

Minutes for WUDC Council on Jan 1st 2012

Agenda for WUDC Council on Jan 1st 2012

1. Welcome	
2. Roll call (& voting status)	10 min
3. Ratification of the Botswana reconstructed minutes	5 min
4. Report Botswana – presentation	5 min
5. Report Botswana - discussion & decision	20 min
6. Report Manila – presentation	10 min
7. Report Manila - questions & discussion	20 min
8. Issue 1 - guidelines for a reg system	20 min
- short break -	15 min
9. Issue 1 - vote	5 min
10. Bid defense Berlin – presentation	15 min
11. Bid defense Berlin - Questions & Ratification by regional reps	15 min
12. Discussion on Future of Worlds	15 min

Issues: Each issue listed below will be explained in a 5 minute time frame. Then we will adjourn the meeting briefly so everyone can confer and then return to vote on each motion in turn.

13. Issues 1-8 - presentation	
Issue 2 - continue historic worlds ranking	5 min
Issue 3 - constitutional change tabbing of teams that are pulled up	5 min
Issue 4 - inscribe responsibilities women's officer	5 min
Issue 5 - can the current host send teams to WUDC?	5 min
Issue 6 - WUDC to support organisation of WUSLDC	5 min
Issue 7 - adding WUDC rules as addendum to constitution	5 min
Issue 8 - clarification of N-1 rule	5 min
- lunch -	45 min
14. Issues 1-8 – voting	10 min
15. Question regarding eligibility - England NUDC	5 min

We expect the topics below to take more time to discuss and/or decide on, so we've allotted more time.

16. Issue 9 - break reform to allow all teams on 18 points to break	20 min
17. Who should fund persons presenting bid defense and report?	20 min
18. Archives of WUDC	10 min
19. Committee reports	20 min
President, Registrar, Secretary, Women's officer, Equity officer, Regional reps.	
20. Elections	10 min
President, Registrar, Secretary, Women's officer, Equity officer, Regional reps.	
21. End	

Addenda with minutes

- Report on voting status
- Reports Botswana WUDC 2011
 - CA's report
 - Budget WUDC 2011 Botswana org comm
 - Budget with auditor's approval
 - Letters to ministry of Labour and Youth concerning visa fees and subsidy
- Berlin WUDC 2012 bid defence
- Manila WUDC 2012 budget of 1st of January 2012
- Manila WUDC 2012 CA's report by powerpoint

1. Welcome

President: be short please. Any new issues? No. Agenda accepted

2. Roll call (& voting status)

[see addendum Record Voting status]

3. Ratification of the Botswana reconstructed minutes

President: minutes had to be reconstructed, since previous secretary's laptop broke. No one has any objections.

USA proposes motion 1, Ireland seconds.

Motion 1
To accept the minutes from the WUDC Council meeting of January 1 st 2011
Votes: unanimous
Passed

4. Report Botswana - presentation

President: Justice, previous convenor, is here to present their report, afterwards there will be time for questions.

Previous convenor Justice: wants to thank the rest of the Botswana org comm and Logan. They have been the backbone of bid, made it all possible, came to Botswana so many times to help. So many African countries now had the chance to participate for the first time, such as Zimbabwe and Malawi. Here to present two financial reports. First one is based on the 3 years when we wanted to host worlds [see addendum Budget with auditor's approval], the second one is specifically based on the costs of worlds [see addendum Budget WUDC 2012 Botswana Org Comm]. The report was audited, after the university and the auditor accepted the report. In the report, 849 people were present, excluding participants that were sponsored. A deficit of 200.000 pula that we had not budgeted for, so I approached the ministry of youth and culture and they gave us 3000US dollars. The university was not willing to fund this deficit. In the new year we hope our sponsors help us with the budget deficit. We are a small institution, in a small country and did our best. Botswana always has many problems, for instance there is always delay of an hour, and we tried our best. *President:* in terms of the ramifications of worlds, maybe you can talk about the effects? *Previous convenor Justice:* We had 10 African countries attend, and gave subsidies to about 3 institutions to enable them to attend. New people came into debate tournaments. Worlds opened debating up to new communities. First time we had 10 African countries at Worlds. Also, the PAUDC was run and held in Namibia and Zimbabwe in past two years, next year it will be in South Africa. We want to thank Council for the opportunity, that's what we organised the tournament for. *President:* Just to list some potential issues such as the finances discussed in council last year. But first, any other issues? *Ireland:* Ireland had the concern that there were only 3 judges per octofinal round. We want on record that that's inappropriate given the step up after the break; more judges would have been appropriate. There were more than enough judges present. But we don't need a response. *President:* We had a long discussion last year and many unclarities. So we, the executive notified the org comm that the constitution requires a full financial report presented 6 months after the competition ends including an audit. We've only received this report 3 days ago in a folder, so we needed to copy the whole lot and couldn't put it online or email it as we only had the paper version.

