs but also that there be mandatory feedback by chair and panellists about each other; d) the idea of a women's breakfast – both optional and incentivised – had been put forward, to help Worlds become more socially accessible to women; e) for her successor, there was a need to think how to continue appointment of the role, be it through the Women's forum or Worlds Council appointment.

The Chair called a break for lunch at 14.25.

Council reconvened at 14.59

The Chair welcomed everyone back and stated that he wished to return to the original agenda, leaving the remaining committee reports for later.

Discussion on Single University-Multiple Debate Union/Societies, Multiple Colleges-Single Debate Union/Societies

Neill Harvey-Smith was asked to report on this issue by special invitation of the Chair. He stated that grey areas between universities, colleges and societies apply to many places all over the world; in this year, they had centred specifically on institutions in London. The University of London comprises several colleges in which the college is both considered independent to a certain degree but is also simultaneously within the university. They have different societies and funding sources. Individuals in the past were always eligible to debate for both their college and their university. This year they were required to register specifically for ULU even though each comprised of members from specific colleges. The question was how to resolve the questions of simultaneous belonging?

England called Ali Dewji, chair of the debate society at LSE: he said that LSE had signed the original Worlds charter, was recognised as independent, will soon be awarding its own degrees at undergraduate level, already awards its own degrees at postgraduate level, receives no funding ever from ULU. He explained that LSE had submitted an online application, created a delegation and were not informed of any change in policy, but halfway through their password stopped working, they were told by other institutions that they had been blocked, then all 7 institutions had been told to group together, so that a 350-member society from LSE was no longer able to send 4 teams, had to decide between sending the best teams and equal representation. He

asked that Council clarify that decision had been wrong and should not be seen as a precedent for next year.

The Convenor laid out his account of events: that during the registration process, colleges had set up accounts, that ULU was the name he knew for London institutions, that former LSE speakers had spoken for ULU at Worlds, that he had sought clarification and guidance, talked to various people then advised the 6 other colleges. He said he had tried to get in touch with Ali, failed, then shut down the account so that payment would not be wrongly taken.

The Chair said he understood that the same personnel existed between LSE etc. and ULU, creating a fear that people might create a composite team and set a precedent.

The UBC CA asked if there was overlapping membership between ULU / LSE debate society? Neill responded that there was not because ULU is not currently functional.

Ali Dewji confirmed that he did not even know other ULU people and that LSE want to be recognised on the tab as independent.

IONA asked if it were possible that people could potentially end up debating for two different institutions. Neill replied that ULU included a vast number of students, with some potentially members of LSE or another college and others members of a future ULU debating club.

The Chair then announced that Jeremy Briar, counsel to Council, had arrived.

Colm Flynn shared his view that the situation was complicated – that the University of Ireland was not one institution despite sharing a name. Given the great complexity, he suggested that country reports, which used to exist, might deal with eligibility within each country or that Council should think about setting up a policy group to consider the issue.

The Registrar said that Imperial College had effectively been banned from Worlds. He noted the issue had just come up for an Israeli institution and suggested looking at the European approach – “is it reasonable for these two students to be debating together”.

IONA recommended that Council never construct a series of hard-and-fast rules just a set of principles. There was a case for ULU to exist: they are a historical abnormality which has been there for some time, so it would not be fair for Council to upset that; it is also the role of Council to facilitate as many people debating as possible – like recognising the two MMU institutions which have a large geographical distance. Also, both ULU and the colleges compete in the UK.

Europe suggested that LSE students should never be allowed to debate for ULU if they want to debate for LSE.

Greece explained that the potential harm in this case was the worry of people trying to get around the institution cap. As this was not the case here, it should be discussed on a case-by-case basis.

England invited Matthew Sinclair, also from LSE, who said he did not accept Europe's views.

The Convenor said that the case of Irish societies within one institution was based on years of animosity which could not be overcome. He said there was a need to be able to go to the Executive for guidance, as a case-by-case basis doesn't help the organising committee to make decisions.

UBC suggested that the test of whether you are allowed to compete in your own country is a good structure to principles. Then you should pick and prove you are debating for the same institution.

Australia related an issue about whether certain students could register as a law school. They had consulted AIDA, sought clear guidance about geographical distance etc. and showed it was not appropriate.

The Registrar pointed out he could address the Convenor's idea if electronic voting were adopted because Council could decide in advance.

Jamaica pointed out that the University of the West Indies comprises three independent campuses on three different islands in three separate countries:

The Convenor was opposed to basing eligibility on the domestic circuit, stating that the Worlds circuit was different because the aims of Worlds were distinct.

Neill reminded Council about other London colleges where there is no debating society and speaking for ULU may be their only opportunity to go to Worlds.

