

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

Meeting Called to Order at 10:17 AM

Opening Statement

Chair: Greetings! During this meeting, we'll go through the agenda, etc. Adiba is now going to do roll call.

Roll Call

Registrar: Roll Call

Executive: Chair, Registrar, Secretary, Equity, Women's

Voting Status: Explanation of weighted voting system. Status A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1 and new delegates get 1 vote.

SEE REGISTRAR'S REPORT FOR MORE INFORMATION

Chair: The first thing to do is to accept the minutes from last year. Would anyone like to propose a motion?

We have a proposal that minutes taken as read, seconded. **Minutes taken as read.**

Assumption Report and Accounts

Now moving on to the Assumption Worlds 2008 report. TJ (Convener) will present the report.

2008 Convener: I'm passing out the report; I want to thank everyone for coming to Thailand. To inform you on accounts of teams, there were 388 teams, 13 observers, and 406 judges. You can see that a majority of funding was spent on food and accommodation: food 40% and accommodation 30%. As for registration- the pre-budget report differed from the actual numbers received, due to differences between projected and actual. Sponsorships came from assorted companies and the university paid 5.6 million baht. There is a remaining debt of 1.6 million baht. Any questions?

New Zealand: What is the public relations budget for?

2008 Convener: The PR budget was for Public Relations and advertising. PR was broken down into billboards and invitations to public- 200,000 people were engaged in tournament. For advertising, we paid for banners, brochures, ads on radio and TV, and 3 billboards in Bangkok. We wanted a big boom in English, because debating is not all that big in Thailand.

Chair: Thanks to TJ for presenting those numbers.

2008 Convener: I also received an email from the President of the University; he wanted to thank Council for the opportunity to host. It will not be our last- I hope to see you soon.

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

Cork Report and Accounts

Chair: We move now to the Cork Report and Accounts.

2009 Convener (Art Ward): Generally, there is not too much to report because things have gone alright. Issues have only come in specific areas; we're relatively happy with the tournament so far.

Registration (Mark Collins): Initially we were asked for country quota schemes, per the Council ruling of last year. With a team cap of 300, 254 spots were released, and these were gone in 8 minutes. 4 spots remained to be allocated afterwards; a few countries benefited from this scheme. One thing to note, for new countries it is still difficult to get spot; we might want to consider changing system. There was then an expansion to 300 teams, all teams allocated based on previously outlined policies with a 3 team cap and n-1. Up to 308, we offered 1 team per institution. Given the widespread interest, we made the decision to have 1 team per institution. Registration was smaller than at Thailand; while there were 600 teams who wanted to register at the start, only 50 teams remained after dropouts on the waitlist. We might not have filled the tournament if larger. We allowed payment by credit card and EFT transfer, but we recommended credit card because of faster transactions, reduced costs, and efficiency. Non-registered delegates dealt with earlier in Pre-Council. Minor problems mostly involved personal details not being submitted on time. We tried to use the personal details system in an effort to speed up ESL and EFL registration, but for those that didn't submit, we registered on arrival. I would suggest an increase to 2 days. For people not submitting passport details, visa issues result. We might want to flag that visas be submitted ASAP, if we have no idea who you are, this creates issues. During the last few weeks, there were a few pullouts because of visas, etc. We want to speed up process on arrival and help with passport details. Any questions?

Croatia: About accommodation- How was hotel allocation done? Certain teams were told that they would be in a certain hotel. Room allocations- there were some questions as to whether preferences were changed. As for credit cards in Europe, many societies cannot have credit cards, because that would entail having private status, EFT is much easier.

Registration: Preferences were not guaranteed for hotels: of 900 delegates, less than 400 submitted personal details. We had to bear this in mind. As for credit cards, there are always exceptions, we're just recommending this policy to the Worlds community.

Ireland: On behalf of the Irish community, we want to express our pride in Cork. Do you have details on non-registered delegates? Who they are and how many?

Registration: There are 3 institutions, Yeditepe, 1 judge; UT Jamaica and UWI Cave Hill had additional delegations. We had no idea about these, so we felt we had no obligation to them. While we tried to accommodate them, in some cases we were able to and for some we couldn't.

Barbados: We have 3 additional observers, privately arranged. I think it is unfair for the Committee to say it has been a burden for them.

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

Registration: The biggest issue has been with insurance on campus.

2009 Convener: We believe that observers should go to debates. Even members of the public gave us a call to say that they would like to drop in. We gave them accreditation. There is no problem with private accommodation. I just ask that you please give us heads up as to what we need to do if you bring extra delegates.

Chair: Just to be clear, it is not an issue of right or wrong. We just want to get it out of the way. We can talk about it later if the Constitution needs to be changed.

Barbados: We are a bit confused; there is no other way for us to communicate besides email.

Chair: Please try to resolve this later- there seems to be a difference of opinion, but the OrgComm felt it was necessary to bring to our attention because it was an issue they had to deal with.

England: Registration was exemplary: very efficient. We all appreciate the work you've put in. What happened with payment for the non-registered delegates? Did this policy apply to all of them- required payment?

Registration: There was no expense charged for UWI because of private accommodations. UT Jamaica got an extra team at the standard team charge. This will be transferred to us.

Israel: For the submission of personal details, why wasn't there consideration of a mandatory information submission in the first stage?

Registration: We asked people to submit all relevant information at certain points. Reminders were sent.

Finance: To preface, I want to make clear that these figures are interim and as accurate as possible this early. We brought in 360000 Euros for registration and single room supplements... We wanted to rent an apartment for OrgComm so we could organize the tournament as quickly as possible. We paid for DCA flights and accommodation before and after the tournament. We also provided accounts for them as well. Drinks non-alcoholic and alcoholic, indication whether will consume, drinks based on these proportions. Food catering company on campus, provided majority of food, tea and coffee, fruit, crisps and candy on last day. Logistics- venue costs, security, cleaning, AV, radio rental, training for volunteers, first aid if possible. Registration and communication- online registration, bank costs, website costs, and printing. 8 social events, decorations, DJs, sundry championship tournaments, OrgComm travel to tournaments, Worlds 2008, Euros, Oxford, Cambridge, clothing for the OrgComm, volunteers, adjudication team, running costs for phones, etc. transport- buses excursions, socials, morning and evening transport. No storage allowed on campus, needed to transfer water etc from center city to campus. We hold a reserve fund in case of massive disaster, significant damage to hotel, unforeseen event- can fix if necessary.

New Zealand: I have a concern about the Worlds community paying for members of OrgComm to attend IVs. Also, if the reserve fund is not spent, will it be given to Koc, or held as residual?

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

Registration: In the consideration for sending organizers to IVs, we wanted to make sure we were high profile. There were high transport costs for Thailand, and we considered it necessary to send our organizers there.

Convener 2009: It was vital to absorb information from tournaments of similar stature and for me to do bid defense. The residual money will not be going to Koc; we created the fund to put out fires, etc. There's no option for anything else; it's our insurance policy.

Oceania: These costs involved in bidding include expensive registration fees. These are very significant in the budget and I think it is inappropriate. When you attended the tournaments, why did all of the OrgComm need to go? Worlds getting more and more expensive, we should want to make it more accessible, fees should be reduced.

Ireland: It is crucial that as many people as possible have experience of how competitions are run. Maximum experience is good, so that people see what makes things work. It is a better competition if people know more.

Convener 2008: In Thailand, we separated costs from the debate club itself. We wanted to go to Euros, etc., but it is problematic- how would you separate the funds? Our budget is from the actual tournament; none of the money was used for trips, which the university paid for.

England: I understand how that's useful. We should be restricting the use to travel, not for registration. Given that you have to go, it is appropriate. Second, will the reserve fund go back to UCC? Not a problem, I just want clarification.

South Africa: We think its fundamental for value of tournament to give people experience- that's what our registration fees go to.

IONA: If OrgComm is limited to solely debaters, it restricts people from other fields with good skills.

Convener 2009: The figure from our society wouldn't be as large if we hadn't decided to send people to tournaments. Not worth it for us to visit only conference centers, we need to go to the tournament itself. We put key people under funding, others self funded.