5. Report Botswana - discussion & decision

Secretary: Jens and I examined reports. We didn't look too thoroughly because we only had limited amount of time. What I noticed was that there were letters to and from the ministry of Youth and Labour regarding visa fees [see addendum Letters to ministry of Labour and Youth concerning visa fees and subsidy]. Org comm suggested they would use the visa fees payed to them to pay expenses, the Ministry would waive visa fees participants otherwise would have to pay and the Ministry would be documented as a sponsor for the amount of the visa fees. There was no mention of any visa fees

as income in the auditor's report. There was also no mention of any sponsorship from the Ministry of Labour. Furthermore, in the auditor's report—if income of reg fee were divided by the reg fee paid by each participant, there would be approx. 1200 paying participants. There weren't that many participants in the tournament. Once we'd discovered these issues, we decided to talk to Justice again. *President*: I had a conversation with Justice. It turned out that auditor's report given, is not audit of not just WUDC, but also of the PAUDC hosted by Botswana. We don't have any numbers for just WUDC, so can't backtrack any of the expenses or income. So the audit in our eyes is not an audit of the competition. *Previous convenor Justice*: we did explain that this is an audit of three competitions at once. Looking at the specific report of worlds, reg fee was 1ml pula, with 948 participants. We also had a deficit from PAUDC. We've had the whole three years audited. The visa fees are mentioned in world's report itself. *England*: just looking at numbers you've given us. 2 mln pula converted is US dollar 267.000,- Multiplied 942 participants by 450 dollars per debater works out at 423.900,- dollars in total. So there is a 150.000,- dollars covered by deficit or African nations participating for free. That's a very large number, where did this money go? *President*: It seems that there have been exchange rate fluctuations which means that the 2.7 mln pula in the report actually might be accurate. However, this doesn't accord with the income sighted in the audit given that the audit is combined. Can we clarify what's been spent at worlds? Since the audit can't be of worlds, council would be ill advised to accept it. *Previous convenor Justice*: Think council is aware of the existence of a report for worlds. The auditor had to edit the whole account at once. We have the invoices, did best we could do. *North America*: is the audit of the financials just for worlds? Is in that report an income listed for registration? *Previous convenor Justice*: 2.763.000,- pula. *President*: there is a spreadsheet with the final world's report, and a paper of the University of Botswana debate masters association income and expenditure. Only the last has stamps from an auditor, the other is simply a spreadsheet we can't verify. There are many more numbers on the spreadsheet than we have numbers for so we can't verify that. *North America*: Why was this spreadsheet not audited? *Secretary*: there is money listed in the report from Botswana org comm about WUDC concerning the income from visa fees that is missing from the auditor's report. Either the auditor has not seen these amounts and the letters and invoices, or he has seen them but they didn't abide by auditor's standards. *President*: Article 14 constitution states that [see article 14 constitution]. Council has to consider either to pass or deny it. So we'll either have a short break or ask for a motion on these financial reports. *DCA Art*: does that mean that per article 14 that if a country has lower standards we have to agree to these standards? Why? It's probably a bad idea. *President*: that's not the issue at hand. *Japan*: we can dig this out for the next few days, but the fact that we have to dig up this much already, is a failure of org comm to provide the right report. *Ireland*: in principle it's not a problem to combine accounts. Council should note that bidding can take over 3 years and is extremely expensive. Council and future worlds should bear this in mind. We should take this into account, also when sending convenors/CA's to Council to bid. The problem is that they are combined with one or two other competitions. That has very little to do with worlds. Ireland proposes motion 2, Canada seconds. *Registrar*: Open to debate that motion. *England*: What is the constitutional consequence of not accepting the reports? *Registrar*: they would not have met their burden. Might then be action taken further than that but that is a different motion. *The Netherlands*: to clarify, do we need to decide the consequences right now should we not accept this? *Registrar*: no. *Zimbabwe*: clarity on the motion. There is combination of accounts. Are we saying they should dismantle that or are we denying the report in total? *President*: from our understanding the only consequence is that we right now that we not accept. Council can always revisit the issue. It won't set a precedent for the future. Should the host decide to present a further report, we could accept it then. *Ireland*: I don't think we'll get anywhere with a new report. Should at least be mentioned in minutes for future. NL move to vote, England seconds.

Motion 2
To deny Botswana Org Comm approval of their financial report after hosting WUDC 2011
Votes: in favour 81, abstentions 1, against 0.

President: are there any further motions? No. Sorry for this outcome, we hoped we could accept your report. Still want to thank you for hosting worlds. Hope you can send full reports at one point so council can withdraw this motion Thank Justice for attending.

6a. Report Manila Org Comm - presentation

Current convenor: we've distributed financial reports. This will be a brief report, as the adj core needs some time to explain their side. Many sponsors, eg department tourism, national youth commission, department education. The project was supported. We have contacted a main power trainee company to help with stress management, leadership, team building. We've prepped our volunteers so they were fully prepared. This is already the 6th issue of our magazine, we want to release the final issue after tournament to continue to build the worlds debating community. A rough breakdown of the finances: the largest expenditure is the hotel. The rest is food, socials and other logistical needs. We still need to receive 268,976,40 pesos in reg fees. We now have a deficit of 10,958,175,40 pesos, but this will be covered by our university.