England said that making people choose would be difficult due to funding issues. If there were concerns about abuse, Council has got to use common sense between this and people just making up an institution.

The Women's Officer asked: Is it the individuals or the societies who choose?

The Registrar stated that small institutions shouldn't get the extra choice.

Australia said that students should pick their university and go with it.

England: Ali Dewji: if a student attends two IVs as ULU then the funding stops, this would prevent them speaking for their own university. There is no instance of abuse – nobody has maxed out their teams then used ULU to get around it.

The Convenor said that people should be able to choose which society their allegiance is with.

IONA stated his belief that the debate was becoming circular – he hoped that someone would table a motion – and summarised that everyone agreed LSE should have the right to compete at this competition.

The Chair reminded Council that a first motion was needed in order to have a second motion.

Europe stated that everyone must abide by the rules: we have one institution and we stick to it and there is a risk of people using complication as an excuse.

The Women's Officer said that deciding on the issue now would set a precedent.

England and Barbados discussed tabling relevant motions – the Chair called a five-minute break to allow this.

The following motion was tabled: That both the University of London and the several London colleges (LSE, UCL etc.) be recognised as separate institutions for the purpose of competing at rounds of the Championships and that University of London students may compete for either their college or the university.

Proposed England, seconded USA:
Roll call: Motion passed by 43 to 17.

The Chair suggested setting up a Sub-Committee to take this issue forward, outlining a role for an individual to consult with regional representatives to begin the investigation. Neill Harvey-Smith was nominated by Canada and seconded by the USA, approved unanimously.

Discussion on Adjudicator Caps

The Chair brought to attention of Council that the n-1 rule governing adjudicators is not currently a constitutional practice. There was universal support for leaving this matter in the hands of the organising committee and the discussion was immediately terminated.

Committee Reports (cont.)

Oceania reported that debating was going well in the region.

The Americas reported that new schools were emerging in the Caribbean, with Jamaica interested in hosting a BP, the Canadian league doing well and Alaska joining CUSID. He said that some US institutions use a different style and invited people to Princeton for an APDA-style tournament if anyone was interested in a style mix.

Europe reported things were going well, though new societies in Eastern Europe had found problems coming to Worlds due to up-front money needs. Many have no fundraising opportunities and Europe wanted to suggest holding the team cap until later in the year. She drew a distinction between Europe and IONA and asked the

Equity Officer to look out for adjudicators from developing European countries as well next year. She also mooted the possibility of making them panellists – participating in the discussion but not the decision. In addition, the wording of motions was felt difficult to understand or relate to for people from other regions in the world.

Africa said that debate was still not big outside of RSA, Botswana and Lesotho – the wealth and racial divide will continue to cripple African debating and this was unlikely to change for a while. He explained it was a wealth issue rather than a language issue: Rhodes, Cape Town and other hubs would try to develop others.

Asia quipped that debate there is so strong they have two regional championships! Both parts held an EFL division to their championships. There has been a rapid development of North-East Asian debating: new universities progressing to break in major tournaments. There is to be an Asian Debate Institute – he welcomed all to come to Korea and learn debate / adjudication.

IONA stressed the continued need for development: Welsh debating had been going backwards and the north of England was still weak. The Oxford IV had held an ESL section which was positive and reflected the number of international teams coming to IONA to debate.

The Equity Officer talked about 150 video / audio tapes she had had digitalised – she wished to hand them to Council so all could share the materials. They belonged to her university and she stated she would like a legal waiver over their use. She then went on to talk about Equity. She said she had received 8 complaints down from 20-30 last year: five had been cleared already and three were non-discrimination issues so that left only 2 discrimination issues. She felt that she needed better liaison with the host institution and welcomed UBC's decision to have an equity officer. The three concerns she had noted from participants were: a) ethnicity and nationality – on day three, three teams of one ethnicity and one of another – she thought there was no serious case; b) a case of denying a POI by saying “you're from x country so no” – which she believed goes to manner; c) language – the question of whether judges are evaluating the argument, its style or manner and the possibility of subconscious discrimination. She was happy about the motion about north-east Asia but some motions had not been updated. She hoped the UBC Equity officer would research controversial questions in different regions.

The Equity Officer went onto talk about the Developing Nations' Forum, which suffered confusion over what it is – suggested changing its own name to the Equity Forum. Economic disadvantage – currency conversion, visa and registration issues – were still cause for concern, so they had suggested a Sub-Committee for fundraising and economic equity. They had discussed the language issue and had proposals: firstly, to keep the Sub-Committee for ESL for further discussion (e.g. local rule or TESL); secondly, that they should elect sub-committee members during Worlds; thirdly, that they should create an EFL division. She provided a detailed handout, an article discussing the interplay between ENL, ESL and EFL. If Council wants to make the event global and attract as many people as possible, she thought it should create an EFL final. Also discussed had been the possibility of exempting EFL speakers from

Grandparent clause as they are not competitive for several years while their English improves.

