

Meeting called to order at 10.35am.

Opening Statement

Chair: Welcome. Thank you everyone for coming early. I am sure all of us had a good time last night. I would like to remind that regional and country representatives are to sit at the table while observers may sit at the back.

Distribute agenda.

Go through agenda.

Start roll call.

Registrar: Roll call

Registrar: To clarify on voting status. Israel is now a status A. Scotland status B. A correction to the minutes, observer nations do not get a vote in the Council (Austria, Iraq, Venezuela). Observer nations are allowed to debate at council but not vote. On proxy votes, constitution is silent on it. A single delegate should not represent two nations but may appoint anyone to vote for them.

Chair calls for a motion to pass through minutes from last year's meeting.

Russia: On observer nations, the Cork minutes states that they get a vote.

USA: Move to clarify on the minutes of the meeting.

Seconded by Canada.

Chair moves to go through pre-council minutes.

Calls for motion to approve.

Proposed by Ireland and seconded by Scotland.

Chair: On minutes of Council meeting at Cork, are there any issues?

Calls for motion to pass.

Proposed by England and seconded by Ireland.

Move on to the agenda.

Chair welcomes Cork to present their report.

Art: I will take any questions after the report. We have emailed accounts to all delegates as it takes a while to go through the whole accounts at council. We had a budget of around 500000 euros. 300000 went to accommodation. A large amount went to drinks and socials and transport. We did not spend all the money but since the university gave us funding, the university has reclaimed the money. We do not feel it is viable to give the money to future Worlds organizers. The accounts have now balanced at zero. After the registration money came in, we put it in a high interest account and received 3000 euros in interest. We suggest to try to get high interest rates. On the issue of kosher

food, we had to use several thousand quid to bring kosher to Ireland. There seemed to be a big disparity between the number of people who takes kosher and those who registered. We need delegates to understand that it costs a lot as it costs ten times more to get the same food for kosher delegates. Please make sure those who ask for it in the future takes it. Most of the money for the tournament did not come from sponsors but from the City Council and the National Universities Council. There is a lot of support from the local council and we asked them for funding and would recommend this to future hosts. On the tournament itself, we are happy about it and thought it was great. There were no big equity complains and no tax penalties or damage penalties. 15000 were given in case something happened but was not used. Any questions or comments?

Australia: There was an error on registration details. People may have chosen kosher when they did not want it.

Art: Agreed that there was a mistake. We have already emailed everyone to clarify but there were still excess numbers.

Chair calls for motion to accept.

Proposed by Ireland and seconded by Canada.

Move on to Koc University report.

Can: Everything's fine. On registration, we felt the system was fine. We have solved some tied up problems but still feel there is a big issue with the system and hope Botswana improves. Too many teams wanted to come but felt that it was resolved in the end. However, organizers agree that there is a problem in confirming registration. On payments, we promised that we would take credit cards but we would to explain that we had to use Koc bank. Canada was frustrated that payments were not responded fast enough. We realized that not all payments were multiples of 390 which slowed us in recognizing transactions. We need people to state not only their name but also hash worlds just to differentiate them from any other transactions. It took a very long time to resolve. Apart from that, we feel it was okay as well with dietary requirements. We were happy to solve kosher issues eventhough it costs a lot. From the budget, it can be seen that Koc Foundation is stated at the top and the deficit is correct but no worries as Koc has agreed to pick up the tab. The adjudication core's expenses were probably more to 22000 as well as for the Organisation Committee. The trip to Yale was cheaper as well due to Yale's help in some expenses. We probably spent closer to 22000 for 22 odd judges. If there are any questions about the adjudication test, you should probably ask Julia but we would take absolute responsibility if council wanted to censor. About last night, we could not stop them in time. Hope it was alright but please stop congratulating the organizers as the tournament is not done yet. Please remind delegates to arrive earlier. We would have given more details. However on judges' expenses, we feel that it is quite confidential. But on socials and hotel, information can be given as well but it will take time. Most of the expenses were for hotel, socials and miscellaneous.

Ireland: Please confirm no teams were left on the waiting list.

Can: No and we even added teams from institutions on the cap.

Ireland: Why wasn't there a womens night?

Can: We gave two meetings for forums. We felt it was a tokenistic night and felt no reason to have a womens night.

England: I have a question about the adjudication test.

Can: Will call Julia.

Canada: We felt there were problems with registration system as confirmation emails are not automatic.

Can: No, confirmation email was not automatic. If delegate leader has been put in, it cannot be changed. On ESL/EFL status, it immediately says no. That was a mistake. This caused the ESL/EFL committee having to ask delegates again. It cost us 1500 euros for organizational costs but if you want to, you should not use the same program over and over again and try to improve it. With a registration of .5 seconds, we need the system to be responsible.

England: Some questions on adjudication tests. There were people who were in the test and felt it was not easy to make a decision fairly. We want a response for the future. The problem can be stopped from happening again in the future. Just for future CA teams.

Julia: It was spoken at womens forum as well. They didn't appreciate it. We just thought it was an alright motion. We had to hire a film crew but not ideal as we did not have much control. However it would have cost 300 euros more to tape it again. Due to inexperience, we didn't realise that there were issues about women, ESL/EFL judges, and we were not in position to do anything with it.

Russia: Some browsers are not friendly with the registration system. Have you checked it with other browsers? Do you have advice in the future on browsers? On the adjudication test, we cannot see who gave POIs but then was asked about a specific POI, we had problems with it.

Can: We did online test during Euros and screw ups happened because it was new. The adjudication core spent 40 hours to get the tests done properly. Julia will further answer on this. On browsers, we didn't try Opera and various others. We couldn't work out how quick people can get in the system. We asked China and Japan and found out that they can access it. It's hard to test how fast people can access the system. We can try testing how fast by seeing who got in first. Will talk to Botswana about this issue.

Julia: Again, the filming crew were not debaters and didn't know about it. However, we thought it was clear as only one POI was taken by the speaker. It didn't cost anyone marks just for getting it wrong. There was a problem as we couldn't see who gave and not get accepted. Will inform Botswana on this.

Registrar: Did you use a relative ranking system where good teams get higher points for their judge feedback and vice versa.

Can: We would like to point out the number of teams giving bad feedback was ridiculous. The teams clearly did not give a fair feedback. Delegates need to be reminded that you cannot think that a worlds finals judge is worth one out of ten. Teams that come fourth get no points for their feedback. Teams ranked 3,2,1, get 1 point. 1 score for reasoning and feedback. We didn't use the numbers on the wing. Some feedback damaged the reputation of good judges. We cannot use it for absolute

rankings. The biggest problem is trying to get info out of feedback. We tend to try to find outliers. A speaker in a 7 point room in Round 7 got 91 and that became material for rankings. We cannot change it.

England: On the problem of bad feedback. I don't think we care if you agree or not with the decision. By changing questions to is it fair gives a different impression rather than whether they agree or not.

Can: Botswana should take note.

Ireland: It happens sometimes but it's not a big problem. I think there should be more on trusting judges rather than on adjudication core trusting on certain judges.

Julia: We tried asking teams but couldn't believe them enough after approaching the teams.

Thailand: To add is it possible that some teams do not know how to rank judges. Maybe teams should be made known what is acceptable and what is not.

Can: This is the first time. Judging tab is useful but never a final say. It's not like a team tab. We would never make decisions from numbers of a computer. We would always look at feedback and whether we know the people or not. We agree we should be clearer on what each score means. On running judge tabs, it maybe takes ten people to do both tabs.