6b. Report Manila Org Comm questions and discussion

President: we have a slight mix-up of the schedule. First we'll do any questions for org comm, then the presentation from the CA team. [6a is presentation of Manila Org comm. Report, 6b becomes Discussion and vote on report, 7a becomes presentation from CA team, 7b becomes discussion and vote.]

Russia: which currency do you mention here? *President:* Pesos. *Russia:* can you specify what was listed under office budget? *Current convenor:* we hired some personal, to get sponsors to arrange with offices. Felt we needed an office for world, which was sponsored by university. *Germany:* were any costs not covered by the university? *Current convenor:* they were covered by sponsorship, but that was not enough. *Ireland:* one of most important things is the expenditure. Any one tip you want to give to future hosts? Also, would want to congratulate you on this excellent worlds so far. *Current convenor:* advice any future host to invest in the manpower, to make sure volunteers have the training they receive. We're creating leaders as well, make sure they're equipped to handle such a big tournament.

7a. Report Manila CA team- presentation

[see addendum: Manila WUDC 2012 CA's report by powerpoint]

7b. Report Manila CA team- questions & discussion

England: thanks for the fantastic job, and for having a systematic approach for determining the quality of independent judges. Did you use these results further in the competition to determine the judges break for instance? *CA Sam:* in theory yes we could, in reality we didn't use it. *North America:* lacking the demo round for judges not as constructed and predictable as it used to be. Think live or video best? *DCA Joe:* We had a discussion. Both have benefits. Live is more accurate simulation, can't watch it 3/4 times and confer, you get the input to get judges to respond to. That's easier live. *CA Sam:* not chosen one because of a certain result. We didn't aggressively mark down judges not agree. Marking was based on the mechanisms of judging, not just outcome matching. *DCA Cormac:* worlds is one of few opportunity to fill a debate with a diversity and a variety of measures. *DCA Art:* there is a huge amount of data which is difficult to measure in one round. Bias to well-known speakers is better known when everyone is doing the test at the same time. Better when watched dynamically. *Ireland:* we want to add thanks. First, more personal and probably directed at org comm about those who've received a subsidy once they arrived. I get mine tomorrow, one day before I fly out. Would your advice be to use a different system of repaying, for example paying people when they arrive? *CA Sam:* yes. *Ireland:* would like to point out something I've been asked to ask. The Irish delegation felt a very small % of Irish persons broke as a judge, relative to other years and relative to overall numbers. Would the CA team want have chat with the Irish delegation? We have worries about the

standard of Irish judges, that it's not the best. Don't know how much exactly broke. *CA Sam*: Think it's two out 52 judges overall broke. Always happy to have conversation and talk to people. To avoid regional imbalances we looked broadly at the DCA areas, not at specific countries. Might think those good decisions or bad decisions. *Ireland*: the concern of the Irish is if we're doing things right? *CA Sam*: Yes, absolutely. Naturally some data is confidential. But more than happy to have that conversation. *Japan*: concerning the adj break: judges that were chairing in bubble rooms and lower rooms, in bubble so were trusted. Some in bubbles did not break, and judges in lower rooms did break. What was the system in that? Do judges get better feedback in lower rooms, because the expectation is lower as compared to perceived bubble rooms? For one to drop out there must be issues. *DCA Joe*: very difficult outside to determine which are live. There were vastly more live rooms than we can break judges. Because when stacking, multiple judges judge live rooms. Bigger than the percentage we think we should be breaking. *CA Sam*: we take all breaks seriously. That does make it more difficult to see how a judge is ranked. *DCA Art*: it didn't not statistically bear out that you receive better feedback when lower down the tab.

President: 32 minutes have past, we'd need a motion to extend the discussion. But first of all, please again only ask questions you would want in the minutes, not just any questions you'd like to ask. I personally find tabbing very interesting, but maybe we should have this in smaller conversation.