New Zealand: Society funding changes this. If I bid for Worlds, my OrgComm needs to go. I could send them to lots of tourneys and pick up tab- costs need to be minimized. Let them pay for themselves if necessary.

Scotland: I'm not sure this is really the case.

Israel: The expense is about 1 or 2 Euros per registration; its easier to pay from all teams than burden the OrgComm. Is the problem because its in this account, or because its an issue? If 10 Euros is a problem, then its not an experience problem, but a monetary issue.

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

Philippines: The expense is justified for the most crucial aspects of job. We all expect a nice Worlds-people must see how to do it.

England: It should be noted that our views be made in the official minutes.

New Zealand seconds.

Singapore opposes.

Chair: We'll have to vote. **The motion has been accepted.**

Oceania: This isn't a direct question about Cork, but in the given financial reports in the future, is it possible to have more detail with more breakdowns? I understand that this is projected, but last year, there was a "Secret Report." There's better scrutiny if there are more details. Request that the report next year is more detailed.

Finance: Next year we'll endeavor to do it, but this is after the fact, but we can do it. For the future, it is really helpful to know expenses, we agree.

Chair: Equity question. An adjudicator on November 15th wrote to Derek and asked if he intended to pay for or waive registration for anyone. The adjudicator received a response that he was not. Did the policy change? If so, on what basis were adjudicators selected? Why was Council not informed?

Convener 2009: There were no judges flown into tourney besides DCAs. There were judges who were only here for certain days with no fee. I will talk to Derek about it. It is a policy that those who applied to be DCAs and were accepted would be offered funding and we would try to fly in people after that.

Oceania: Wondering if promises based on the bid itself, or expectations.

Chair: There was no policy as stated on November 15th; you said there was no policy for waiving. Afterwards, there was suggested information that significant amounts of people did receive waivers. Why were we not informed of change?

CA 2009 (Derek Lande): We were silent initially. Then we said no commitments; we would wait and see. Per our conversation, we allocated money for it and said we would make judgment if we got enough registrations. We felt it probably wasn't necessary in October. The money for it had already been allocated. We had money to spend to encourage adjudicators to come- we looked to see where they were needed. Preliminary rounds, more were needed there. Primary method was to talk to Adjudicators in Ireland and UK- we said that we'll put you up for low cost if you pay for airfare. We got some great judges for a low cost. There were a small number of people that we were able to have stay for full thing, because of beds going unused. Some people dropped out and we couldn't cancel the rooms, so we offered people to stay for longer. It was a pragmatic decision we were aware of. If there is a bed going free should we let it go free? There's no real reason not to give it to them. From the adjudicator perspective, it's a no brainer. Informing council? Didn't say that we wouldn't do it. Not part of plan,

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

didn't preclude that we wouldn't. We'll be mindful in the future that you should consult Council on every type of spending; similar to other Worlds, if you violate a promise, then we should report to council. Extra money was available for adjudicators, we didn't feel the need to check in, although it is good advice for future. No real requirement for OrgComm checking with Council on this. Future teams should have latitude for future spending decisions.

Estonia: Was this an announced policy or your own basis on good adjudication?

CA 2009: This was pragmatic and done quite late. This isn't practical, we informed them early to mid-December. We were reaching out to people. We considered applications, but the cost of flights goes up proportionally the more time it takes. That was the biggest factor.

England: I see no particular problem, people might see equity implications, but this is just spending money on different things than expected. They don't need to ask council permission.

South Africa: Considering ways to make it better, we don't need to be fair if we're just trying to raise competition, especially if open registration was already given.

Convener 2009: It is not practical for a lot of people to get here. You would have to subsidize disproportionately in order to get equity.

CA 2009: This was for preliminary rounds only, I don't think that anyone really wanted to come for only the preliminary. Literally a handful can stay for whole tournament. On the 21st and 22nd of December we informed them of the possibility. We need to give the adjudication team latitude. All teams have good adjudication, when we stack panels, we have still been able to give good feedback in dead rooms.

Convener 2009: None of these people cost any delegate money. No one subsidized this.

Chair: Thanks for putting this on the record. Any other questions?

Accommodation: Accommodation hasn't been ideal, but for a competition of this size in a city the size of Cork, we either needed triples or 4 or 5 hotels. This was not our first choice, and I apologize to delegates that haven't received their preferences. If we could have done anything we would have. In regards to the random allocations, where possible, we looked at delegation sizes and the people needed in rooms. It was like a giant jigsaw puzzle. There were accusations of a break hotel, less than interested in that, shown not to be the case. In terms of roommate preferences, where given, we tried to accommodate. Within institutions, preferences were given. After the 27th, we allowed changes and people could move around. Criteria used: roommate preferences; if none, people of same institution, then country. We tried to assign based on gender- this was not always possible- in absence of this, we changed based on religion, etc. In the grand scheme of things, we understand that there were issues with specific religious requirements. We do apologize, hope it hasn't impacted on tournament. In regards to catering, we hope there were no dietary issues. We tried to put extra emphasis on this. Allergies and religious requirements were taken into account. Halal, etc. on first day seemed skimpy. We asked caterers for more, added fruit. Kosher- from registration, 90 people initially said kosher, and we emailed to confirm.

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

75 said they weren't. We assigned registration preferences. 8-9 said they were. Remaining didn't email us back; those that didn't reply, we provided kosher. In the end, only 2 meals per day were taken. 5500 Euros spent on this food, expensive in Ireland. We could have saved registration fees if we had this information. Nothing that can be done about it, but we wanted to flag it for council, that we acted on dietary requests specifically.

Australia: A comment on the accommodation. The Jurys Inn is a fine hotel, significantly undesired compared to the other hotels. People there thought they cross subsidizing for other hotels. We understand there wasn't capacity for other hotels. Is there no way to offer discounts for lesser hotel? It was made clear and transparent in the bid defense last year that it would be based on registration order. Now we hear it's a jigsaw puzzle.

Accommodation: The Clarion had a lower rate, the Jurys Inn had the same rate. In terms of subsidy, it didn't happen. It would benefit large or small delegations, we thought that triples might be better than separating institutions.

Australia: It seems to only apply after you have already allocated. How was initial sorting done?

Accommodation: Preferences in hotels, then delegations- we thought this might be the fairest way to do it in the end.

England: Where you have hotels that have disparate facilities, might it be possible to have access to other hotels?

Accommodation: This is not possible because of insurance reasons.

Singapore: The problem might be more than just facilities. There is a clear difference in rooms, maybe size, quality, perhaps that can't be made up for. For this reason people think there is subsidizing. It shouldn't depend on cost- we can approach these later- but based on facilities.

Ireland: Because of the size of the tournaments this is the most difficult part. Very unfair because it is based on no control, to charge them a bit more because of other factors. Average out the registration fee; some people will get more or less.

Finland: There will be differences, but this is inevitable. There is a suspicion of order. If you're constantly equalizing, make it explicit. We're all happy to accept this. If it was random, we just tell people.

England: It is not a good idea for bids to give discounts. No obligation for bidders. Might be fair, appease people, suggest we move on.

Asia: For future bidders, the room size is different in each hotel, but basically the hotels are the same. We know the difficulty. We had similar issues in Thailand.

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

Estonia: Most female delegates from some cultures might be problem. I understand there are different policies. Hopefully we can make this an automatic policy. It might be unreasonable that they must explicitly express to not be with a male debater. Might be confusing.

Registration: It is difficult to adopt a general policy. It's the reason why the 3rd stage is critical. There is an option to add additional information, no sharing of rooms, etc. We tried to make it as fair as possible, 450 didn't submit information, so we tried our best.

Motion to move on requested, **moving on**.

Equity: The equity report, there is a difference between cross-section of debate community in the third year of this equity policy. We are trying to add to code of conduct. There is some confusion between bad adjudicators and people who are racist, sexist, etc.

Oceania: N-1 exemption, how many applied and how many were accepted?

CA 2009: We don't have exact facts, but there were a large number of applications. Many dropped out. We accepted all instances except one from the UK. Granted to everyone else.

Registration: About 40 applied, of those, 10 were initially accepted.