USA: We recognize that this is the first time. Adjudicators have interests to know. Would you want to give out information if they wanted to know how they did?

Julia: I wouldn't. If so you can work out where the good and bad feedbacks are. They might just be despondent on feedback and too upset when they shouldn't.

Can: The constitution only requires stating 1,2,3,4. Feedback will release information to debaters. If say, everyone knows people will get the scores, this may change the feedback. Don't think its scientific enough and need to make sure that its fine before using it. It may be a good idea but wouldn't suggest the AUCD approach. I believe it should be more on margins. We also look at whether people get along or not.

India: I have serious misgivings about the system, as, due to a judge comes from a region that is unknown, or maybe due to a team saying someone's bad, it may be that the team may be right. It is problematic that because it is a 7 point room, you believe it's impossible to get those marks. This tournament is a big one. It is a bad impression to have prejudgement.

Can: We never said that three ones would be good or bad. It is not nice that the person thinks that the person is incompetent. Real judges may also be wrong. It's subjective. It's more of teams giving 1,1,1 issue. We also do not expect a team in the middle of the tab, someone is able to give a speech that can win a grand final. He is also in a low room and hasn't engaged a good debate. One person didn't get above 80 in any debate but only because of one 91 he gets a high rank. The quality of feedback was read through. If teams can write reasons, then it would be helpful.

Derek: It should be noted that better briefings can be done. I thought briefings are among the best given. Thought that feedback has always been just for release but everyone must know that feedback is important.

Russia: On objective criteria on feedback and trainings for judges. Too much time was spent on the recorded debate but not much on the general idea of judging. There were also complaints about not seeing the DCAs. The DCAs were in the tab room and too busy so cannot see them.

Julia: We thought that we had already provided training through documents. We also had a Q and A session and only four people went to it. We wanted to use the debate to show how oral decision works. Josh covered the procedures. The Q and A went too long and Josh didn't have enough time to get through it. We feel that the judges should go to the trainings that we have provided if they wanted to learn more.

Can: When talking about the tournament, DCAs probably are not accessible all the time. However, there is always a judge in the tab room.

Russia: Some teams wanted feedback. They only see the DCAs two times either in the hall or tab room. There is no exact place to find them.

Julia: We made sure there is always a DCA at the front of the room and then the DCA would go back to the tab room after the rounds started.

Can: We also made conscious effort to ask people around. When specific people ask, we can tell whether it is a real issue or not. A DCA has hardly 23 minutes and need to eat. DCAs are not a place to answer everything. The tournament is too big to be friendly.

Korea: We were told that ballot had problems.

Julia: The tab always checks the order but we agree that it happens (mistakes).

Can: The system works like this. The runner will check and then it will be checked by the floor manager and we do not believe a mistake should have happened. We agree there were two problems. We will ask the judge involved to reconvene the debate to sort the rankings and correct the ballot.

Chair: Derek has a question.

Derek: The most important thing is comments. If we look at comments, some comments described adjudicator as a turd. I don't think that feedback was good like saying a person is so stupid that he or she shouldn't be here. We need to have a full 360 degree review, need to have teams on chairs, chairs on panels, panels on chairs. I don't think its a hundred percent practice but we need to look into it in the future. There is a serious issue of how forms are used. There is a disparity depending on which region you're from as they haven't learned on it. Some countries almost seem like they were coached to give 1,1,1 when the results are against them. Scores depends on level of judging. Lower rooms give worse feedback. We really need to educate people on how to use feedback forms and feed to the next worlds.

Equity: There was a motion passed at the equity forum that I originally wanted to mention during the equity report but I will say it now. The equity forum passed a motion that recognized the way Koc worlds rotated adjudicators were significantly different and more diverse and the equity forum appreciates the system. We hope that Koc can pass it on in the future.

Can: It was also due to many independent judges who joined us. You can see from the long list of judges that they helped us. We really felt it worked. We think Botswana should also do it.

Jamaica: I want to suggest that it would be useful to have adjudicator briefings before every round to deal with general matters from feedback forms.

Can: It is better to be personal. Due to wanting people to get out quickly and keep on time, giving general comments may not be too useful. Logan can decide on it. However, we did make an effort to remind judges on certain things.

Scotland: When will you release speaker scores?

Can: We don't want an outbreak. We want to check the entire tab to ensure that all issues are resolved first.

Korea: How many teams on 18 points broke?

Can: Can we come back with the info later? I would like to state that we should always decide based on reliable information.

Motion to accept report by USA and seconded by Russia.

Motion passed.

Chair thanks the organizers and the DCAs.

Moves to Botswana bid defence.

Justice: University management will speak.

Uni management: We will show that the university is proud to host Worlds and have finalized hotels and the venue. We hope to be ready to welcome you.

Justice: It has been a great tournament and we have learned a lot. It is going to be a great experience. The opportunity of organizing worlds will help the countries. We have run a schools tournament and universities tournament to test the tab. On Botswana, we will try our best to help the disabled and getting coaches. It is not hard to get to Botswana. There are flights from Kenya and Nairobi especially due to World Cup. We have also looked into visas. We will provide buses and it will be more like a scenic travel. The university has offered numerous centres so that we can spend time on important things. There will be internet and a swimming pool. We are not like Assumption University but we do have the usual amenities. We also have the cheapest registration in recent times, 350 USD. It shouldn't increase unless it is to fly in experienced adjudicators into the tournament. If not, we are very committed to keeping it at 350 USD. Registration can be paid through wire, credit card, etc. On adjudication, we have announced the team as well as the local CA, Pearl. We need to also develop the local pool. Many people have agreed to pay for themselves and will provide training. In conclusion, we have lots of support and in the document, the budget is there. The budget is very dependent on rego. Want to give a truly African experience especially with the people of Africa. Thanks to Logan for helping so much. Hope to learn from previous hosts more.

Ireland: Three questions. How often are the buses?

Justice: As often necessary.

Ireland: How many judges? Last year you answered there is no real pool of local judges and feel that it will be expensive as it will take a lot of money to bring judges in.

Logan: There is a local pool and regional pool. We have discussed with the South African pool and will subsidize their fees. It will take two or three months to raise funds, if not, we will increase rego for bringing in more judges.

Ireland: How many so that to guarantee good judges?

Logan: Will try to incentivise people to come through lowering fees.

Ireland: It is a 90 room tournament and we are talking about 40 adjudication taking place. There is a big problem with that.

Logan: We are quite confident we can get many adjudicators to come. If people feel its something we should do to increase costs, we will.

Justice: Will bring experienced judges.

Ireland: Will the costs be going more to region as most other people will be more expensive?

IONA: On meeting earlier on, rego needs to be earlier. We suggest way earlier due to flights. Costs are high so should have it earlier. Justice pointed out N-1 rule. There will be some institutions that want to send so many adjudicators but not again. It is essential that the best people should be sent to worlds as it will not contribute to the quality of adjudication. I don't think we should bind Botswana to raise costs but Council should state that they want higher costs just to increase the quality of the adjudication pool. A motion should be made to increase the adjudication pool.

N. Zealand: On sponsors, how many and how much?

Justice: No promise of financial assistance but some of them have already sponsored.

England: Should think about increasing the budget to get good judges. People agree that we would trade socials for better chairs. Maybe should make a deal with certain institutions where if they're willing to bring more judges, you can get lower rego. To be fair, a local judging pool will affect the number of chairs at Worlds.

China: Thank you for the presentation. How is the African debating development? On bringing judges, from which region?