Hong Kong: small comment on motions. Lots of difficulty for Asian delegation, not the topic, but how they were written. It is an English debating competition, so you should have certain level. Especially the one about the law was difficult to interpret, with lots of added information. Took 10 minutes to figure out what the debate was, which side of it we were on. Not all motions, or use a bureaucratic system, but just to consider it next time. *President*: council has a deep understanding of language issues. What care did you take to prevent this? *CA Sam*: while discussing any language issues, all adj teams ask this question and can get wrong. We practiced due diligence, had multiple language backgrounds on the team, were all happy all motions ok in that respect. We had sheets with motions and info slides outside the announce venue. Looking up of words takes time and is a disadvantage teams shouldn't have. *DCA Art*: in round 1, THW make fathers take paternity leave. Some teams propped 'make available' instead because they were unclear on the meaning. We changed make into force for all future motions. *Germany*: you mentioned breaking 52 judges. For future CA's, how did you decide that number? *CA Sam*: our aim is to maximize the quality in all out-rounds. Looked at what rounds you have to run using the same pool of judges, which meant we needed a total of 48 judges with a reasonable number of reserves and some extra flexibility. We had discussion of what number to break, and that is of course disputable. We decided to absolutely maximize quality but respect other viewpoints. *England*: there were 12 judges from the IONA region, that is those currently studying in IONA, with only one female IONA judge that broke. What are female IONA judges doing wrong? Could be a freak statistical occurrence, I'd have to read more. *DCA Joe*: Two IONA women broke, by our metric 3 as we contest yours. That is 34,2 % IONA of all breaking judges. We have the kind of regional plurality we wanted. We did not consider the intersection of these two. It does not appear obvious to us. *CA Sam*: absolutely think representation is important, we subdivided the break to level of regions and separately gender. 42% of breaking judges were women, which is highest percentage to date. Increasing the categories reduces our ability to decide on quality, it makes the case for representation harder to make when it demands more. *Korea*: at worlds an adj test is always used. How is it used? If the adj test not necessarily reflect quality break rounds, why is it one of the reasons to rank judges? *Joe*: the test was one of numerous parts. Other parts were feedback and discretion. Impossible to quantify how much test weighs into overall assessment to break. Any impact on ranking, changes over course of tournament. *DCA Art*: people who did well, ended up worse, people who did the test poorly through feedback went up in the ranking.

President: do we have a motion to accept the report? *The Netherlands*: the language team still needs to report. *President*: yes, let's first do that. *Language Officer Anne*: let me first give a few numbers. Total of 375 applicants for ESL/EFL status; 240 through our form, the rest only through interviews. We interviewed 290 people, some after looking at their form needed to be interviewed anyway. We granted 240 granted ESL status and 120 EFL status. Just 16 appeals, of which 10 were accepted and 6 not granted. All EPI to be ESL status. Maybe some EFL speakers did not understand the appeals

process, so maybe that's why they didn't appeal. We had a committee of 17 people, of which 4 IONA, 4 Europe, 1 Australia, 6 Americans and 2 Asians. The committee was slightly too big. We had a few people too many, but regional representation was very valuable. I'd recommend next committees to have similar representative team. There were a few concerns about the rules, maybe changes to the rules in the future. There was no time for a motion now, but it will come up next year. I will provide a report for next year, so lots of people can get a status automatically to save valuable time. Ireland proposes motion 3, England seconds.

Motion 3
Council thanks the org comm, CA team and language committee for all their hard work and accepts their report.
Votes: unanimous
Passed

8. Issue 1 - guidelines for a reg system

President: we'd like a discussion of reg reform before Berlin's bid defense. Their proposed reg is part of their bid defense. Want to separate these issues. Another note, registration is difficult for council to decide. There are many issues at hand, we had a long discussion last year so please keep it short and brief. *England:* we remove our motion and would like to hear Berlin's reg proposal. *President:* Discussion becomes part of Berlin bid defense.

9. Issue 1 - vote

[Removed from agenda]

10. Bid defense Berlin

Registrar: we'll have the bulk of the presentation first, then pause for questions and discussion and then have a separate discussion about the registration at the end. *Future convenor Patrick:* We briefly want to show you our progress over the last year, one of the issues being registration. Brief form of report sent out 5th of December, on blog under documentation section or send Patrick an email. We've found a limited liability company under Germanu law because not then our societies are not directly affiliated, independent to make sure if anything goes wrong any liability doesn't fall back on berlin debating union. It's set up with a chief executive, Supervisory committee of 4 persons. Old debaters with jobs in big organizations. We've also setup org comm with Clear responsibilities. We've been at work since making plans and documents, all written down for future hosts. We've finalised contracts with the hotel, 1100 beds, 400 teams, 300 judges. Can later on reduce by 25% in case of any financial difficulties. It's in the Centre of Berlin. Prelims are at the university, we're now looking at transport, probably with buses. We have confirmed media partners: ZDF, and Die ZEIT. We're looking into streaming rounds. Uni agreement has bandwidth. Want to include as many people as possible. Support from the education ministry and foreign university. The DCA's are James Kilkup, Victor Finkel and Isa Loewe. We want to showcase the diversity in Berlin, so it's important to have a public final. The budget is 800.00,- euro's [see addendum: Berlin's bid defense]. That is the top end budget. When we try to get sponsorship, this is what we present. At the moment we have approx. 550.000,- euro incl. registration. WUDC will definitely take place even if at a very low level, we'll just have to cut anything that's not a necessity.