CA 2009: There were 2 teams that applied for 0 teams and just judges, thought it might be disproportionate, we accepted.

Convener 2009: Is this policy useful?

Oceania: My concern is that policy for exemption. I think it impacts on the future development of an adjudication core. Sounds like it was small; it's a good thing that you didn't just allow it as a general policy. For inexperienced adjudicators, Worlds is a really good experience, it creates the next generation of judges, diversity of judges is an issue, but I think that this representation is important.

Sam: Motion to table this until this afternoon, there was a specific equity issue.

Motion to move, **motion passed**.

Thailand: How many social events are there that underage people can't get in?

Convener: Tonight no, licensed event, tomorrow event no. The third event is the ball, they will be able to attend.

Australia: How many underage total?

Convener 2009: Most were, some weren't. Only about 5 delegates under the age limit.

Oceania: We have a lot of people under 18 that compete, usually can work it out, maybe guardian allowed? Participants should be able to attend as many events as possible.

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

Ireland: Nothing in Irish law stipulates this. The venue gets shut down if there are people inside under 18.

IONA: Cork will have done everything possible.

Convener: We tried to get random people in. When you're trying to squeeze in as much as possible, you lose political capital to get other things done. Insurance purposes were the problem, but we tried our best. With only 5 delegates, it's difficult. They were notified.

Chair: This Worlds really does stand out: courtesy, goodwill, kindness, as well as professionalism. Great job. Now to bid defense.

Worlds 2010 Bid Defense

CA 2010 (Can Okar): This is not the year to be signing contracts. We came up with worst case scenario finances. Virtually all of our costs were sunk into hotel, everything is included in the 5 star hotel, which is basically our budget. I insisted on budget for adjusted pre-crisis 1.6 Lira to Euro, now 2.2. Signed it to 580000, that's the limit. We thought we could get sponsors. Now we don't have any. Koc is the only one, they are putting 1 for 1 in Euros that you pay. Our patron is very generous. If we change, it will be to another 5 star, single hotel. Same facilities, all in one complex. Conference to rooms and back. It saves us close to 60000- we might get 62000 from sports club donor sponsor. Given that the financial situation is still crazy, please allow flexibility up to 390 Euros from 350. It will be tough to go back to Koc. We will provide a very detailed budget. If you would like to have particular line items, let us know. Adjudication and tabbing. We are currently writing a program which will link registration to tab. The problem this year- it was not their fault- but information got to the tab too late. I'm been working with Cork; they're letting me know the problems, etc. We announced the Adjudication team. Few issues. Adjudicator subsidy, adjudication will come before free beer in case of collapse, we will not have panel of local judges because we're fairly new to debating. I'm trying to get up from 15000 to 30000 by talking to donors. European judges will be majority of judging. I talked to Tate to try to get Asian judges who wouldn't otherwise come. Societies that send tons of judges great, will try to make sure not all Europeans or Australians as chairs. We wouldn't be flying people out unless you can't get there. We will cut registration for lots of people and will spread it out along different regions. Flights will go to Asia, parts of Europe. DCAs are responsible for collecting applications for free registration. This will be open to everyone. We will have a great rotation. Aiming for us not to talk about bins, everyone is customer. If you have 1 point, you're still a member of community. We will rotate as much as we can. If n-1 abused, we will train people so you don't get weird decisions. Equity. Turkey, some things are easier while some things are more difficult. While events will mostly be in the hotel complex, there will be places without alcohol where people can't drink. In Turkey, licensing laws are not so tough, but by law, we must have places that are non-alcoholic. We've talked to the kosher community. Antalya has a Jewish community, so that's good. For kids, we will try to accommodate youngest ages. If less than 17, you can't drink, but off the record, you can. We advise you to have a chaperone if you drink? An advantage in Turkey is that intuitively we understand a bit more about equity. The amount of training to get people up to scratch

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

was immense. Sam Greenland has accepted the equity officer position. Regional development. Qatardebate. The Queen of Qatar seems to be throwing money at debating. Would be flying ESL/EFL teams for a Pre-Worlds tournament in Qatar; we get you there, waive part of registration, with no cross subsidy. It might not happen, but it's a good idea. We're about to start up schools debating. This won't disappear as soon as we host.

Convener 2010 (Azlan): Whichever hotel we choose, there will be no differences in facilities, same or better. Both are 5 star hotels. Rooms of 2 people, with a few triples. We will be using some rooms for debating, but we will minimize that. Automatically males with males, etc. Conference rooms – 2, can sustain more than 1000 people. Can put in one room, or separate. Because they're in the same building, it'll take 3-4 min to get to room maximum. Food. 3 meals a day, kosher, halal, dietary allergies, etc. There are swimming pools and a beach. Unlimited alcohol guaranteed. Already signed into contract with hotel. All kinds of alcohol, gin, raki. Socials in hotel. Not same venue every day. Will rearrange rooms. New Years Eve. Set up a huge tent on beach by a private company. We're in talks with well-known international DJs to come. If we can't, we will bring in huge names. It will bring in more sponsorship with huge names. Nightclubs outside hotel as well, but we can only provide beer there since it costs a lot of money. If we can't provide you entertainment outside, we want to do it in the hotel. We will hold the final in an ancient theater. Although it is under renovation for 2 years, we are now trying to get the biggest stage in world right next to it.

Russia: Aren't there safety issues for tents? How do you account for safety?

Convener 2010: Hotel staff is already trained in such issues. Antalya attracts many tourists a year. Unlimited alcohol all the time, lots of conferences, so they know how to do things. It will be professional.

CA 2010: There is a trust thing, we will provide free alcohol, we will not allow drunk people to debate. If you wouldn't do it at home, don't do it to us. Please tell your delegates to not get completely wasted all the time.

Ireland: How many judges are you planning to fly out? Will there be non-halal meat available?

Convener 2010: Turkish hotels serve bacon and pork. Beef and other meats are all halal.

CA 2010: 50 that fall into both adjudication sets. The number we fly out will be small. There will be a Europe-Asia mix. Cheap enough to get there, we can much more easily waive registration.

Australia: In terms of ability to pay, you might want to have a clear policy for allowing registration waiving based on hardship.

CA 2010: This responsibility will fall to DCAs. We won't look into bank accounts, we want to trust you.

Australia: There were some really small rooms here. It becomes difficult to debate. Can we check rooms thoroughly for size?

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

Convener 2010: There is plenty of space; the average size of each room is 25 meters squared. It will all be set up.

England: Is the institution cap still 3? Any exceptions?

CA 2010: I can't make promise, and I don't want to preempt Council, but we will probably stay at 3. Maybe go down to 2. Do you want quality versus more teams from around the world?

England: There was something mentioned at Euros about LGBTQ issues. On campus, everything fine. Will that also be the case in this venue? Any problem in Antalya?

CA 2010: I wouldn't go to any nightclub that wasn't closed down specifically for us. Told we were paternalistic at Euros. We advise for your safety; we will make announcements in your best interest.

Israel: Is there a difference in actual cap for hotels?

CA 2010: We will stick with 360 no matter what. 400 was too much, this one some teams missed out.

South Africa: Wasn't exactly 100000 Euros. Is it different for different hotels?

CA 2010: We will give you a rundown of specific costs. We will lower again perhaps. We have a strong legal position against hotel. We can sue them; we're Koc. We will get out of the contract if necessary.

North America: Given the financial constraints, maybe its better to have more contact with Council rather than less. Recommend before April 30 and September 30 to keep communication open.

CA 2010: I'm very sorry about the report. It would have been wrong if we sent it then. We could have run it in August, but then it was tough- now we're OK. As soon as we sort out the hotel, we'll send out more concrete documents. As soon as we've nailed it down, we'll be fine- all of our other plans are OK. We're in a strong position. It will be before April.

Move to confirm Turkey by Ireland, seconded by Australia, motion to confirm passed.

Bid for Worlds 2011 and Pre-Bids for Worlds 2012

Chair: We have a pre-bid for 2012, we will hear from them. For 2011, we know of Botswana, are there any other institutions that wish to bid?