Justice: We have hosted a few championships. The Schools and Universities. Kenya, Nigeria will host these future tournaments. Would like to explore ways to get experienced chairs.

Netherlands: Point already raised but would like to move the motion.

USA: It is the sense of Worlds Council that Botswana Worlds should raise rego fees up to a hundred USD and use the extra money exclusively for paying the expenses of qualified judges.

Chair moves to debate. Any oppositions?

Venezuela: rather than exclusively but to add to help countries that financially need help.

Registrar: Asking for amendment.

USA: Don't accept amendment.

Ireland: Against amendment. Support Judges but not for helping countries with external issues and feel that it is a different issue.

Chair goes back to original motion.

Asia: This Worlds should be about Africa coming to Worlds. It is a problem if rego is high.

Justice: 350 is too expensive already for Africa.

England moves to vote on motion and seconded by Ireland.

Motion passes by majority.

Back to main discussion.

Croatia: what type of rego system used?

Logan: Will probably use the same system as Koc and try to fix the problems. Want to also take into consideration on Can's proposals.

Netherlands: Institutions can register as many as you like but limited to the three team cap.

Logan: We'll move down the list. If five teams are registered, three teams are taken in and two go to waiting list.

USA: Have you negotiated with airlines?

Justice: Have talked to some airways. Not finalized. Can provide coaches and domestic flights but harder for international flights.

S. Africa: Better to not fly with S. Africa airlines. Due to World Cup, quite expensive now. Try other airlines.

Singapore: Want clarification. Phase one as many as possible. Phase two maximum of three. If everyone's rushing how do you know the order.

Logan: After phase one, you will be informed the number and then you pay accordingly. Then when some teams don't pay for some, they will be dropped and we go down the waiting list.

Singapore: Register

Logan: Know the maximum that wants to be sent and sort the waiting list.

India: We received suggestion from England about helping to get judges but before looking into extra judges, institutions should try sending the experienced judges under N-1 first.

Greece: The waiting list

Jamaica: Still not clear on Phase One. Is there a possibility of being told in the first 90 seconds that you're on the waiting list.

Logan: Given there're no alternate and guidance on rego process, we would probably be consistent with first come first served but at least enough to accommodate one per institution as well as teams from certain regions. Cannot change the rush unless there is a different proposal.

Jamaica: Feel that they should pay rather than just naming who they want.

Logan: We do require deposits. It worked in Vancouver as well.

Russia: Will you be able to announce the exact dates and how to announce.

Logan: We're holding back to confirm final dates of payments so that we know when we need to pay. Will confirm in February.

England moves to vote to confirm Botswana and seconded by USA.

Motion passed.

Move to bid for Worlds 2012. 2 universities. Will toss a coin to see who presents first. 15 minutes. 10 minutes for Q&A. Then adjourn to discuss.

Hart house: Jason Rogers: No powerpoints. Introduce everyone. Jason Rogers CA. Monica Ferris Co-convenor. Micheal Internal director and Co-convenor. Steve is treasurer. Karen is funds. Hart Institution has paid membership of 200 ppl. So many looking forward to hosting Worlds.

On adjudicator issues first, then to the tournament itself.

Adj issues: 4 DCAs, Oceania, Asia, Europe, underrepresented region. Expect feedback from Council on adjudicators and policies. Want to grow as a bid. Strong local judging pool (very experienced and successful people from the circuit). The list given is not the one we are spending on. It's the list of those coming for free. Some thought it was the ones paid for. Want to avoid inaccuracies that we have not decided on who gets funding to bring people in. Want to appoint to ensure that it is very representative. Even if there are any unexpected costs, the named pool will be there irregardless of costs. We'd like to fund at least 30 adjudicators. We can also try convincing for free. 40000 euro budget for finding adjudicators. On ESL/EFL issues we want to get it right. N American community has a small amount of ESL debaters. The DCA policy is not enough to represent ESL/EFL. We're committed to making links to regional representatives to find out which judges should be funded to ensure best representation. We recognize the pool is very anglo centric and that's why we have the funds to find more representative judges. Would welcome any recommendations especially on ensuring ESL/EFL events are not hidden for everyone to watch. A strong judging pool will allow us to have a good rotation system like Koc. Lastly, would like to make a plea about rotation. Since Stellenbosch, it's been in Asia and Europe, once in N America. N America has problems to get votes. Vancouver helped N America a lot and has a commitment to grow the region. Want to make it as good as possible.

On how the tournament is run. Hart House is within Toronto where there is a lot of support from Hart house community, university and fully paid staff to run the tournament. Have rooms for debates

and all rooms are within 5 minutes. Hart house has experience in running events. Have good venues for finals. Have nice natural wonders of the world. Skiing, shopping. Toronto is 50 percent born outside of Canada. Food is really good and a lot of options especially to provide for kosher and halal. Very easy to travel around America after. The hotel is where the queen resides when coming to Toronto, 5 stars. Really fantastic rooms. Subway in basement and three minutes per stop. Provide passes to travel around the city. Socials: largest club in N. America. Great venue with lots of space.

If need more time, propose for more time.

Russia: Booze being available for under 19s. Will it violate laws?

Canada: Have to have wristbands. Never gotten in the way of underagers to drink alcohol. Underage drinking has been there for awhile and no issue with alcohol. Zero concern of legal problems and the venues can include everyone.

China: On underrepresented region DCA. ESL/EFL are not the same. What are the criterias? Any policies?

Hart: Recognize ESL/EFL are different. Adjudication team will not get larger to accommodate for all regions. Most worlds will see IoNA, Australian and American and sometimes Asian. Problems with finding people. Don't think geographical would work. Very interested in flying in judges from all regions. We all know its bad if only certain judges are there.

Germany: Committed to better connections. What are the ideas?

Hart: Let's go to European tournaments and forge relationships with more regions to be able to identify the judges that we need to fly in for tournament.

Israel: Is it possible to walk?

Hart: 30 minute walk. Don't know if it's good in winter. Its 8 minutes to Ga. Because of Sabbath, need to walk. We understand. Well try our best to accommodate the Jewish community. Toronto's not that cold.

Croatia: Are we going to share a bed with teammate?

Hart: It's double rooming.

Australia: Would you bid next year if unsuccessful?

Hart: Don't actually know. Bid will look different. Canada avoided recession.

Ukraine: How will it avoid the time?

Hart: Shouldn't be an issue to increase another 1000 people. No need to wait for buses as there is 24 hour public transportation. Campus is in downtown Toronto so will be fun.

Venezuela: How about visas to go to Canada? Need to fly through any countries? What about drinking age?

Hart: Visas. The staff will work out visa concerns. On US issue, there are direct flights to Toronto. On drinking, there are 18 years old, its covered. On coldness, can avoid cold with transport and clothes.

Ireland propose to extend and seconded by Israel.

5 minute extension.

Indonesia: On accommodation, one hotel?

Hart: Yes and free ballroom.

Asia: How would hart worlds help Asia and Africa to go to Toronto easily. Monash found embassies to help us.

Hart: Very devoted to accessibility. If not, we can't run it. We run down the costs of Toronto, very committed to bring it down. With more sponsorship, we will bring it down. All foods covered, not like Vancouver. Alcohol can be given out freely in Canada. Will have free or subsidized. Passes will reduce costs and Toronto can be enjoyed by everyone from cheap to expensive. It is within walking distance. We self fund a lot and want to bring it down.

Equity: Is it ok to have two venues for events. In Vancouver, we were told that tickets for one venue is finished but then only certain countries were in venue B. a bit of a worry.