11. Bid defense Berlin - Questions & Ratification by regional reps

Asia: is the venue on campus or an outside venue? *Future convenor:* Evening venues, if not enough funding will mostly be on campus. If we go outside, we could for example have the final in an old airport temple. Don't know how much would cost. *China:* this budget is the best case scenario. What is the estimated budget with the 550.000 you have? The budget shows you need 1 mln euro's. What are the differences in the 1mln euro budget and the 500.000,- budget? *Future convenor Patrick:* venues would change, public relations for preliminary elements out to general public to get people excited, volunteers training would be at higher level, volunteers would be at a youth hostel for

people outside Berlin or instead get crash, food and drink would go down substantially. We do want 3 sit down dinners, if not the price would be 80.000,-for food only. Accommodation also drops with certain amounts: 50.000 if volunteers crash + 358.000 accommodation + 80.000 food + 50.000 transport + 0 staff + 10.000 venues + 0 administration + 10.000 PR + 5000 volunteers + 5% overall budget for miscellaneous (= 563.000*.05=28.150) = 591.150,-

China: the 500.000,-budget, is that a 450 reg fee. *Future convenor Patrick:* yes. *Korea:* can you clarify what the budget is used for under heading staff and volunteers. *Future convenor Patrick:* Staff is applied to funding for the limited company for some people. Chief Executive can't find another job during that the time, it takes a lot of time. The supervisory board decided this before the Chief Executive was appointed. Other costs are food, accommodation for training, transport to and from Berlin. *Turkey:* explain the quality and quantity of accommodation and food. Is it a 5 star hotel? *Future convenor Patrick:* it's a 4 star hotel, with 1100 beds in one hotel, with different types of rooms, some 4 person rooms. *Japan:* how many meals are provided? *Future convenor Patrick:* 3 meals a day, even in the contingency budget.

President: discussion moves to registration, we'll have a break before we move to ratification. [see addendum: Berlin's bid defense].

Ireland: thanks for the presentation. This sounds like a really good idea. Recommend council accepts it as a trial to see how it works. Seeing the work of Cork WUDC reg, and Koc WUDC. Everyone who wanted within reasonable amount of time, could come, because of pull outs. Within reason of course. One of the significant factors is that teams that drop out, do so in a reasonable time. First day of Cork WUDC reg 200 teams got onto the waiting list, when Cork WUDC happened we were down to 0. Do you have a policy for drop-outs? *Future convenor Patrick:* De La Salle had a very good policy for that. First down payment 50% sometime in June, enough time so that if someone then still comes in, flights are still cheap enough. Particularly smaller institutions benefit from that. They have the security that they always be able to send one team. Large institutions won't suffer for reasons said above. *The Netherlands:* good proposals for institutions that need to apply for funding, gives time to request for funding.

The Netherlands move to ratification, Ireland seconds.

Motion 4
Council ratifies WUDC Berlin 2013's Bid defense including the proposal for registration.
Votes: unanimous
Passed

13. Issues 1-8 - presentation

President: point 12 is moved to later down the agenda since no decisions can be taken in any case. So we want to give you an executive summary of the motions 1/8, if sponsors feel misrepresented, they can add things. After lunch we will move to, only if necessary, a discussion and then votes. Most motions were introduced at pre-council already.

Issue 2 - continue historic worlds ranking - *President:* to continue the rankings originally on Colm Flynn's blog.

Issue 3 - constitutional change of tabbing teams that are pulled up – *President:* now pull ups are chosen randomly, if the motion is accepted teams that have been pulled up before will to be less likely to be pulled up again.

Issue 4 - inscribe responsibilities women's officer - *President:* This year a hiccup who's responsible for the organisation of women's night and the women's forum. This motion the women's officer is responsible for this, no clarification of this at the moment.

Issue 5 - can the current host send teams to WUDC? - *President:* this is sponsored by current org comm. Questions is: should the current host of world be allowed to send teams to their competition? Executive and emeritus members came to the advice not to do that this time. Did not want to create a precedent. *Current convenor:* host institutions, if they can host worlds and spare the manpower to allow debaters, they should be allowed to do so. If you prevent your debaters, it's a

big disincentive for big institutions to host worlds. We wanted to host world's to have the younger ones join in the competition. Our expectation is that we were allowed to join.

Issue 6 - WUDC is asked to support the organisation of WUDCS - *President*: this came up last year already, asked by organisers of WUDCS, that WUDC sends a message of support.

Issue 7 - adding WUDC rules as addendum to constitution: - *Registrar*: in a way it's status quo. The current constitution requires current rules of BP debating should be added as addendum, even if wanted to change them, we don't know at the minute what they are or how to change them. First we need full set of rules to then change.

Issue 8 - clarification of N-1 rule - *President*: we would like the rule of N-1 to be inscribed in the constitution.

President: these are the motions we deemed uncontroversial. Motions for the afternoon are potentially more controversial than these motions now. Point 16 break reform requires a large majority, 23 status A nations voted to reform the break. This is reprise of this proposal. All teams on 18 broke, need partial double octo's to break. Ask Canada, most will remember discussion last year. Have to come back to this. Point 17 also raised by org comm., who should fund persons to defend bids and present reports. Point 18: current nowhere to store records properly. Idea is uncontroversial, just question how best to do this. Example is that the Botswana website down, it would be good to have our own resources like tabs, reports and elections scheduled. Miscellaneous, if people feel we should talk about future of worlds. As of yet, still no bid. Shared feeling problems with this competition exist, it is very difficult to host.