Botswana Bid: This bid has been 3 years coming. Our range of experience is anywhere between 5-10 years. Logan is helping with out bid; James Dray also. The South African region is already strong in debating. One of reservations Council has had in the past is capacity. We hosted the Pan-African Championships. More than 300 teams showed up; it showed we can prove our capacity. Logistics and Airports. This will be six months after the World Cup, airports will be bigger, the hotels better and there will be buzz. This event will be monumental for our small country. Lots of support from ministries, etc., and we already have some funding. Development of debate. We have a vision: to bring Worlds to this

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

part of the world will go long way to develop debate. We have already brought in 10 countries, we think when Worlds comes there, will give people opportunity. Lack of consistency between teams. Will increase new countries to tournament for first time, no other opportunity. Sheer excitement. You will have never been here or will go again. Very scenic country, not dented by overdevelopment. Intend to put you in two 5 star hotels. Venues are all there, George Bush came a few months ago. All the debates will be hosted within the campus. Tons of classrooms, large conference rooms. All food preferences will be accommodated. Will try to add as much variety as possible, local tastes. Our airport brings in 8 flights a day, should be sufficient. Will be opening accommodation up to a week early, do tourism, arrive and get settled. Logan is CA and shares our vision. James Dray is part of the Adjudication panel. Something completely different.

Ireland: 10000 set aside for adjudication. How many judges will come from outside Botswana?

Bid: From South Africa, we have people that can help. Flying in CAs, DCAs from their locations. Botswana consistently comes to Worlds. Over the next few years, we can develop a pool of debaters and judges.

Ireland: You'll need 90 chairs, will it be possible?

Bid: This is preliminary, but we feel we can get 20 or so from South Africa, and we'll try to bring in others as well.

Croatia: 8 flights per day, where are they from? How is the transport from SA?

Bid: Flights come from Cape Town and Johannesburg. Open to early arrival. Advise people to take advantage of that. Johannesburg and Gaborone is a 4 hour drive. Contingency is having coaches available. You might like the idea of driving through Africa for tourism.

England: On message on BD, 32 teams there in Africa. It was announced as being much larger. It raised some issues about trust perhaps. Clear communication is necessary. What is the largest tournament Botswana has hosted?

Bid: The Pan-African was the largest tournament. Botswana wanted to show Worlds community our organization. Apologize for confusion. Some teams dropped out close to date. Corrections made on website. Included trainers, runners, all these other volunteers. 300 total.

Netherlands: How many of these judges will be experienced chairs? Compared to this year, how many did Cork have?

Bid: Since this is the first time, it wouldn't be truthful to say we're the same as Cork. We're working to get as many as possible. Experienced core that can help. Cheap flights from Australia to Africa. Working with CAs to bring as many experienced chairs there as possible. Estimate 60 chairs is more than doable now. We will expand. Plus, we have 2 years. We think lots of experienced judges will want to come.

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

Oceania: It's not a fair expectation for hosts to list specifically who they will bring. We saw with Thailand that a lot of work was done to get people to come. They are aware it is important. From Australia, older people really excited.

Russia: In South Africa, we had to stay in Cape Town, issue with us being white. In daylight, there was some trouble. Not many of us know about Botswana, background on safety? Other issues?

Bid: Botswana is liberal democracy, not experienced racial tensions. Free and open society. We will have people there to help you with directions, etc. our hotels about 10 min away from campus. There won't be much movement.

CA 2009: we had roughly 80 people as highly experienced chairs, of which 15 were incentivized to come in. 50 chairs will come from n-1. 350 is a bit of a big team cap. If you feel in a years time, you can't do it, please move the cap down to 320, its tough to do more than 300 or so. They've got a ton of experience. They have good organizational experiences.

Bid: We will be trying to learn a lot from previous Worlds.

Africa: South Africa is much worse than Botswana in terms of crime. South Africans don't come because of expense. It's mostly an access issue. When we are enabled to come, we can judge high rooms.

South Africa: Botswana is extraordinarily stable, another recommendation.

USA: You haven't said anything about income, what type of support can you expect?

Bid: It's difficult to work with specific figures 2 years ahead. When you have ministerial involvement, it's good. We have enough external sponsorship, probably more than any other Worlds in the past few years. We were assured that there will be lots of support.

Jamaica: Do you have a list of countries that need visas?

Bid: All commonwealth countries don't need, always available through websites. We will help you; specifically, one person is dedicated to visa support. Most of that information can be accessed via websites.

Greece: Are you planning on lowering the registration fee if you get more sponsorship?

Bid: We put already low at 350 USD. Lowest I've seen. We've been helped already by NGOs, etc. We might do a give or take 30. We expect to get a lot of help.

England: If we're concerned about adjudication, the world community needs to bring good adjudicators. Please go back to delegations and tell them to come.

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

CA 2009: In the current financial crisis, there are lots of currency fluctuations. I don't know prices, but you might want to show what it will be in local currency. Manila too. If there are problems, we don't think you should have burdens because of foreign fluctuations.

England moves to confirm, Germany seconds.

Botswana confirmed to host Worlds in 2011.

Chair: We have two pre-bids for 2012. It gives us chance to find out who they are, give advice to them, and talk to delegations for their input. The first is the University of Victoria Wellington.

Victoria Bid: We've been thinking about this for a while, but we've solidified our plans now. Not since Australia in 2000 has Worlds been held in Oceania; the last time New Zealand bid, Auckland wanted to host in 1982. Wellington is the capital, home of government, creative capital of New Zealand, beautiful city and waterfront- you can walk around in 20 minutes. A few hotels that are within 5 min of each other. Home of Lord of the Rings. Excursions based on that. It will be summer in New Zealand. Hosting experience: We hosted Australs 2006- largest ever with 80 teams. Great quality, lots of adjudication experience. All people will be around to help out. We hosted Victoria IV, 44 teams over the past 5 years. We send lots of teams and adjudicators to Worlds. We know how Worlds, international tournaments work. Judge quality can be assured. There are cheap flights from Australia. Lots of Worlds debaters from other New Zealand schools there; we have cooperation from other schools. 300 team cap, similar Worlds fees to the past few years. We'll come back with budgets and more information next year.

Philippines: The last time we hosted was in 1999. We will be celebrating our centennial year as a university. We have tremendous university support. 100% support from the Philippines debate union. The whole country wants to host this tournament. Experience in hosting Australs, we hosted the national high school championship. Strong nightlife, debate community. Very cheap. Best Philippines hospitality.

Barbados: Team cap for Philippines?

Philippines: Not sure, at minimum 300-350.

Russia: Identified prospective CAs?

Victoria: Ranald Clauston, Sayeqa Islam.

Philippines: Don't want to name names yet, we will get at least a final list by Koc Worlds.

Convener 2009: Like to thank these guys- it makes it easier to think about it if we plan it earlier.

Lunch Recess

Discussion of Registration Procedures

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

ESL / EFL Interview and Registration

Chair: The first report will be on organizing ESL/EFL institutions, report numbers, and open it for discussion. He also wants to make recommendations for us. We can perhaps put those in a subcommittee. What happens when the amount of teams that want to register is much larger than the people who can register?

Sam (Equity): This is just about the process, please save other questions for later. 161 speakers registered as ESL/EFL. 77 teams. 7 speakers were competing alongside a native speaker partner. 25 EFL teams, 52 ESL. We conducted 181 interviews. Thanks to all those that helped out with this process. It took 12 hours for each person to get it done. 20 were not given the interview. Others were reclassified. Per rules, an appeal process occurred. We provided new and different information to these 7 people as to why they were wrongly classified. 5 appeals, 10 individuals. All appeals centered on 1 clause, Article 31 (more than 5 years in an institution based on English discussion/language). Of those 5 appeals, 3 entirely successful, 1 was partially successful, 1 failed. Another person outside appeals was reclassified to maintain consistency. It is worth highlighting that when these policies passed, it was said that an appeal to Council should not be possible. I feel that logistics can be rethought as it happens at a given tournament. I will continue at Koc. Pre-registration online didn't always work. People who requested an interview didn't show up, and other data entry problems occurred. There were 3 North Americans who weren't ESL/EFL who were classified as such regardless. Information checking needed at tournament. It is harder to check after than to get through in one go.