Hart: I couldn't find anyone myself that night. Toronto has big venues that can fit everyone. Will promise at least literally connected. We have largest club in N. America so should not be an issue.

Canada: How awesome are you?

Hart: Don't know compared to Auckland A.

Move to De La Salle.

DLS: Our pleasure to present the bid. Professional, quality. Two full time staff to run the worlds. Will coordinate with 14 students and a lot of volunteers that will help out. Brought administrator along.

Adm: On behalf of DLS, request that seriously consider it as have talked about it for 2 years. Already part of centenary celebration. Am here to observe and learn. Would like to offer Philippino hospitality. Promise you can celebrate a real christmas as well as warm weather and warm smiles. Please let manila host it.

Sam: Want to add thanks for considering. Would mean a huge amount just to be considered. Want to point out that two full time staff have committed for two years to ensure a well run tournament. Tournament is underwritten by uni and can guarantee costs. Bidding when scarcity of rego issues. That's why we increased to 400. Think that we can guarantee 400 team worlds. Not only 22000 euros for travel alone, 66 free rego costs secured. This is guaranteed. Am able to bring 66 top judges. Make sure it doesn't shut out n-1 judges from breaking. Everyone will be treated fairly. Will ensure regionally represented. There is also language representation which is also because they're good judges. Want this opportunity to develop judging. Am bringing in most comprehensive judging program to help. Will create videos and structuring those into seminars. At suggestions, we would love to get feedback as well as advice on the vocabulary to use to give adjudication to teams. It

damages feedback when making a call. Will follow up program after worlds to ensure people can use it as a launchpad for the region. Will have Oceania, Asia, Europe, America. DCAs also to go and find out the quality of adjudication circuit in home country. Co-CAs will help out as well. On language, we guarantee that there will be an ESL/EFL DCA. No problem in having them. We want them since we recognize that not all DCAs can see the point of view of ESL/EFL. They won't only be ESL/EFL rep but also because they have the quality of judging as well. We have made effort from the start to prove that we are ready. We see that there were non native speakers but we chose them because they're good judges. Will not be able to tell the venues yet. Applaud that its called the open break rather than main break. Don't think ESL/EFL are not a minority and also a majority at times. Will give equal right to everyone. It is part of centennial celebration which is why we can underwrite the costs. Aside from adjudication, we have 9 social events and all venues will be unique. At these events, all alcoholic and non alcoholic drinks will be free. We know Worlds is your holiday, that's why you can afford to stay in manila to improve your experience in manila. Would like to invite Ian to project the importance of it.

Ian: I feel that it is something I can speak to. The changes brought about by worlds cannot be seen. The debaters currently debating didn't even see the impact of Worlds. Worlds has grown dramatically since 1992. Asian community used to be one table. Great to see the development especially the impact. Its televised now and it's a huge event. They don't know who the president is yet but the new one will be there like the last manila Worlds. They're very receptive to advice and really hope you consider the bid.

Q&A

USA: A number of countries have travel advisories. Some are different. There are universities that explicitly stop institutions. Have you quantified who cannot come?

DLS: We've made security preparations. The campus has perimeter security and entry only with invite. Once, the president didn't get invited and got turned away. Don't want to mislead. There may be some that cannot come. We'll seek to resolve that. We have a huge number of people to help out especially about assurance of security. It is usually based on a different island, and any problems we have two years to resolve the issues. This event also has high school students so in terms of security, wouldn't be a problem.

Aus: Will you bid again?

DLS: Im sure they'll come back again if failure but must realize that the basis of the outstanding support is due to the centennial celebration. I don't know how to justify to university again after this but maybe they would.

Equity: We have seen some Phillippinnes universities that have dropped out recently. Will they come back?

DLS: Worlds has become less accessible. We want to bring it to help them come back.

Ian: Some of those universities were quarterfinalists but cannot come due to accessibility.

Sam: The team cap is to ensure that more people can come.

Germany: Are we going to be bussed around? Concern with traffic and some buses are at 2am.

DLS: In terms of journey, it'll be 15 minutes. There may be issues with traffic but; it is holiday time so little traffic, we can sort out traffic clearance, significant events gives us standard to solve it. May be a bad traffic day but the worse situation is 30 minutes. There will be early buses. We also want to try to follow Koc to accommodate for time. Can leave when they want to.

Israel: On prelims on Saturday, doesn't seem like we can walk.

DLS: Most probably prices can be brought down. Well try to find a hotel that is most feasible. There are 5 5star hotels. On that concern, well give greater consideration to closer hotels.

Israel: If its far, would you walk with us?

DLS: Absolutely.

China: Is there anything youre planning to do for local communities.

DLS: Regional programme. Its for the whole region. No problem of making material more accessible. We would also love to be around the Asians circuit. Would have to develop those circuits. We'll look into other sources of funding to reduce costs. We're mindful on the spending.

Indonesia: Schedule sees round one on day 8.

DLS: It's just a mistake. Well follow the standard schedule.

Netherlands: How are you going to accommodate for kosher food? What about rego fees since its expensive?

DLS: I understand about dietary requirements. Well provide all specific requirements. Well do everything we can. We're also committed to Halal and Kosher requirements especially about quality. On registration process, will make it as early as possible. We know that there are those with problems of finding flights. We won't demand money 6 months before. Well have plenty of time.

Chair: Any further questions can be forwarded straight to bids. Will adjourn for lunch. Go and discuss and well readjourn at 2.45pm. Please come back asap.

Meeting adjourned.

Meeting readjourned and called to order at 2.46pm.

Roll Call: Registrar.

Move to vote for 2012 hosts. Registrar explains voting process. Registrar reminds delegates the number of votes according to status.

If voting is secret, requires a motion.

Russia proposed secret ballot and seconded by Indonesia.

Ireland: Easiest and fairest with secret ballot.

Derek: Should not be secret as they represent nations and to ensure transparency, cannot have secret.

England: Agreed. Secret ballot would not allow accountability.

USA: Would like to offer an amendment to the system. Would like to amend where balloting is by paper silently and results are read out.

Russia: Clarify.

USA: Will be read publicly after voted.

Ian: That's status quo. We came up with it after Toronto Worlds.

USA: It was roll call.

Steven: Yes.

Russia: Secret voting means on paper and then is read out according to country.

Steven: Will collect, read and no pressure when voting. Will Russia accept?

Russia: Yes.

England: I remember Thailand was a vocal system.

Ian: You remembered wrong.

Eng: It doesn't matter.

Registrar: Will do paper balloting and it will be known who voted where.

Seconded by Ireland.

De La Salle University wins the vote 72-28 to Hart House.

Chair moves agenda to new business.

Ireland: Something should be said about the way bids were done. A lot of snide and bitching has happened especially with snide references. In the future, please consult on bidding as it is shameful to see the way the bids have been done. It was shameful.

England: Would like to suggest the actual bidding process should be in pre-council as it would make it shorter. Especially since the moment it is brought to Council, the decision has been made. Would like bidding to be at pre-council. Unsure if it's a constitutional amendment.

Sam and Jason: Agree that there has been a lot of snide remarks. Would like a change in the future

Registrar: Constitution only states there has to be two meetings.

Oceania: Forwards break expansion.

Venezuela: Would like to amend constitution on article 28.

Jens: ESL/EFL reform as a topic.

IONA: Would like to raise discussion that different bids are pressured to list judges in advance. But this affects finding out who good judges are now rather than two years later. Would like to order that bids do not mention who adjudication core will be.