- addition - role call and voting status

[see addendum Roll Call and Voting status]

14. Issues 1-8 - voting

Issue 2: continue historic rankings

Registrar wording motion: handed out copies. Colm Flynn fabulous job of maintaining ranking. Collaborated with IDEA to change how to rank institutions, more diverse debate styles and more regional representation. Say what you will of his new rankings, think there is merit in maintaining these rankings. There is a major difference: previously based at just performance on worlds preliminary rounds. Proposal is to maintain the historical rankings with one minor twist: the historical rankings just look at preliminary rounds, would also like to look at excellence in elimination rounds with a simple formula. *Singapore*: copy of the email from Colm in response to this proposal. He likes to ask instead of starting up a new one, council holds off on for one year, so he work out any kinks and take Published. *Russia*: now the rankings looks at the total point in preliminary rounds, I propose to count the average points, to not preference country that can send many teams. *Ireland*: not do to with countries positions, but institutions. *Registrar*: in response to Colm email. Not to make critique of his ranking system, but I think it's very different. I want to preserve the historical ranking. The two rankings can coexist happily. *CA Sam*: making provision for 18 point break, gives teams that did less well at first a bigger opportunity to accrue more points. Did seems odd and something we may want to change. *Canada*: Colms email makes sense to wait for him to work out the kinks, but if that ranking does not continue forward, records will be lost, so we'd rather not wait a year. *Japan*: if concern is that 18 point break, it adds to Russia's concerns. Important to keep track of records, but it has no consequence in actuality since it has not been used to prove things, modify reg etc, so we have no reason to be rushed. Can bring it back any time we want. We support Colm's email. *The Netherlands*: no distinction in ESL/EFI except for the grand final, that is kind of a funny. Call to vote Netherlands, seconded North America.

Motion 5

Article 33: University Rankings of the World Universities Debating Championships

The Registrar shall be responsible for maintaining the historical rankings of universities competing in the Championships.

The rankings shall be comprised of the total points accumulated by a university at the five most

recent Championships. In the case where a university does not compete in a Championships because they serve as host, that university's ranking shall be comprised of the total points accumulated at the last five Championships in which that university competed.

A university's points for a particular Championship shall be comprised of the total points accumulated by all teams representing that university at that Championship during the preliminary rounds as reported in the published team tab.

Beginning with the 2012 Championships and henceforth, A university's points for a particular Championships shall also include points accumulated during the elimination phase of the Main Competition according to the following formula:

1. Where three teams advance from an elimination round, two points shall be awarded to each advancing team;
2. Where two teams advance from an elimination rounds, three points shall be awarded to each advancing team;

Where one team is selected as the Champion in the Main Grand Final, six points shall be awarded to that team.

Votes: in favour 2/3 of status A nations. Rest: in favour 58, against 14

Passed

Issue 3: no now pull up random chosen.

President: proposes motion. Ireland seconds. *CA Sam:* friendly amendment to add 'or equal number of teams' otherwise if all teams are on an equal number of pull-ups no teams could be pulled up.

Ireland: one simple question? Is the software is available to make this happen? *President:* yes, not default rule to all other worlds. Just means a tab director can add this function to the tab system. We should move to vote. England seconds.

Motion 6

Council interprets the provision of randomly pulling up teams as meaning only extending to teams that have not been pulled up before or are on a lower number *or equal number* of pull-ups of pull ups, than any other teams in their bracket.

Votes: unanimous

Passed

Issue 4: *Registrar:* Motion delayed till write up is done.

Issue 5: sponsored by org comm: should the current host of world be allowed to send teams to the competition? *President:* this is an advisory motion, not a constitutional amendment. *Current convenor:* that future hosts are able to compete at their own worlds. Ireland proposes motion 7, Singapore seconded.

Motion 7

Future hosts of WUDC are able to compete at the worlds they organise themselves.

Ireland: Reason supporting, our country has hosted worlds twice in the last 6 years. The numbers required to run worlds are so large, if 2/4/6 people missing are such a crucial damage, you probably shouldn't be running it. Especially important for younger members, it's a fun time, I missed out on worlds myself cause it was hosted by my own institution so would have enjoyed it a lot. *Netherlands:* in principle respectful, and for national championships it works. Amsterdam Euro's had exactly enough volunteers, nothing extra. Then we would be relying on hosts being responsible which is necessarily always the case. *Russia:* this should be the case, we've talked about experienced institutions like Oxford or Monash who won't host now. We should rely on the host to take the possibility, must give this a chance. Europe: this was a very constitutionally based rule. In Glasgow WUDC this was gentlemen's agreement for the organising committee. It's now a hard rule that we

never got rid of. *England*: ULU considers a bid, one reason not to would be not being able to compete. *Ireland*: friendly amendment to own motion, that the hosting university does so within rules of reg, N-1 and all the payment deadlines. *Qatar*: it's also the responsibility of host to provide swing teams. Excellent idea. Priority has to provide the swing teams. Hate to see prioritise own teams as compared to swing teams.