Qatar: During the process, it was explained to me about the issue of education in English. I accepted the ruling, as many Arab students in Qatar are taught English (mandated) only in math and physics. 4 teams were classified as non-ESL/EFL when it might be incorrect.

Sam: We had to implement by mandate of council. The interpretation that we took exempted language classes. It hinged on non-language subjects and proportion of classroom load. More than 50% were deemed primarily English. It is possible that it wasn't gone through in detail with each student. Asked them all, went over responses. We trust the veracity of information. It's not our business to second guess. When told they go to an international school, we went on this basis. Sorry if we didn't get the right information, but that's why an appeals process is there. Average time for interview was 5-10 minutes per group/pair. Appeal process took 3.5 hours for 5 appeals.

Switzerland: Why is there no clause that if someone is not capable, no matter how long they've been in school, that they can be classified wrongly?

Chair: Just for clarification, we're talking about the process, not issues behind ESL/EFL.

Oceania: Is it too intensive? Will we find a good amount of people capable to serve on this committee in the future?

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

Sam: It's dependent on who I can find. 2 people per interview. I mixed pairings around for consistency. As the process pares down, people can start to feel comfortable with individual interviews. We must make people feel they are being considered. Perceived transparency needed. Enough people who care here who will do it. I beg people to give more time to the matter. Depends on logistical constraints. Time was necessary.

Europe: We have a whole system in Europe- one must register online and describe in detail their language training. Perhaps this can happen next year in Koc.

Sam: People didn't fill in information, so if you didn't do it, tough luck. Must make sure you ask questions. When people read website, they feel that it isn't their burden. We should give them every opportunity. People filled out things wrongly.

Estonia: People didn't have to conduct interviews at all. The process might be faster if you have information from previous years. How did you apply ESL/EFL category?

Sam: Yes. It became quicker doing interviews over time. If it was clear that the Moscow information was right, we could classify faster. Second day was really quick. It is much quicker if you can trust data entry. In Europe, you have transnational movement, while Korean speakers tend to be from Korea.

Russia: Is there a way to separate this into 2 stages? Let's say a quick interview, and if there's a problem, go to a second stage, where professional interviews could be done. I would want to help, if the process was easier.

Sam: It is experience dependent. The second interview was essentially an appeals process. It will be sped up. This is the first year of system; next year, people can say their experiences from this year. It took us a long time because we were getting used to the process.

England: If an ESL speaker broke in the main break, they are no longer ESL under the Constitution?

Sam: That's not in the constitution. Never mind, there it is. I will submit to Council an update- I didn't check this.

England: We can tidy this up later; it should be part of criteria.

Qatar: It might be useful that the criteria be public. I did not know this information, and if I had, would have told teams to go through appeal. Make sure Article 31 is available to students.

Sam: It has been in the constitution for a year, and we designed the questionnaire on the website with that in mind. We posted the article on room doors, handed them out, anyone with queries given a handout. We thought that was enough.

CA 2009: No one in ESL break. How many in EFL have been in ESL?

Chair: If we get this information, we can look at it.

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

Germany: If that was case, criteria are new, so this situation wouldn't be applicable.

England: I agree in principle. It's not what the Constitution says.

CA 2009: It says THE ESL rounds. Do they reset because it's been fundamentally changed?

Chair: I will clear up with the Registrar now. The way we've decided is that ESL means 2 different things at least. Because rules mean what they are currently defined as, cannot describe 2007 vs 2009. If they competed under old criteria, it doesn't go with new criteria. Big distinction between previous years and this year. It is dangerous to apply a different standard.

Israel: If status applies from last year- shouldn't we let delegations know?

Qatar: Every time you change criteria, you change the rules and make it non-retroactive. Makes it unworkable.

Chair: If you pass new criteria, there will be a problem, but no problems have yet arisen.

Russia: Before we had these criteria, ESL/EFL competed as equals. Last year, the threshold for ESL/EFL was difficult to achieve. We cannot apply retroactively.

Chair: We need to look at constitutional stuff rather than other issues.

Derek: If there is any team that broke at ESL Octos last year, will they be able to break into EFL this year?

Chair: That seems to be the case. Not our role to reinterpret.

Sam: No, we didn't use as part of criteria. Mistake will be rectified. Conflict should be solved in talks in the future about the Constitution.

Finland: Do we want this rule at all?

England: Is it possible to pass a motion that we suspend this part for only this tournament and stick with the decisions as they've done? What they have done is not wrong.

Croatia: We are making a rule redundant. No teams have done this, so why are we discussing it?

Africa: Considering status now, I don't think we need to change it.

England: We don't need to reinterpret.

England moves to move on, New Zealand seconds.

Motion withdrawn.

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

CA 2009: There is another ambiguous situation: if you have a team with two EFL speakers that break into ESL, are they eligible for speaker awards in lower categories? The Constitution is silent on this. If you break in higher break, you should only be in that category.

England all important issues, but we can deal with later, can we move on?

England moves to move on, seconded, passed.

Team Caps

Chair: The next situation is quite broad, might be resolved through subcommittee to create framework and rules over the year. An alternative might be for delegates to propose motions now to change the Constitution. Issue is that lots of teams want to come to Worlds, more teams than caps can accommodate. Conveners have to decide. Council might have views on that. Effect of team cap? Institutional eligibility? I will allocate 30 minutes for discussion.

Ireland: The problem this year was registration filling up in 8 minutes. Thus, a large section of the debate community excluded. Up until recently not part of competition, UBC for example. What do we want Worlds to be? Universally represented? The best team in the world? Whoever has quickest broadband gets to Worlds- it's not fair. We have to find an acceptable outcome. Here are some suggestions. Reduce the team cap. Expand reserve spaces for qualifications based on regional tournaments. 1st phase open to certain teams, then 2nd phase gets other teams. Try to limit impact on OrgComm.

Africa: If you can't get into Worlds, and voting status changes, it affects your access to the tournament. Access to broadband is a huge issue. In South Africa we couldn't see the site for 15 minute because we have poor broadband. Competition size- there's not much you can do. Does restrict what you can do though. Qualification is difficult, Africa has new tournament.

Sam: There are huge equity questions about this in terms of representation. Other issues about institutional representation. If there are fewer teams per institution, it means that there are fewer judges that people have to send. Don't underestimate 1 team to Worlds per institution. Do 3 teams add lots more? World community sees you're there. There's a tradition of debating. Institution at home sees you have gone. There is a huge value in going to international tournaments. Prestige and status. Value of 2 individuals who go back and teach what they've learned. Should have as much institutional representation as possible. The problem with the USA's 67 teams is that they have the money to send many teams. Initial stage of registration for only 1 team for maybe a week. Then opened up to how many spots we want to give.

Australia: We must keep in mind the implications for next year's Worlds. Proposal of committee to analyze situation, perhaps more radical ideas. With a 360 team cap, there is not so much pressure perhaps. Think about how additional teams are allocated if 1 or 2 team cap. Perhaps allocate another team based on something else?

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

Peru: Debate is like taking baby steps, it is important to have one team that can bring it back. Qualifications then are not as doable. We would be excluding new countries that want to take part.

Oceania: In the long term, institutional basis will run out. In short term, we can make it work. Subcommittee should look at it. In the meantime we should expand the country place guarantee to all countries, not just to countries that came the year before. Turkey should allow people to have more teams, but in case of filling up in 8 minutes, we need to be safe rather than sorry. Eligibility of teams needs to be tidied up. Historical eligibility should exist subject to capacity.

2010 CA: More teams will apply in first few minutes than in this year. Almost all on waitlist got to go. Its been liars who say they will send 3 teams and don't. They should be shamed. It needs to be discussed. Don't bind us too much in conversation today. We can do this, but will talk to you and set up system that we can all accept. Keeping aside 193 places not practical. Neither 2-1 cap either, need to figure out implications. Naming and shaming, deposits are potential suggestions.

