

**Minutes for WUDC Pre-Council Meeting**  
December 28, 2012

Agenda:

1. Roll call
2. Agenda changes
3. Confirmation of voting status
4. Eligibility concerns
5. Women's officer report
6. Language committee
7. Presentation of 2015 bidders
8. Special session procedural vote (reconsider break reform)

1. Roll call
  - 13/15 Status A nations and 28 overall were present (27 overall needed for quorum)
2. Agenda changes
  - Minor changes were made to the agenda, including correcting year designations and adding an agenda item to consider adding a tenth preliminary round to WUDC
3. Confirmation of voting status
  - Madeline Schultz suggested that New Zealand was listed incorrectly as Status C due to Auckland and Wellington being classified as Australian teams. With those teams included, New Zealand became Status B with 4 teams this year and 2 last year.
4. Eligibility concerns
  - Patrick expressed that there are no concerns with n-1 or eligibility issues from the perspective of Berlin and the tab staff
  - China raised a concern about the eligibility of several debaters to compete at WUDC:
    - o Some teams paid for registration and couldn't find replacements at their same universities after the original debaters needed to drop. As such, it is believed that five universities recruited debaters from other schools to compete:
      - Beijing University of Technology (BJUT)
      - Nankai University
      - Peking University
      - Harbin University of Science and Technology
      - Tianjin Foreign Studies University
    - o Steve (Chair) clarified that composite teams are ineligible to debate unless the organizers determine there's space for them to register. China explained that some teams informed org comm and are being permitted as swing teams, but others may not have done so. Steve asked China to investigate circumstances of teams involved and report back to him as soon as possible.
  - Singapore explained that a debater from NTU A (Arvind Raghavan) may be unable to attend due to visa problems.

- Steve raised a concern about the “Ditki Indonesia” team based on a complaint that Ditki is a government agency, rather than an eligible institution.
  - o Indonesia explained that Dikti is a government agency, but was permitted to register starting with Botswana Worlds and funded the team. Additionally, this team consists of individuals from the same Catholic university in Indonesia.
  - o England suggested that it was problematic that these students’ own university tried to register and failed to secure spots on their own. Madeline Schultz agreed that registration of additional teams under non-existent institutions is a serious policy problem
  - o USA said that this seems more like a matter of the government hoping to be represented in name since it was providing funding than a registration problem
  - o Steve said that he would be reassured if these students could prove their enrollment in the same university
  - o Canada asked whether Ditki intended to give its spots to students from this university immediately or did so after these students didn’t get a spot on their own
  - o Indonesia said the tournament to determine who to fund was held in July (Steve: after registration took place)
  - o Steve suggested that Council may wish to take up the issue of non-academic institutions registering spots
  
- 5. Women’s officer report
  - Women’s officer said that the name of Women’s Night was changed to Gender Night by the org comm without consultation. They would like clarification about how this decision was made. It is being changed back now, but changes of this sort should be discussed in Council, not made unilaterally by the convenors
  
- 6. Language Committee:
  - Anne: Language Committee is having an easier time than in Manila. Most of the interviews have been done online, and 80 more will be done today. Language hopes to entertain appeals tomorrow or the day after
  
- 7. Background on special session procedural vote
  - Steve provided background on prior break reform votes and objections raised:
    - o Break reform has been discussed for two years. Last year, a motion was passed whereby everyone on 18 or more points breaks.
    - o Tom (England) and Madeline Schultz questioned the validity of that vote:
      - Though the voting status of some nations was recorded incorrectly, fixing their statuses still resulted in the motion passing
      - Second concern is what “2/3 support of status A nations” means. Previous Chairs and Roberts’ Rules suggest that if 2/3 of the nations who voted were in favor of it (status A and general), then it has passed
    - o Therefore, the 18+ break is currently in effect. Given the controversy and willingness of the org comm and CA team to accommodate potential changes, discussion will be permitted on what the break should be at this tournament
  - Steve then outlined the procedure for holding this vote and the potential Special Session:

- Treated as a procedural vote to hold a Special Session (requires 2/3 majority of voting body, and is not a weighted vote)
- If we move to special session, Council will entertain any of three motions: return to 32, change to 48-team, change to 64-team)
- England asked if reasons can be provided for having a session. Steve rejected this.
- Madeline Schultz argued that part of the problem was in counting Slovenia's vote:
  - Madeline argued that whether the motion passed is based on Slovenia's vote (Simone's minutes from last year and Steve's records did not agree).
  - Steve responded that Simone's minutes also document Slovenia's absence from session, show Australia as voting once against it as a Status A nation and then for it as a Status B nation. Therefore, the minutes are fallible
  - Madeline: India was present for half of the meeting, though. Also, there was an earlier error made by Steve, too
  - Anne (Language): Slovenian representative was not there, and there are pictures on Facebook of her trip
  - Women's officer: concern that if we're saying that the minutes of the meeting are fallible, it becomes a problem of who we most believe
  - Steve: minutes haven't been accepted yet, and will be at next Council. The record of the vote was kept by Steve as Registrar and submitted to Simone. She got her records from Steve's
- Steve announced a five minute recess

8. Presentation of 2015 bidders and note on Chennai

- Steve: materials for bids are in the front of the room and available on the websites
- Steve: ratification report from Chennai will be emailed to all of the reps (regional reps ratify this, but the entire Council may ask questions about report)

9. Special session procedural vote

- Motion to hold a Special Session passed easily
- Motion to adjourn pre-Council passed unanimously

## Minutes for WUDC Special Session

December 28, 2012

- England proposed a 48-team break, Germany seconded.
- Madeline Schultz suggested a procedural motion to recognize Slovenia's vote on break reform as reflected by last year's Council minutes
  - o Steve: Special Session as announced was limited to consideration of different proposals that might be available for the break. Also, only way to reconsider this would be in contemplation of the ratification of the minutes
  - o Madeline: alternative is to tell people on New Years that they haven't broken if we later ratify the minutes. We should make a decision instead of acting by default
  - o Steve: If we reach consensus, then this become irrelevant, so let's return to it later
- Discussion of the 48-team break followed:
  - o England explained the proposal: 18+ break is partial double octos with three teams breaking out of them (speaker scores are still used to decide who goes into them). Also, a 48-team break can capture the top of the 17-point bracket, which matters since 60 speaker points separate the top of the 17 and bottom of the 18.
  - o Russia: Breaking EFL and ESL teams similarly using a points system could create a strange situation, so 48 teams sounds like a better system.
  - o Steve: Modeling suggests 11.7% of the teams break using the 18+ system (46-48 teams). At a larger tournament (one of 2015 bids), the 48-team break excludes high-point 17s and some low-point 18 teams. At a small tournament, you'd break deep into the 17-point pool
  - o Women's Officer: 48-teams would give a degree of stability to the organizing nations because it would be easier to figure out how many rooms they need to book (number on 18 varies) and how many judges they need
  - o England: Reason to not expand larger if you're trying to capture more of the 17-point bracket is the depth of the judging pool. If we experiment with a 48-team break, we can consider a 64-team break later. Also, by this proposal, the 17<sup>th</sup> to 48<sup>th</sup> teams would be in a double octofinal round and compete for the bottom 16 slots in the octofinal round)
- USA motioned to call to question, England seconded. Steve: this motion requires 2/3 of status A, 2/3 of all nations. The motion is that the open break should be comprised of 48-teams at this competition (Berlin) and for future Worlds (at the exact rate that partials works)
- Motion passed 81-0 with two abstentions (Zimbabwe, USA)
- USA motioned to adjourn, seconded by Israel, passed unanimously.