North America call to question, Ireland seconds.

Motion 7
Future hosts of WUDC are able to compete at the worlds they organise themselves, if they comply with N-1 rules and all the registration deadlines and payment deadlines that are imposed on all other institutions
Votes: unanimous, except 1 abstention
Passed

Issue 6: WUDC is asked to support the organisation of WUDCSL

Venezuela: last year was the first time we organised WUDC in the Spanish language and it was a huge success. We want to follow the rules of WUDC so we can create a league and can follow movement.

North America: call to questions, Europe seconded. Vote unanimously.

Motion 8
that for all future years, Council would support the World Universities Debating Championship in the Spanish Language by sending a message of support.
Votes: unanimous
Passed

Issue 7: adding WUDC rules as addendum to constitution

Registrar: article 2 constitution refers to rules to be amended. My research hasn't found the rules attached. So propose to attach as appendix 1 the Da Crux rules that have come to be understood as base rules. This also provides a mechanism to change the rules.

Registrar proposes motion 9, Ireland seconded.

England: need second to find rules online. Ambiguous in rules whether government whip is allowed to present positive matter. It's something to be aware of. *Jamaica*: that's not ambiguous, it's an inconsistent application of rule. It's either allowed or not allowed. England accepts this comment from Jamaica.

Ireland move to vote, Netherlands seconds. Vote: unanimous.

Motion 9
Article 2
1. There shall be a competition, which for the purposes of this constitution shall be named the World Universities Debating Championship. A round of the Championship shall be held once during each and every calendar year.
2.The Format of the debate shall be British Parliamentary as set out in the Rules of the Championship attached to this constitution as Appendix One.
3.Proposed changes to the Rules of the Championship shall be treated as a substantive motion before Council and subject to the provisions of Article 7.
Votes: unanimous
Passed

Issue 4 - inscribe responsibilities women's officer -

Newly elected Women's Officer Deirdre: for all future worlds that the women's officer is consulted and an agreement is reached with org comm for arrangement of women's night.

Europe proposes motion 9: to add this under article chairing women's. France and Mexico seconds.

Europe: council wants to be aware that we are proposing a constitutional mandate on worlds to have a women's night. That is not a requirement at this stage. It does specifically not prescribe a debate, but it does prescribe a women's night.

Ireland move to vote, Europe seconds. Unanimous.

Motion 9
Article 28.1.4.a
The Women's Officer(s) shall be responsible for chairing a women's forum to be held during the championship round, for organising, in agreement and co-operation with the Organising Committee a women's night, and for the discharge any other duties such as their membership of council would involve.
Votes: unanimous
Passed

Issue 8: clarification would like the rule of N=1 inscribed in constitution.

President: found out during pre-council that these rules are not in the constitution. There is a precedent according to Colm's archives. *Registrar*: wise to inscribe in constitution, but we'll move it to after point 15 when we have a motion written up.

15. Question regarding eligibility - England NUDC

England: we have a situation where there can be dual eligibility, eg. ULU and a constituent institution like Kings college. Or a cooperation hosted by multiple institutions. Smaller institutions can develop by association of the larger ones. Risk of abuse, so England has enlisted a rule. If you want to speak at worlds for an institution you want to make a primary commitment. So you have to speak at majority of intervarsity, and speak for any other institution at not more than 3 competitions in total. Failure to do this means the English rep refuses to defend your eligibility at council. *Ireland*: there is a different situation within IONA, but it would be in the spirit of worlds. *Europe*: in Europe the context is very important, up to council not to inscribe but agree that it is in spirit of them. *Japan*: what happens to exchange students with institutions in two different countries. *England*: same rules apply. *Ireland*: move that council supports English reps in this policy and close discussion. Ireland proposes motion 10. New Zealand seconds. *Russia*: to people need to bring paper that proves already enrolled. *England*: in constitution. *President*: it's a yes or no question. Do we agree this is in line or not? Qatar, NL, Canada seconds move to vote.

Motion 10
Councils reaffirms that England's eligibility policy concerning dual eligibility is consistent with WUDC rules constitution.
Votes: unanimous
Passed

Issue 8: clarification would like the rule of N-1 inscribed in constitution.

Europe proposes motion 11, North America seconds.

England: is it a question about dissolution of a team, or a question which team dissolved. A, B, C or D? Can we make that look less random? *Ireland*: dissolution of teams is institution decides, all information regarding bidding and in advance of reg. *Singapore*: it's relatively common practice to borrow judges from elsewhere. How does council feel about that? *President*: as seen at pre-council, this is the discretion of org comm. *CA Sam*: can't conceive reason why borrowing goes wrong. Requirement, at the moment pre-council decides, adds to motion who decides.