Korea: Would like to discuss on how worlds has become very posh and high rego costs. Thought it'd be good to discuss.

Chair closes the forwarding of agenda.

Will discuss on bidding and adjudication core announcement, break expansion,

First agenda. Moving bidding to pre-council. England presented motion and seconded by USA: council recommends that at all future worlds, bids for hosting are presented at pre-council rather than council but voting will be done at council.

Russia: Pre-council doesn't usually have all countries. And just voting at council and no questions is bad as they want to collect feedback and improve at the next meeting. Would like full participation.

Oceania: On timing, we start late on discussion of issues but always curtailed because too late. Unhappy that discussion than occurs later. Its better for council to have more time.

Russia: All issues are important so we have to allocate time for it.

England: Am concerned people don't turn up at pre-council. Its better to be pre-council and move to vote.

Ireland moves and seconded by Canada.

Motion passed.

Derek: Think that amendment to article 15, section 7. No bid shall offer funding to any adjudicators prior to winning the bid. Those adjudicators who are fulfilling roles on the organising committee. Or adjudication team are excluded from this.

The article is not intended to preclude the adjudication team.

Proposed by England and seconded by Scotland.

Oceania: Cannot offer funding to named adjudicators. It is fair to announce number of adjudicators.

(any named adjudicators)

USA calls and seconded by Canada.

Motion stands.

Chair moves to break expansion. Sam, Ips and Jonathan shall begin.

Sam: There's been discussion about break expansion. This is the only proposal. The discussion will be, the appropriate structure should be about whether there needs to be changes to status quo at all. If

yes, then either enlarging break or more preliminary rounds. If we enlarge break, there are some models that can be done and will be discussed later. Propose based on ideas put forward by Malaysia, reasons of changes. England will put forward why not to.

Malaysia: Major arguments: The number of teams participating has increased. Its only 7% of the tab that breaks. Second, a lot of teams benefit for breaking. Recognize that some teams at 16 are also good. Adjudication pool is also imperfect but due to inability to break cannot see them. Lastly, diversity. The brinks are usually diverse institutions, and a glass ceiling exists. We recognize historical significance but times have changed. On diluting of adjudication pool, a hundred adjudicators were broken at Koc, so it can work. There were discussions that consecutive 2nds should be enough to break. Want to discuss first to expand or not.

England: On concerns: This is not a definitive debate, don't have to solve it now, on voting to change or not, there should be a two thirds majority to change first before we can change. We think it is unclear that expansion of tournament doesn't mean more teams are competing for main break. It is still the same teams that compete to break. Some of the most successful teams used to send more teams but now, due to cap, there are less of these teams around. There are also concerns about matter. It is a break of the last few years. Concern about meaning of break. Motivations not because of fairness. Judging will be more improved with more rounds. Not all hosts can change breaks every year. Reduce quality of ESL/EFL break as this excludes them from ESL/EFL. Bearing in mind that there will be a reduction of the judge pool. That list is not exhaustive.

Registrar clarifies that a two thirds vote is needed only if substantive difference in constitution.

Oceania: even if, two thirds is there. Majority doesn't guarantee it will be passed, will have to look into exploring the higher number of possible options even if needing two thirds. On expanding, it is on the maths and whether breaks are accurate or more arbitrary. There is also constitution requirement that worlds lasts in 10 days.

Netherlands: Not in interests as the quality of ESL/EFL will be affected as in increasing rounds, more days have to be increased. Don't think it's a good idea.

Can: To point out that it is physically unable to find sufficient space for 12 rooms to accommodate every one. Am totally against it principally. Extra time needed is bad already. 4+3+2. 9 rounds. Wanting ESL/EFL to be separate from open break as well. It'll be very costly to add another day. Or debate on 28th. Everyone's christmas is affected. Have to do a lot of things on the 28th. Could already affect Worlds. If only in personal interests, have to look into it. Should also consider to how organizers respond when to finish and start.

England: If two thirds of committee isn't agreeing generally, discussion should be in sub committee as two thirds majority will never get.

Asia: On future, so many good teams that could be in break are not there. Why are they not allowed breaking. On list of 18 teams, need further information.

Canada: When people talk about past tournaments, meaning to break is different. The status and meaning is different.

Scotland: Don't think the problem is there. Getting seconds doesn't mean its enough to break. You have to be very good to break and also unreasonable just because some nationalities cannot break, they should expand. It should be about who managed to do it, not need.

N America: Before you listen, there are a variety of proposals, increase in rounds, elimination rounds, etc. Want to hear first.

S Africa: General comments. There are two conceptions. Firstly, break is a selection mechanism to find top teams. Second, break is to recognize performance. If add rounds, its only for selection. If to improve to recognize more people, the seconds. Round robin would be good to find all the good teams. But in this tournament, need to recognize the level of achievement. Need to establish the principle that break is to find top teams. Than only can we look into the proposals.

Logan: Strongly agree. I think number 32 was arbitrary. It should be consistently arbitrary about how many teams should graduate to a higher level of tournament. Teams have always challenged the main break. Not about quality as it is arbitrary. Almost 45 teams were on 18 points. These teams won almost every round. Top half of every round. Essentially, the number did not represent. That number is corrupt as well.

Singapore: Got number of 18 and also look at the countries to ensure where countries came from.

Tate: I have that information.

Proceeds to read the teams. 33-46 on 18 and 47-74 on 17. 11 teams on 18 didn't break at Koc worlds.

Ireland: 32 is not arbitrary. It goes down to 1. Its fair. Unless you go to 64, then you go to including people who didn't get seconds. Either you break top 16 only. Some on 20 points also have to go into double octos. They've done enough to get to octos but suddenly have to fight further.

Chair: Suggestion to limit comments to a minute. Many proposals will be put forward. Still discussing on expansion.

Israel: Would like to remind that after going to EPL, you cannot go back to ESL. If so, ESL community have to become EPL forever but at the same time may not be of equal strength in the future.

Germany: Not about specific proposals. I think the arguments are about to break. I think there is a building on. Do we want to burden the host further or not. It would be stupid if it is impossible to implement in the end. Should give organizers a break.

Tate: Can ask Botswana. They don't feel its impossible. About 32, we don't shrink the break when there were less teams. On ESL, Im sure there are other ways to solve the problem. ESL can opt out.

India: I think it would be a disservice if they're kept in ESL beak. Just because 250 teams added doesn't change the break is not true. Many of the teams have been improving, they have become better.

USA: Propose whether there is enough support to move on or not. I call to question on whether council wants to continue or not.

Seconded by Canada.

Oceania: I think we can vote to whether we want to look to change or not.

Motion passed to stop discussion.

Oceania: Guess it ends. I propose that future of the Worlds discussion should see further discussion be done in email rather than in council.

Korea: How were the votes counted, one per country or according to weightage?

England: Would like to reiterate that even if a majority was there, it wasn't two thirds.

Derek: I think that if majority wants a discussion, there should be.

USA: Clarification. Are each member single or more?

Registrar: Roll call vote to continue discussion or to stop discussion.

44 for and 55 no. Motion failed to continue discussion.

Oceania: The vote seems to feel like more discussion should be done and propose later a working committee.

S. Africa: There seemed to be some anger as there has been discussions outside worlds. There seems to be a silent majority that doesn't want to talk about it.

England: I think that was a mischaracterization but that the discussion is to be stopped at Council. I don't think it is a silent majority as it implies that they're not clear. They are clear that they are opposed.