The Chair ruled that the legal issue should be linked to the next item – the sub-committee looking at incorporation and other legal issues – and asked for the report from Jeremy Brier:

Jeremy Brier explained that Worlds has no legal status. It exists in our minds and personal relationships. The legal safety-net is the host institution, which has insurance. The benefits of incorporation were spurious: it would offer liability protection so an individual member of WC could not be sued, but this was not needed as the university would be sued as it has more money; Worlds could contract as a legal personality, but again the host university is able to do this; it could exist in perpetuity, but this is not a tangible concern after 26 years of willingness to host progressively bigger tournaments; intellectual property or trademark rights, if they became an issue, could receive separate protection and there is no current threat from any rivals. On the negative side, it would be highly expensive, with filing requirements and the necessity of forming a board. It would open up members of Council to breach of personal duty. Jeremy had discussed the question with eminent QCs in his Chambers and legal experts who understand debating such as Stephen Pitel.

Israel asked whether incorporation would help in raising money from other organisations?

The Chair explained that the biggest problem which incorporation was thought to address was the use of the Worlds title by an individual institution leading to confusion among universities – hence the investigation. There had also been concern about individual liability.

Jeremy Brier responded that institutions could already go to companies for sponsorship. Council could take intellectual property right protection – which is quite difficult – but as it was not under threat, it might better not to go into the matter.

Colm Flynn asked what might happen if someone lost a bid and decided to sue the Chair?

Ireland asked why Worlds could not register as a charity?

Jeremy Brier responded that it produced the same problems. Also, to which country should we affiliate – there is no extra benefit.

The Convenor said that individuals were liable but most have no possessions – people could sue each individual but the university was more likely to be a target.

UBC CA said that wherever you incorporated, there would be complex legal questions about cross-border issues. Even contracting for sponsorship was a bad idea.

IONA asked whether people would be able to sue individuals?

Jeremy Brier said yes - in theory - but reiterated that it was no different now.

Constitutional Review:

Equity outlined her proposal to create an EFL final. She said it might mean culling another event such as public speaking but asked Council to consider how many EFL students were at the tournament. She claimed that the Masters tournament had included only one ESL speaker and that no additional events had been available to them so they need at least 90 minutes in the schedule.

The Chair clarified that Japan had almost beat Ireland in the first Worlds Masters tournament.

IONA noted that the events which Equity wanted to ditch were popular and mandated, there was already an over-burdened schedule and the only way to hold it was concurrently.

Australia asked whether this proposal meant that there would be an ESL QF/SF/Final as well as an EFL Final? Equity said yes.

USA expressed the view that finding a suitable EFL and ESL definition was the issue.

Registrar clarified that there was still no wording, one year after the issue was last discussed, because a definition of EFL simply wasn't able to be constructed.

Bangladesh, USA were granted 20 minutes to attempt to table a motion. The Chair called a break at 17.00.

The meeting reconvened at 17.20:

Motion: 1) WC requests the UBC org com to hold an EFL grand final
2) The ESL sub-committee shall be asked to produce within 3 months a provisional definition of EFL and associated rules and procedures for the competition.
3) Council shall consider the recommendations at the sub-committee and evaluate the EFL competition as held at UBC.

Greece stated that debaters from some countries didn't have secondary education or media available – that some come to Worlds in order to learn English.

US asked how an EFL final can be inserted into the UBC schedule.

UBC agreed that it may be hard for future competitions but pledged willingness to try out the idea.

Equity invited Steve Johnson from the University of Alaska to speak – he lauded the development of EFL and what it could do to help develop debate in China and encourage participation.

Asia believed that Worlds manner is biased against some people at this competition.

Jeremy Brier expressed a view that Worlds did not represent a cultural bias but simply a different style of debate.

Asia shouted “shame” at Jeremy Brier.

The Women’s Officer said that cultural differences existed.

UBC CA reminded Council that there was a motion on the floor that UBC try out the criteria.

Neill Harvey-Smith asked who would decide who counts as EFL and who physically registers people for the competition.

IONA concurred that there should be clarity over how the registration process would work.

USA asked how ESL status had been overcome?

Equity suggested that perhaps the ESL sub-committee could assess.

The Convenor claimed that UBC could already do it if they wanted so the motion was a waste of time.

Jeremy Brier restated his conviction that an EFL final was not needed.

Europe shared her experience of sitting on the sub-committee, trying to find suitable criteria and failing and so didn’t see how Council could approve it.