CA 2009: There might be a reprieve because of downturn perhaps. Perhaps people who didn't ever have money, some teams' money dried up. Botswana will be expensive to get to, not so oversubscribed. It's an equity issue to reduce teams to 1. Botswana can't or else they won't have a judging pool. Balance of judges in pool, more dependent on local pool, might be issue. Lots of institutions lie. We offered a fair chance to pay. Payment never arrived, move on and so forth. We can't do anything about it now. Perhaps require payment earlier, but was told difficult to do. Let OrgComm have flexibility. Give indication at Council. We need money to make tournament happen. If there is low demand, it might make it difficult to give other spots out if you keep spots aside. Council might tie hands of OrgComm so they can't do anything.

England: Set up a committee. Issues interrelated to look at constitutional issues. We don't want bindings for Can next year. Other ways when are more teams that perform well, better quality attracts more teams. Of 308, 231 from ENL. People will suffer if we radically change things that make up Worlds. Problem of institutional cap of 1, those who consistently send 3 teams who pay, it hurts them when people lie.

Ireland: In August and September, people claim that there was not enough time. You need to give more time that OrgComm needs to make sure they get payment and sort out other issues. Look at how we structure registration. If we start in June and pay deposit, maybe pay earlier than usual. Regional qualifiers. If Worlds at stake, it increases the draw of regional tournaments. If spread right, fair regional representation. Next two years, because of implications, this pressure won't be there probably. Effective and strict conditions need to be set- make a committee.

Africa: There is a danger of shutting down discussion. There is a problem with lying, also problem of simple costs. It's all different depending on where you're coming from. To steer discussion, need to have discussion about what Worlds is. We come to develop, any benefits lost if you take away things that make it a world championship. We try to make equal, but we also want to be meritocratic. We must balance.

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

Jamaica: Require a deposit at initial stages in order to commit. Disadvantage of team cap of 3, lots of places can't send 3 teams. For us, the server went down, couldn't access. Deposit over a week.

Wales: There are more debate institutions in the UK than the rest of world. Regional tournaments means expanding so more people can experience Worlds. Same institutions will go year after year, because small schools can't win against big teams. Do you want exclusivity or to let more teams experience Worlds?

IONA: I agree with Africa- its good to have teams there who won't experience this. We shouldn't deny teams to Oxford, Sydney, Cambridge. One team per country, absolutely ridiculous to have legitimacy.

Qatar: I must say this experience is very valuable. It's a difficult balance. Value of all countries coming is important. We must have a guiding principle to let people from new countries who want to come. Perhaps a window period. Financial penalty might be an issue. Other events have a minimum standard. Regionals are an interesting idea, but there are still drawbacks.

Chair: I propose tabling for 20 minutes.

Recess

Canada: I want to speak against a regional championship. There is a disparity in Canada between regions. Western schools only recently began to go. If only 4-5 schools dominate competition, there's a big issue.

Israel: The deposit should be non-refundable. Regional tournament level is not as high as Worlds. Perhaps new institutions have a guaranteed spot, and then allocate.

Sam: We can't hope that this will go away. People will go faster and wait for problems to be solved later. Huge subcommittee. We have lots of time to do this by email. Some countries will find it difficult to commit funds early. N-1 historical situation- we have a predicted numbers of judges. We might need to revisit based on status quo types of institution. Perhaps n-1 after first team. Come back with statement on this balance. Have to deal with this tension.

China: More regional representation is needed. I come from BFSU. Sponsored tournament of 128 teams this year. Many Chinese debaters want to participate. This year only 2 teams were permitted to come to Worlds.

Finland: I don't think it is unreasonable to reserve spots- only 90 is not a problem. There are no problems with Helsinki not sending a C team,; we only get funding when they are registered. Perhaps suspension or team cap lowered for next year.

Oceania: It's based on your external officer or time zone now. In the current system, institutions should miss out as well if they don't do it. It protects quality. In principle can direct OrgComm, if it will make it better. It seems that most countries were already there, so it's not too much of an issue.

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

England: These things can be discussed in subcommittees. Do we need to do anything for next year? Issue is that 8 minute registration is tough, and also lying teams. Maybe suggest we look at those for next year.

Turkey: Name of university is important. We want university representation, not country representation. We will take as many universities as possible.

Russia: Different teams, different interests. We want to be treated equally rather than anything else. People should feel they've been treated equally. Binding things- practices so that everyone knows how they'll be treated.

Asia: Diversity is important now. New institutions should come first. Team cap initially, then first come first serve. More talk needs to happen on what Worlds means. Something initial now, more concrete in future.

CA 2010: Regional tournaments are a good idea. Unless you have permanent staff, Worlds can't grow. We might want to think about qualifiers. Its weird qualifying now, we just take the first team who signs up. What we're doing now is not sustainable. Like early money and deposits. Guys from Jamaica did not want to do this. I might open in June. Consultation with elders from region, please don't tie me down, it could hurt the tournament.

Singapore: Over time we need to move on from 4 teams to 1 per institution. Evolving the tournament. Perhaps consider change in n-1. If you send more teams, it's not restricted by judges. Good debaters can also be the good judges.

Caribbean: When we have a team cap larger than 1, more adjudicators can apply. Then we have more adjudicators. Can apply as independent, strengthens quality. Difficulty of IONA vs Europe. We need opportunity for independent adjudicators.

Serbia: What do we consider an institution? Perhaps look at geographical diversity- 5 universities in one area is not representative. Burden of responsibility is for representative of country instead. We have someone to talk to as a representative.

CA 2009: The problem is that we were oversubscribed in both teams and judges. We tried to do balance on experience and room in the tournament. Institution vs nation divide- be careful. Put pressure to not drop that spot so that another institution from that country can put another team in. It's a tricky situation in USA for regional tournaments with 7 national debating bodies.

Ireland: I propose a motion for a subcommittee- what is the goal of Worlds? Fairest means of registration? How to deal with oversubscription of teams? Judges? Institutions?

Motion From Australia, Thailand, South Africa, Ireland.

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

Sam: Perhaps we can get our heads together to streamline discussion on one or two motions rather than overlapping ones.

Ireland: Can we talk about mine first? Since subcommittee can talk about all of these issues.

Chair: Trying to get consent, if I asked for subcommittee, can we do that? I will create subcommittee within Ireland motion parameters.

Ireland: Someone like Ian Lising should chair.

Chair: Registrar should chair, guardian of rules, etc. We will have broad participation hopefully. No limit to scope of people involved.

Subcommittee created.

Finland: There are motions that might be binding on them. Possible to make motions recommendations?

Oceania: The subcommittee won't report back until next year. The point of our motions is to fix problem for Worlds next year, subcommittee for Botswana.

Ireland: Most of the issues are solved, if people would like to withdraw, please would be helpful.

England: -If these motions pass, it will bind Koc because they take effect now. Don't discuss now whether to have motion on table, discuss in later debate.

CA 2010: If motion says we won't bind next year Worlds, can that work?

Chair: People have the right to put in motions. Delegates who put in motions, can you go discuss whether there is any overlap in motions.

CA 2010: I might have said to make a strategic motion not to bind. Must be good to look at the motions. We wanted to do this anyway. No problem with discussion. Would like to see thinking in room of team cap of two vs 3. If I decide to go for three, I don't want to be accused.

Motion from South Africa dropped

CA 2010: A motion and recommendation. WUDC recommends all countries should be allocated 1 team. I was going to do this anyway, this makes it a recommendation.

Croatia: No vote needed?

England: I don't want it to be that you will change your mind, we want you in good faith to make decision.

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

Russia: Some people represent other views, perhaps emailing country representatives. This forum isn't enough.

Chair: Might Australia want to withdraw motion?

Oceania: Idea is for Can to have spots aside.

CA 2010: We will have spots aside, Council already agreed with bid. Know you want involvement in it. Bit insecure.

Australia: Based on faith in principles by Can, **we withdraw**.

CA 2010: Please try to advertise in countries so that we can have this choice understood.

Australia: Can wants to hear more from Council if you want a team cap of 2. Motion of two team cap, for discussion purposes.

CA 2010: No idea what majority is, I want to hear opinions, it would be binding if you made a decision.

England: What does slightly binding mean? What do recommendations, endorsements, motions, mean?