Scotland: Many countries came but not knowing we're going to discuss this. Should email this to all institutions. There are mailing lists and can be found. Make an active effort to email everyone as it was a problem.

Europe: Last council saw that we have moved things to public areas and many ways to follow up. Better to go through posting on the web.

Chair moves on the agenda.

Venezuela: Motion to modify article 28 so that Latin America can be added as a new addition.

Seconded by Peru.

IONA: Last time was discussed, two proposals. There was a reason to argue that Caribbean region should be separate. There was then a request that it may sound oppressive. Was asked to create a separate region. There needs to be a major need and a big body to justify. It is if Latin America increases, it would be justified but if not, a seat would not be comparable to other seats. Even though its based on geography, there needs to be a reasonably sized body to put it in. If yes, then a lot of breaking of regions has to be done.

Caribbean: I see the issue. There are two distinct communities but needs to develop the community. From Caribbean, where there is diversity and language as compared to Latin America where language is different, need to distinguish.

S. Africa: There shouldn't have been Africa. We and Botswana agree. European perspective is quite different. We develop own things back home rather than overplay at council.

USA: Latin America is not really a geographical region.

Canada: Europe and Middle East are also distinct but one region. Region representative just presumes need for a region.

England: I'm sympathetic but there are good arguments. I do think adding another voice on council just makes it longer and bigger. By looking at the list, Latin America has 5 but N America has 49. Need to have a sense of how many people can you represent as a region. It will be difficult to justify when looking at other regions.

Equity: I see the points about development. To my knowledge, there are regional tournaments in Spanish but not necessarily in English. As long as they have interest to represent at Council, then just give them a voice. It's not number of countries or institutions but region.

Venezuela: I understand what Equity has stated. I agree that we have a small representation but we have started debating. But we are struggling hard and we have commitment to try to bring more people here as English is ESL. In order to encourage, important that Council recognize that there is a distinction. It is also that Constitution is not supposed to be changed easily and it makes no sense. If you agree, it is a matter of interest just to recognize that there is a different jurisdiction.

England: Propose motion and seconded by USA.

Motion to modify article 28.2 of the constitution so that Latin America, which is a completely different region, can be added as a new jurisdiction. This implies modifying 28.2.2 to leave the Caribbean alone and adding Latin America as 28.2.8

Motion failed.

Move to ESL/EFL motion.

Jens: Would like to move constitutional reform to get clearer criteria on ESL/EFL. Between 27th and 30th December we had interviews and 60-70% we followed up on ESL/EFL and have upheld 30%. I apologize if any misplacings occurred. On numbers, we have 104 ESL speakers, 104 EFL speakers and 23 EPL speakers. A total of 44 EFL teams and 47 ESL teams. A lot of ESL speakers debate with EPL teams so they are classified as ESL.

Korea: Any language review should look

Jens: Was approached by Can Okar late and due to experience, I was appointed. Gotten officers from many regions and have tried to get equitable representation.

Korea: Was there an equitable distribution such as Asian officers as they felt may be more comfortable talking to them.

Jens: TJ, Loke, Sayeqa were on the team. Sharmila couldn't make it. We tried. It shouldn't matter as if there is a review, you will be represented. We also want an across the board ruling and not just someone who does not have an idea of what is happening. I apologize if there were anyone who were uncomfortable.

Chair thanks Jens.

N Zealand: I'd like to ask Council to recognize the work that has been done by the committee.

Applauses.

Jens: The proposal will make the process easier and better understandable. 70 people had to go through and cannot go for lunch break just to hear interviews and some did not have time to come for the interview. People may be uncomfortable but we always blame council and we'd like to propose change. We'd like to pass information to next council and cannot just hand over to next committee due to confidentiality. We'd like to pass a recommendation to allow information to be passed. We recognize that those familiar with the process were helpful but those who were not aware, they did not get enough questions as a lot of questions needed to be asked to get the answer. I ask country representatives to tell delegates to have the information to pass to us to make everyone's life easier. Would like to talk about criteria reform but not appropriate here. Now would like to propose a reform. Please read the criterias so that we can change anything that wants to be changed.

Chair adjourns at 4.45pm for a 15 minute break.

Chair calls meeting to order at 5 pm

Jens: The comments I've received are three problems and one typo. The typo is number six, a consistent classification, not division. The problems are; the criteria of substantial exposure to English, anyone not EFL anymore should not be considered, it is open to interpretation. We agree they should not be disqualified on FB and, etc, even if they have made a decision that they are no longer EFL. Hopefully you agree that we keep the criteria in there and change it next year if it doesn't work out. Through interview, we can get more information and get more refined criteria to define. On representation of officers, it doesn't change proposal from constitution now. Committee chooses people unofficially. Council should choose language officer so that its more long term and transparent. Everyone should agree it should be done in a certain way and allow one year to then discuss and ask the questions. Thirdly, on article 31.4.E, in Worlds, people should not be EFL if they have been there for 12 months learning in English, etc. because they are no longer disadvantaged. This may be misunderstood as they have classes for half a year. It's not supposed to sound that way. If council finds it contentious, we can drop it.

Russia: Generally to point 4. The number of criteria, reducing length of exposure. Problem of setting exact number, if more than 12 months as a language, etc. How about start at school for six years, may change. Is it up to discretion of committee to decide and secondly, there is a worldwide level of standards in the world.

Jens: Firstly, it is very dangerous to go back to positive criteria. People will complain as it is not about quality of speaking but chance of learning. They feel there is barrier to learn. Not to change status

quo. Just the proposal. Then next year we can come back and decide if its too hard or not. Cannot reasonably test. There may be ridiculous situations, like last year, there were extremes. Hard cases can be dealt with with appeal. With number five, then we can solve the issuee.

Russia: Not saying assess quality of spoken but exposure. You have discretion to decide quality of english. First year is different according to what is learned. Just adding point 5.

Jens: Committee shall have discretion to look into quality of exposure specifically A and B. Will be put into proposal.

Slovenia: Agree but article 31, the purpose is to recognize that ESL/EFL have faced hardship and have to put in extra effort to learn english. I am technically EFL, but the committee doesn't feel I should apply for status as they feel that my English is good enough. It seems like you should only apply EFL if you are really bad.

Jens: If its up to me, I'd abolish EFL but since Vancouver, people have tried to be in EFL. Reason for EFL is not to give another chance to break but to recognize the hardships. As long as you qualify its okay, we believe that they should have incentive to classify themselves of which level they deserve.

Slovenia: If that's true than why do you pose the question about the hardship to put extra effort and money.

Jens: The lower right corner are things that are not asked about but Council decided that ESL speakers partners should be in the tab as well. Will have the discussion again next year.

Russia: I used to champion EFL. Felt that ESL category had English as an official language for some institutions and was disadvantageous to some countries that have no exposure. This problem is solved as these people are no longer EFL. The advantage is catered under criteria. Have to look into the criteria especially the purpose of the creation. Some things change and have to look at new meanings.

Oceania: When we passed the regulations, it was the purpose that the opportunity made available to learn is the basis to classify. EFL indicates that there are different ways to access English like either you learn English or encounter it as foreign. The reason there's no IELTS because we don't want to impede ability of people who have by their own efforts to take themselves out of the category. There are a number of competitors coming to compete in categories that they feel they are entitled.

Peru: I think the 5 years is a good reference but should not be a definite number and the committee should decide the worth of it.

Germany: I don't think the discussion is going on the right path. It should be about the proposal. Have to ask back whether there's anything in the proposal that needs to be taken out or additions just to keep to topic.