Oceania suggested having the same desk for ESL / EFL registration.

The Women’s Officer said they use the same Sub-Committee, have online registration so same way as ESL, so there was no harm and they had no objection to doing it.

Asia returned to the question of need. With differences in ability and thinking in English, he felt provisional criteria already existed, as you can see a difference in how people speak when judging.

Motion 1: Votes cast – motion passed by 50 votes to 15.

Financial report on UCD (carried over from a.m.)

The Convenor presented the final balance sheet, demonstrating that income exceeded expenditure and explaining that the balance would be repaid to the university, which will go to help general societies at UCD.

Greece asked if a hard copy of the report would be made available. The Convenor said it may be placed on the website.

Constitutional Review (cont.)

That the designation Chair of Organising Executive Committee should be changed to Convenor – Forwarded Israel, Seconded US.

Composition of Worlds Council

Insert into Article 28...

Australia, Singapore

Insert into Article 5...

USA, Bangladesh

From Article 10...

Australia, Canada

From Article 19...

Greece, USA

Article 4...

Electronic voting – allow Council members to conduct votes via the email list.

Authenticated through third party service.

USA, Australia

England: (Alex Deane):

Greece

Adjudicators may only be allowed to judge in elimination rounds...

Greece moves to amend:

England seconds

“voting judge”

Canada: (Kevin Massie):

Bangladesh

Move ratification process forward to September for full ratification by new e-voting system.

AOB

Greece raised the idea of appointing non-voting judges in break rounds to take part in the discussions.

Europe felt this would represent a wonderful opportunity to develop adjudication skills.

UBC CA raised an issue – that 9 preliminary rounds put judges in a good room some stage. It could be hard enough to keep results secret without this, but with every additional person, the greater the chance of leaks which can spoil the suspense.

Greece suggested that some judges only get to sit in low rooms so would not get an opportunity without this measure.

The Equity Officer pointed out that UCD had been very co-operative over complaint handling at the tournament and thanked the organisers. This met with applause.

2007 World Executive Committee Elections

Chair: Ian Lising

Ireland
USA

Registrar: David Ham

Australia
Bangladesh

Chair offered thanks on the record for work over last 3 years.

Secretary: Neill Harvey-Smith

Canada
Australia

Sarfaraz Ahmed
Bangladesh
Greece

NHS gave reasons in his support
SA not present

Elected by oral acclamation

Women's Officer: Katie Price

Equity Officer:
Isabelle Louwe
Israel
Netherlands

Masako Suzuki
Japan
USA

IL and MS gave remarks in their support.

Scotland objected to oral vote
Ballots provided

UBC – Jo Nairn – new equity officer – how consider relationship with new role?

Answers given by candidates

IL 24 MS 36

Regional delegates elected:

Oceania: Sam ?

Americas: Robbie ?

Asia: Jason Jarvis

IONA: Derek Lande

Africa: David Watson

Europe: Noga Isaacson

Registrar: Last issue: passed over when discussed voting status – only countries with status can vote on an electronic vote. Those with status, who are not here, retain status because process exists for gradual loss of status.

Oceania: So quorum is of those with status not how many turned up last time? YES

Croatia: So a year's grace? YES – won't lose status until the following year.

Europe: So Council at its present construction is Council?

IONA: isn't it based on votes they would have if they had turned up at last meeting

Asia: Freezing it is problematic – only those who turned up? NO- only about countries with no voting status

Ciaran – so need to essentially keep Council going over the year

Oceania – either no status nations get no vote or “if anyone walks in they then get a vote all year”

Europe – if showed up, we have an email then you should be able to vote.

Ciaran – essentially deferring decisions from Council, they paid money, it gets postponed then you need to decide so only fair they should get to participate.

Asia – if Australia didn't come, would they lose voting rights

Chair – doesn't depend on turning up but having a team or adjudicator in the competition.

Jeremy Brier – if anyone can vote and e-voting is used then should be able to vote

Oceania – decisions not about tournament they attended

Americas – how work in terms of quorum? HARDER TO ACHIEVE

Colm Flynn

[Confusion over the precise wording of the rules]

Scotland – can't we get an email at council

Jeremy Brier (Counsel) – let's pass it and get out in five minutes

Croatia – benevolence that non-voting nations have a vote in council

Americas – motion to close the discussion

Passed (Greece opposes)

Worlds 2005 Minutes (cont.)

A motion to pass the minutes was proposed by Canada, seconded by the USA and passed unanimously.

The minutes were signed and handed to the Secretary.

The Chair praised Council for bringing together delegates from around the world, operating in a complex organisation for the good of debating everywhere. He thanked everyone for their work and declared the meeting closed at 18.41.