Chair: Council makes the decision, and this is time to do so, this would serve as instruction for Can.

Oceania: If they choose to not follow it, would it have to come back to Council.

Ireland: Recommendations mean binding because it represents the world community.

Europe: Even if it's a recommendation, don't use Koc as guinea pigs.

Finland: The benefit of having Can in room is that he says he will not feel bound, but guided.

Africa: If people are worried, I propose just a discussion. Can supports it because he wants to know.

England: Can wants a poll, what delegates think, no binding act. Ask a question of whether people want it or not.

Chair: I'm extending discussion for 15 minutes.

Ireland: It's a bad idea for 2, we have no idea what it means, it's never been done before, no implications. It's foolish to do it with such little time.

Sam: I hope countries can represent institutions. First team is important, not sure of added value with 2nd. Reduction now preempts subcommittee. Also doesn't take into account people in this room.

Chair: This will not be mandated.

North America: I support 2 team cap.

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

Oceania: Its no fair for institutions to miss out, pretty similar to 3 teams, do not have maximum adjudication limit.

England: We need to increase national diversity, but if one university can send fewer teams to Worlds, this can be a problem. We need more time to discuss this in subcommittee.

Russia: Setting binding two teams depends on how many institutions are able to send that amount of teams today. Running a danger of some nations with no established history in debating. Some students still go to another university, and we cannot validate it. They'll get here somehow.

Netherlands: For Russia, you probably know which universities are in your country. Can we just have a poll?

Chair: It might be unfair to bound people to a position after thinking about it for only 5 minutes. I'm not going to stop people.

Singapore: There are lots of countries where there are many universities that can't send more than 1 or even 1. With team caps, you allow more countries to send more teams. We don't need to mandate everything.

Canada: In principle I would support this, but binding Koc now is problematic. Unforeseen circumstances could happen.

Europe: We haven't tackled the issue of adjudication pool. Giving them fewer judges. Turkey will have to fly in more judges, if no local pool.

Scotland: Can shouldn't have to find more judges for Worlds in a year. More practical harms.

Barbados: Don't make an arbitrary decision today. If we don't have the demand in a few years, that would be bad for Worlds.

South Africa: We shouldn't stall discussion because it can't happen because of judges. If n-1 is bottleneck, you will have to change n-1 to pass this. Teams who have missed out in the past an issue, this should be studied.

IONA: We can look at further in subcommittee. Very few teams that didn't get in Cork, Can increasing team cap by 52, so it shouldn't be a problem. Creates another delay, since Koc already strained financially. We shouldn't hinder viability.

Slovenia: It goes against idea of promotion. We will spread out.

USA: Everyone seems to support this, but we don't know marginal gains, how will this affect diversity? Unless you do the study this year, it's inappropriate to change the status quo now.

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

New Zealand: Be wary of rushing into this too quickly. It's been an incredible pace from 8 institutions in Vancouver to 2. We need to figure out whether it's going to slow down. Look at the examples in past.

Germany: Worlds is also about equality. Larger teams might have problem cutting teams down. We need to look at it in subcommittee.

Philippines: If we have a team cap of 2, their C team will come as adjudicators, we have to free up slots. In principle we're increasing possibility of diversity. Better for other countries.

Wales: There were not many teams on waiting list here, don't see why you would have to open it up. If fewer teams go, it makes it more exclusive. It closes Worlds off to the rest of the society. Disincentivizes competing. Harms ability for teams to make decisions. Its good will for Sydney to send more judges.

Turkey: Mark Collins and Derek Lande can help us. Composition of waiting list matters. People are having conflicting opinions.

Can: Thank you for the discussion, can we move on? We will go to an executive committee when we have a report.

Australia: Thank you to the Council for discussion on the issue, hope it will continue in subcommittee to explore all potential harms and benefits to vote potentially next year.

CA 2009: Can we add things?

Chair: At this point, people have already accepted, go into committee and make suggestions. We'll make a sheet for signups for committee. We'll call the subcommittee the "Subcommittee on the Future of the WUDC." Move on to committee reports. **3 motions have been tabled for constitutional review.**

Committee Reports

Chair: It's been a good first year, thank you for helping me out, I'm very grateful to Ian Lising. I said my aim would be to treat everyone equally. Those who I haven't had a chance to work with closely, I hope to do so. Done a lot of traveling this year, growth of debating, WUPID in Malaysia, Eastern Europe, Turkey, and 25 others, there is excitement for BP debating. Thanks all for the work you do.

Registrar: It's hard to fill Neill's shoes. Thanks for the opportunity. I think as Registrar it's important to recognize the Constitution. Im here as a support group. Highlight issues in Constitution. I've worked quite hard as lawyer and as a debater. I've effectively been pushing for debates in Asia.

Secretary: Thank you for letting me type. It's been great hearing your opinions and I'm grateful for the opportunity.

Equity: This will be slightly longer, but it's been a privilege to serve as Equity officer. Thanks to the tournament Equity officer. There are a number of things in report that will highlight issues. I'm grateful to go to Koc. Hope that the delegation will come with me. Tony Murphy might be elected after me.

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

Regional representation. Recognize the rules need to be interpreted quite often. Issues of cultural traditions. Gap between expectation and what happens. Recommend that my successor do a few things. Videos of debates with sample adjudications- how parameters are interpreted. Test debates in ESL/EFL and native language. Many different debates for help. Hope that delegates will help my successor and help train adjudicators. Multiculturalism. This tournament is globalizing fast. Judging pool does lag behind a little bit. Important that all debaters perceive they have chance to win. We hope the perception and reality can happen. Don't have to be an adjudicator from that background to judge those debaters. There are multiple debate traditions. Broad types of styles. Tough to legislate against misconception. Preconceived mechanisms need to be made so that you can deal with issues.

Women's: The women's forum was a huge success. It was due to accessibility and help showing people there. Large increase in number of Americans present. American women points. In USA debate, politically correct language norm, no suggestion that non- politically correct language shouldn't be used. Look at it in persuasiveness. Larger cautiousness is US and Canada. Strong point of consensus is that women will be just as competitive. Thanks to all that helped out. Women's night should be about underrepresentation of women in debating rather than women generally. Statistical breakdown on women in debating. Would like to pass on role to Bronwyn Cowell.

Europe: Will this be talked about for ESL speakers as well? Politically correct language?

Women's: It's not intended to be a standard. Don't need to use gender-specific language.

Regional Reports

North America: BP is thriving in America. 4 regions. West coast. New circuits that are starting up. Increased participation in Worlds and in Council. More issues. Early April, US BP championships at Vermont. After that is HWS Round Robin. We had world class tournaments, like Hart House, US BP Nationals. Thanks to Cork. Looking forward to Koc.

Caribbean: We're happy to see that Latin America is represented for the first time. 2009 we will be having a regional championship. Invite assistance if possible. Thank OrgComm for advice and help. Thanks for making this experience memorable.

IONA: We're very proud of Cork. No debating in Iceland, Scotland has more teams here. Traditional IONA circuit strong, we can get debate in Northern Ireland. Less traditional teams broke.

Europe: Thanks to Cork for a great Worlds. Booming Eastern Europe debate circuit. Western Europe- France and Switzerland coming for first time. Looking forward to Newcastle Euros. Please ask questions to Oskar Avery later.

Africa: We hosted Pan-African tournament. An ESL team won South African nationals. Major school debating. First time we've seen Zambia, Ghana, Nigeria, Uganda. Regional championship hopefully. African Council. We hope to set up a real council.

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

Asia: Asia now has two regional tournaments, talking about unifying these tournaments. Discussion will be tomorrow. Hopefully put on an Asian BP tournament, increase adjudicators, training in region a lot. Sydney comes to Thailand to help us out. We went to Macau. Expanded into more IVs- Singapore has an open, WUPID, Thailand will hopefully have an IV as well. Hope more consider joining group of strong debate nations soon.

Oceania: In Australia and New Zealand, everything going well. Australs is coming back to Australia. We encourage international guests to come. Circuit of Minis is going from strength to strength. BP is growing. Thanks to Cork for the great tournament.