Canada moves to vote and seconded by USA.

China: Any changes to item 4E?

Jens: No. If youre still not happy, well drop it.

China: I represent a young community and we think that article 31, this would exclude all Chinese debaters as it is becoming a phenomenon of studying compulsory subjects in English for six months which will classify them as ESL. The circumstance should be on learning.

Jens: Is English the effective language of instruction?

China: We don't think this significantly make them an ESL speaker. Want to make amendments to the constitution and proposal.

England: Can I suggest calling the motion to a vote. I know there are small changes and reform can be done next year. Committee has discretions to change. This committee is to avoid this discussion. Are we trusting this committee or abolish it. We should trust the committee and move on.

Russia: I agree on principle and only a minute change and better than bringing it next year.

England: Do we have other issues?

Chair: One more on world reform.

Moves to world reform while the committee sorts itself out.

Korea: Costs getting higher and no support to come. It is difficult to fly without support. Is there a way to cap the fee with a curve to make it more accessible rather than elitist?

Ireland: There's no way to do this. We believe in the hosts to host and the Council decides through voting. You cannot impose on hosts. Everyone has cost issues but would bear the costs because they won the bid.

S. Africa: Agree that we shouldn't define but tendency is to increase costs. We made sure the extras are from sponsorships but not from rego. We don't have a bidding war.

England: I agree that we should indicate to potential bidders that they should bid cheaper tournaments especially in the future. However binding them is wrong as we want to be presented with all options.

Move to vote to move on and seconded by Netherlands.

Motion stands.

Move back to ESL/EFL reforms.

Have a new final wording and requires trust that we come back to it next year. Specific area that marks somebody as ESL/EFL, we need to revise the whole issue despite changes. On article 22 at the beginning on how language committee is set up has to be by council and not organizers. We agree there's a problem, well put it in the constitution next year. Jens outlines the motion. Article 31, number 4E will be dropped for now. Number 5 is changed to Article 31 number 6, a consistent.... Article 22 will stay as proposed.

NEW Art. 31 and Art. 22 (8) WUDC, as decided on Jan 1st 2010.

Art. 31 WUDC

1. The purpose of the English as a Second Language and English as a Foreign Language classifications is to recognize the achievement of speakers and teams in overcoming the inevitable burden of debating in a language that is not their own. The purpose of the English as a Foreign Language classification is to recognize the specific burden of speakers that have little or no exposure to English in their daily lives.
2. The Language Review Officers shall evaluate the inevitable burden of a speaker both with regard to the amount of previous exposure to spoken English, as well as the level of complexity of said exposure.
3. Speakers are expected not to be suffering a sufficiently significant disadvantage to qualify as ESL or EFL when they:
 - a. Have spoken English for more than five years as a primary language in their home or social circle, or
 - b. Have spent more than five years when of school age or above in a country where English is the primary medium of exchange, or
 - c. Have spent more than five years enrolled in an educational program where English is the effective medium of instruction in a non-native English environment, or the English language is the subject of instruction, or
 - d. Have worked for more than five years in a workplace where English is the effective medium of exchange.
 - e. The cumulative period of time under which at least one of conditions (b) to (d) is fulfilled may not exceed five years.
 - f. Time shall be halved for education in a native English environment.
4. Speakers are expected not to be suffering a sufficiently significant disadvantage to qualify as EFL when they:
 - a. Have spoken a substantial amount of English in their home or social circle, or
 - b. Have spent more than three contiguous months when of school age or above in a countries where English is the primary medium of exchange, or more than 18 months in countries where English is an official language,
 - d. Have spent more than six months at an institution where English is the primary medium of instruction for subjects other than English.
5. The committee shall have discretion in evaluating speakers towards the quality of their exposure, specifically:
 - a. the content, structure, and quality of English used for the instruction that speakers are enrolled for.
 - b. the persons instructing the speakers.
6. A consistent classification of speakers should be maintained across the competition.

Art. 22 (8) WUDC

8. Determination of Language Status
 - a. Before each Championships, the Organisational Committee of the Championships shall appoint a committee of Language Review Officers (the Language Review Committee) to assist in the determination of language status of participants.
 - b. The Language Review Officers shall be appointed with regard to experience with the issue and equitable geographical distribution.
 - c. Before and during the preliminary rounds of the Championships, the Language Review Officers shall gather information about and shall interview participants claiming ESL or EFL status, to determine if they meet the requirements of Article 31.
 - d. A list of all teams and speakers with ESL or EFL status shall be published before the announcement of the teams qualifying for the elimination rounds with at least enough time for the procedure outlined under Part f. to complete.
 - e. Participants' status may be awarded without interview if at least two Language Review Officers agree.

- f. Any participant who believes their status has been determined incorrectly shall have the right to appeal to the full Language Review Committee, whose decision shall be final.
- g. No team shall have ESL status unless both its participants have ESL or EFL status. No team shall have EFL status unless both its participants have EFL status.
- i. Speakers may be awarded their status for future championships, if a change in status is not expected.
- j. Unless the criteria change, participants cannot re-apply for a language category that they have been ultimately denied at previous championships.
- k. Records must be kept by the Registrar of all decisions including reasons. A waiver of confidentiality of applicants must be obtained.

Registrar: We can move to debate.

England moves to accept the proposition, seconded by Ireland.

Motion stands.

S. Africa: Feels a need to have a forum where everyone actually knows about them. So that there would be real debate and negotiations.

England: We don't need to do anything but feel that ESL/EFL should have a forum in the future.

End of new business.

Chair begins her report.

Chair: Previous chair, Neil couldn't come due to personal reasons. Had option to come or not and made option to come due to responsibility and felt there were contributions that could be made. I took a bus down which took 12 hours. That in itself is a valuable experience. Past three weeks managed to run WUPID where top 30 teams from the Worlds ranking list participated. We are also working towards another debate tournament with the Malaysian Bar Council in the BP format. Also plans for more BP Debate tournaments and academy's around the region. It is a great format. I thank Steven Johnson doing a wonderful job, for guiding me on the technicalities of council. Special thanks to Neill Harvey Smith and Ian Lising for the advice on managing council this year. Thank Secretary Afiq Nasir, for doing a great job by taking on the responsibility on even shorter notice. Council was a challenge; but inadvertently it's important to note that everyone sacrificed New Years to be here, to contribute their ideas and valuable opinions. Thanks everyone.

Registrar: Nothing much in three days.

Secretary: Thanks Chair and everyone for the opportunity.

Chair thanks Masako as well.

Masako: Due to schedule change, had limited time for equity forum. I have issue from two years ago. Have discussed breaking adjudication pool. Pool should also reflect breaking team pool as well as participants. Equity forum appreciates diverse pool. Equity forum notes that Koc took effort to rotate judges around. As ESL/EFL has no time to be discussed, we do appreciate statistics on past to help with ESL/EFL issues. Would like to ask for data from all hosts. Vancouver hasn't given the data.