Constitutional Review

Chair: I noticed problems with the Constitution over the past few years. Unintended consequences from things that don't fit. Try to go through and make clearer. Will allow you to check.

Sam: This is the second half of discussion on ESL/EFL. Number of thoughts put together by language committee as a result of rules put through. Speakers who break one year in one category not being eligible for lower category. Renummer accordingly. Nowhere in Constitution does it say where you are if you don't fit in either. This is a spectrum. Doesn't mean proficiency. There are differing expectations. Describe as EPL, that you don't need special consideration. Start to use that and change expectations. Part of Article 31 point 3 a. You're not an ESL speaker if you use it as the primary language in home. What happens if you speak English socially but not at home, average to poor English. Quality of exposure of language. Amend that clause. There are more significant issues that we could discuss next year after rules have settled down. More than 5 years at English institution. Level of exposure removes sufficiently. It depends on primary use vs. effective primary use. 50% of classes +1 in schooling plus years. There's a bigger question on effectiveness. Is one functionally speaking Chinese but reading English. It's problematic because of the classification. Language ability is on a spectrum. Barriers because of lack of exposure. Based on opportunity, not how good your English is. Subjectivity comes up. 5 year rule is a bit harsh. What if they study English language as a major. Are all years of schooling equivalent? It's a question of veracity. There's criteria for composition of teams, not possible for other teams to challenge language. Might want to make it happen. Objective vs subjective standards. I wanted objective last year. Absolute inability to look at things subjectively. Language officers picked by representation and knowledge, I was appointed by OrgComm. Someone who has respect of community can run it later.

Netherlands: When would we be deciding on these other issues?

Sam: I already wrote motions for the "Now" motions, we can have a subcommittee for the others. Need to know people who will be at Koc, need a discussion before August.

Ireland: Can current language committee make proposals?

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

Qatar: What's already written is pretty close, there are still differences over effective primary and primary. How do you build a mechanism that is not overly burdensome. We need a decision in writing.

Netherlands: Favor idea of Ireland just to go to committee. Rules should be changed.

Sam: Last Worlds, there was a committee set up to make proposals. If we don't do it today, we can't set anything up for Koc. I'd like to include all in discussion for next year.

Germany: We need to do something before, otherwise it's seen as arbitrary. Decide on motion that Sam has set up, for all other things, set up committee, give more discretion to interpret rules.

England: If we set up a committee, can they implement them without Council?

Chair: If the language review committee asked for consultation, and to tell us how they intend to interpret existing rules, that's a good thing, if we want to change them, we can't do that.

Australia: I vote to move these motions, second motion is to create extraordinary session of Koc to approve this.

Can: We would have to do language tests before Council meeting.

North America: In Article 31.2, the Language Review officer will look at quality of language. Could propose a motion that allows language committee to submit a document of interpretation before Koc.

Proposed by New Zealand, seconded by Qatar.

Motion approved.

Sam: This is a constitutional tidying up motion. Proposed by New Zealand.

New Zealand proposes motion:

- 1. Council recommends that "EPL" (English as a Proficient Language) replace current usage of a "ENL" (English as a Native Language) wherever it appears.**
- 2. Delete Article 30.4.5 after 1st sentence and insert Article 31.3 with same wording.**

Sam: It is explicit- proficient rather than native.

Another motion proposed by Croatia. Seconded by England.

Netherlands: We might just want to postpone until the language committee has done another interpretation.

England: I don't know what the language committee would do that would make it wrong.

Russia: It may bind us, there are people who aren't native speakers, but very well proficient.

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

Sam: I propose that England and Croatia withdraw, done before interpretation.

Germany: This does not include a time frame.

Chair: Please talk about that in Committee.

Sam: Before we wrap up, anyone who wants to join this committee, email me by February 1 to express interest. Need to start by February.

Chair: There's one issue that wasn't resolved earlier- determining eligibility for speaker prizes for mixed speaker teams.

Oceania: Derek raised it, might want Council to decide.

England: Speaker status is not in the Constitution. Allow people to be qualified for ESL irrespective of partners. Estonia seconds. Doesn't affect break, but does affect speaker status.

Netherlands: Will this affect it currently?

England: No, it means for subsequent years.

Sam: If EFL speaker is best in tournament, would win all prizes. Do have data. There are people who are composite, it is unfortunate because we don't have data on this. My view is, tough luck.

Qatar: I would like to vote for an amendment. Accepting that no speaker may win more than one speaker prize.

Oceania: If the best speaker is a novice we give them both- they're awesome.

Africa: We recognize there's a barrier to performance. That's the reason we don't allow them not to be in main break is that there's no barrier.

Estonia: Is Council aware that under our policy, we don't allow to be in both EFL and ESL finals. Different categories- teams and speakers.

England: There are two issues. Constitution doesn't make reference to speaker awards. Is it appropriate?

Macau: If you're regarded as EFL, significant obstacle.

Sam: It says its regarded as a significant barrier, but you don't penalize for hard work. You still qualify.

Greece: We need to put in clarification of one or two speakers in tab.

Amendment proposed.

Ireland: Does this mean top 10?

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

Chair: No, it's not in the amendment.

Ireland: Can we do a roll call?

Amendment fails.

England: ESL recognizes you have difficulty in language. It is a minimal advantage to being with a better speaker. ESL speakers not necessarily worse than their partners. It's a good way to get involved. Penalized more because of lack of language and not recognized.

New Zealand moves to vote.

Motion passed.

Finland proposes three motions.

Finland: Something that a few people in Europe wanted to bring up, the argument is that it's a bit dubious to have 77 EFL teams with requirement of 80.

Registrar: If you look at the Constitution, it has to be 80.

Chair: I know they were amenable, thought more debate was better, but Constitution is that way for a reason. Cannot do it now.

Convener: I don't think there's much of a point to talk about it. We didn't want to cut them, we're just not allowed.

Qatar: Can we accept re-appeals of language status?

Chair: Those are final, we extended the deadline already.

Finland proposes motion.

Sam: Would this mean that ESL adjudication was different from adjudications with EPL?

England: It's dependent on ESL status, so motion doesn't do what you want.

Finland: It needs to be reworked. ESL is a category applied to debaters, not judges.

Oceania: It wouldn't apply to Koc?

Finland: Not to Koc.

Estonia seconds.

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

England: I'm concerned about status of ESL for adjudicators. Agree to leave discretion to CA. Bids must be held to account on ESL judging. If a bid does have an ESL CA, do they need a DCA? It's a problematic resolution.

Oceania: It's worth considering if it doesn't apply to Koc. Sometimes people do overlook these issues. People with personal experience could help.

Ireland: It should be left to the CA, Council shouldn't micromanage. Don't know if this will be beneficial for ESL status.

New Zealand: The precedent for Council intervening in regional gender/ethnic requirements?

CA 2010: There's no motion but we might want to vote. As a person who went through this, it would make it very difficult. This will happen naturally. We have great ESL candidates coming through.

England: It undermines the credibility of the DCA.

Philippines: We don't see the purpose if ratified by Council, assumes reliability anyway; experience is not necessarily a requirement.

Motion withdrawn.

Sam: The equity forum discussed this issue. Work needs to be done on it. Equity and CAs will keep working together.

Elections

Chair: It's now time for elections, roll call.

Chair: Neill Harvey-Smith. Nominated by Russia, seconded by Ireland.

Registrar: Adiba Shareen. Nominated by Malaysia, seconded by England.

Secretary: Stephen West. Nominated by Canada, seconded by Russia.

Equity officer: Tony Murphy. Nominated by USA, seconded by Ireland.

North America: Steve Johnson.

Caribbean: Hugh Simmons.

IONA: Ruth Faller.

Europe: We'll let you know when we elect a new President in August- Branka for now.

Africa: Joe Roussos

World Universities Debating Council
Thursday, January 1, 2009
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

Asia: TJ Senamngem.

Oceania: Don't know now, will update in future.

Chair: At times this was heated, thanks for making it easy. Productive steps forward. I hope we'll have good focused discussion in the future. Thanks for giving up your time.

Meeting adjourned at 5:43.