Women's officer: Women's forum was particularly successful as we can raise issues from several countries. Issues pertaining to adjudication test. Agreed that language was unnecessary and some felt uncomfortable to go through. Agree that the topic is legitimate to promote a debate for hundreds to watch for purpose of ranking. We also agreed there was limited time and debaters so not enough time to accommodate for issues. We're glad Botswana agreed to make efforts to avoid issues in the future to accommodate for many regions and filming many debates so that there're more choices. The second issue is that we're glad Botswana won't make people uncomfortable again. Some were dismayed about dancers at the event. Many left due to feeling uncomfortable and this is perfectly acceptable. Want to acknowledge the speed of dealing with the issue that once complaints were made a sincere apology was made. It was also raised that in 2 to last 3 years there has been women gyrating on stage and also on women's night in Thailand but broadly speaking a similar display. Would like to encourage that, to everyone involved in entertainment, that there are certain parameters that need to be operated within. We have a great variety of cultures and this should be looked into. Wasn't mentioned enough in Thailand. Hope Botswana takes it in. Sad that there was no women's night. I know there were lost council minutes and had to accept that. Now that I have been reelected, am glad to perform the position again and want to help Botswana to hold a women's debate with people from a wide region of the world eventhough not mandated by constitution. No reason to not have it in Botswana. That is all I have to say and that the tournament's been wonderful.

Regional reports.

Asia: Asia's growing rapidly. Many IVs; WUPID, NorthEast Asian Open, Malaysia's GSD, Macau, Singapore Open and Peking Open in Beijing. As we said there are two tournaments but there will be one tournament next year in Thailand and there is a BP tournament in Thailand. Asia should create own regional tournament to be able to practice and recognize Tate, Adiba and Logan for help. South Asia has grown rapidly with Sharmila going to help out. Chinese FLTRP has changed to BP as well. This has more than 152 institutions and seen growth. Steve Johnson went to help the development so please talk to Steve. There's growth in Taiwan, Macau and Hong Kong thanks to Loke Wing Fatt. Indonesia has informed that BINA Nusantara and BINUS are the same in this tournament but have been pointed out that they have different campuses, different programs and cannot transfer or change and different debate clubs. Please recognize them separately in the future. Going to De La Salle and hope for more growth.

N: America: Very alive and well and have 49 institutions enrolled. Reflects diversity in debating occurring and major tournament events. Hart House, Cusid, Yale. Upcoming are N. American debating Championships in Toronto following that is Hobart William Smith Championship and encourage everyone to look into it and many are willing to help to connect with other BP debaters in N. America.

Caribbean: Stands on need for development. We've had challenges since setting up. What we intend to do is, the Barbadians have offered to have a regional championship and would like support for adjudicators. Coming out of Worlds we have solidified and try to expand the region given that we have language barrier. We want both parties to grow equally especially as we both have different needs. Were trying to ensure everyone gets help financially as well. We have identified a couple of areas and will work on it.

IONA: Big events, Worlds, EUDC and Amsterdam Euros. What we're happy is IONA and European community are coming together and a great transfer. There's also good development of debaters. Will see first Spanish team and South American teams. Getting Spain involved will be amazing. WSDC this year saw two key things as there are 50 different countries and Oman and UAE sent teams and it'd be great to have them at WUDC. Having judges from WSDC and encourage them to continue. The circuit has 50 odd tournaments throughout Ireland and Wales. In terms of London tournaments, there are usually second tier tournaments and first tier like Oxford, Cambridge.... No major changes since last year. This report is talking about issues from the region. The members are representing own region. The problem is growing but organizational structures cannot keep up. When issues of expanding and were becoming like the UN and cannot go through. On getting resolution, more cooperation needs to be done. Stop thinking of reform and dedicate time to talk about how we make decisions such as structure of sub committees rather than talk about other issues. We have to talk about role of executives. We don't make use of executive structure in place. They should reach out to regions more and speak to other regions. Don't just come to council and chat. Need to have people who want to push forward issues and its hard to find people. Regional reps need to critically reach out as views and more efforts need to be made to exchange views. Don't take the job if you can't. Thank you.

Europe: I also feel a lot of exchange has happened as IONA IVs allow free IVs from different countries. There's France and Netherlands organizing competitions with Switzerland, Austria, Sweden as well as Ireland and England have seen new institutions. Amsterdam will host EUDC with a team cap of 200. Pertaining to Amsterdam euros, Amsterdam has proposed a system similar to Worlds and it would almost be a lottery. There is a European council and have received a system. May look at the proposal and consider it for future. Because we have so much growth, we're looking at reforming inside Europe to work out the same problem that Worlds has. The continental circuit has seen intermingling. To avoid complacency, we have decided that we want a continental tournament similar to Mace. On accessibility, IONA finds it hard to find out about Worlds. We've made a homepage for Euros council and you may find info on the website. Just took two days to set it up. We have a Facebook group. It's closed. Just apply and well put you in. Many things mirror Worlds and want to use it for euros.

Oceania: to reiterate Derek, lots of discussions curtailed. If we use rest of the year, then council will do more work. On Oceania, N Zealand have hosted a lot of tournaments but won by Vic. Many N Zealand institutions joined in. Easters held in Brisbane won by Sydney. Aussie BP championships won by Sydney. Mini won by composite. Australs hosted in Australia and next year by Auckland. Monash hosted Australs and one of the best and won by monash and thank monash for hosting.

Africa: We have continued to grow over the past few years and have a council. That represents 10 countries with 8 never been to worlds. S.African circuit held a national championship and we're excited about Botswana worlds and hope to see you there.

2011 Executive Committee Elections.

Steven will explain on rules on voting.

Registrar explains the rules.

Chair begins elections.

S Africa nominates Sam Greenland.

England nominates Adiba Shareen from Malaysia.

Adiba declines from running.

Malaysia nominates Chris Bishop from N Zealand.

Chris Bishop declines.

Thailand nominates Jonathan from England.

Jonathan declines.

Botswana nominates Joe from S Africa.

Joe declines.

Malaysia moves to close seconded by Botswana.

USA motions to accept unanimously seconded by Canada.

Council accepts.

Sam Greenland from Australia wins unopposed.

Registrar.

Phillippines nominates Duncan Campbell from Australia.

Thailand nominates Adiba and Adiba declines.

Botswana nominates Joe from South Africa.

Malaysia moves to close seconded by England.

Roll Call vote.

49-48, the registrar is Duncan Campbell of Australia.

Secretary.

Ireland nominates Joe from S Africa and seconded by Malaysia.

China nominates Paeng from Thailand and seconded by Japan.

England closes seconded by Scotland.

Joe wins 66-31.

Equity Officer.

Indonesia nominates Paeng and seconded by Malaysia.

Singapore nominates Ah Yeoung and seconded by Australia.

Greece nominates Anna from Netherlands and seconded by Serbia.

Paeng withdraws.

Israel moves to close and seconded by Canada.

Russia moves to vote and seconded by Philippines.

53-44, Ah Yeoung wins.

Women's officer has been elected at the womens forum, Bronwyn.

North America: Adam Goldstein.

Caribbean: Undecided.

IONA: undecided.

Europe: Jens Fischer

Africa: Moses Masitah.

Asia: Undecided

Oceania: Seamus Coleman

Chair: We have come to the end and congratulations to those elected.

England: I hope everyone appreciates what Adiba has done in short notice. Thanks Chair on behalf of everyone.

Last year, Worlds Council suggested three years time of announcing bids and London would like to announce the idea of hosting Worlds and I may be the CA. House of Lords, etc taking BP back to Britain.

Oceania: Thank you for the trust to chair you for the next year. You can expect to hear from me a lot. If you won't be the national rep next year, please let me know as the issues will be discussed between now and next year. On default, you are all now national reps to pass on to your institutions. We'd like to open it but on default, youre involved. Would like to receive any proposals of major changes as early as September so that discussions can be done before council as well as empowered to vote in council.

Chair thanks Secretary for stepping in as well as Registrar. Happy New Year and enjoy the rest of the tournament.