The Netherlands calls question, Ireland seconds. Unanimous.

Motion 11
22.8

Institutions who wish to compete at World's may be required to send judges to the Championship Round, such requirements will be established and clearly communicated by the Organising Committee, at the latest in advance of registration.

1: Council shall enforce this requirement, with penalties up to and including the dissolution of a team to create the required judges, with said dissolution at the discretion of the registering institution, or the removal of teams for the championship round draw.

2: Any waivers or alterations to this policy shall be decided by Council at the Pre-Council session.

Votes: unanimous

Passed

Motion on change of requirements for EPL/ESL/EFL status are available during break.

16. Motion 9 - break reform to allow all teams on 18 points to break

President: a reminder of the discussion last year. Discussed different proposals at length. Common feeling of uneasiness about the break, percentage gone down. After long and often confusing discussion, council decided by simple majority there should be some break reform with 3 different proposals on the table. The other 2 were more simple: one would simply double the size of the break with 64 teams breaking. The other one has 48 teams should break, which would be partial double octo's. None of those were able to secure majority. First, for mathematical reasons this would peg the break at certain % break dependant on the size of competition, at about 11%. Another important issue: the ESL and EFL break,. There are no good logical reasons to not also want to change their breaks. And speaker points are still relevant there. *Registrar:* can predict with relatively certainty always uncertain what break point would be, could not specify break point for them. *President:* true that that is impossible to calculate, there are still no good logical reasons to cut off on 8 points. Very strong feelings on some part of council, which were not shared by others. One proposal is retabled, the others aren't. Final argument was, even though the size of break relative to size comp has become smaller, other breaks have been added. An overall larger number of teams makes it to final rounds.

Registrar: first explain the motion, then move to second part which is the discussion. Number of copies are being distributed. Share and pass down. Are working on more.

Canada proposes motion 12, Singapore seconds.

Motion 12

Proposed Amendment

(~~Stricken language to be deleted.~~ Underlined language to be added.)

Article 30

4. Selection of teams for the elimination rounds

a) At the conclusion of the nine preliminary rounds, teams are to be ranked in consecutive order (from highest to lowest) as follows:

i) Total aggregate Team Points accumulated by the team; and

ii) Where teams have an equal number of aggregate team points, on the basis of aggregate Team Scores accumulated by the team; and

iii) Where this is also equal, on a count-back of the number of times that each team has ranked 1st, 2nd and 3rd, with a team ranking higher if it has been ranked 1st more often, and so on; and

iv) Where the teams still cannot be distinguished, by drawing lots

b) ~~The highest thirty two ranking teams~~ Teams that have averaged two Team Points per preliminary round (i.e.: all teams with 18 Team Points after 9 preliminary rounds) will participate in the Main Competition elimination rounds. ~~and~~ These teams shall be ranked from 1st to 32nd first to last according to 4(a).

c) Where there are, at the commencement of the preliminary rounds, at least 80 teams eligible to compete in the ESL and EFL elimination rounds, the highest sixteen ranking ESL and EFL teams will participate in the ESL Competition elimination rounds, and shall be ranked from 1st to 16th according

to 4(a). In any other case, the highest eight ranking ESL and EFL teams will participate in the ESL competition elimination rounds, and shall be ranked from 1st to 8th according to 4(a). No EFL team participating in the ESL elimination rounds shall participate in the EFL rounds.

d) The highest four ranking teams eligible to compete in the EFL Competition shall participate in that Competition, and shall be ranked 1st to 4th in accordance with 4(a).

e) Any ESL or EFL team ranked high enough after the preliminary rounds to participate in the Main Competition shall only participate in the Main Competition. No speaker who has participated in the Main Competition elimination rounds may in any future year hold ESL or EFL status. No speaker who has participated in the ESL elimination rounds may in any future year hold EFL status without the permission of the Council.

f) Teams shall compete in the elimination rounds subject to the qualification requirements of this Constitution.

g) The consecutive order of finalists should be announced and posted by the Tournament Director before the commencement of the elimination rounds.

5) The Main Competition elimination rounds

a) Teams shall be drawn to debate in accordance with ~~Schedule A~~ Article 30 (4) of this Constitution.

b) Should there be fewer than 32 teams that average at least two points per preliminary round, the top 32 teams will advance to an Octofinal round, regardless of their record relative to their average scores in preliminary rounds.

c) If more than 32 teams qualify for the elimination rounds based on 4(b), those teams will be ranked from first to last according to 4(a).

d) The lowest ranked of these teams will compete in a Partial Double-Octofinal round to determine the teams who will progress to the Octofinal round.

i) If the number of teams beyond 32 is an even number, the number of teams participating in the Partial Double-Octofinal round shall be equal to the number of teams beyond 32 multiplied by 2: $[(N - 32) \times 2 = PDO]$ where N = the total number of teams with an average of 2 or more points per preliminary round and PDO = the total teams contesting the Partial Double-Octofinal round].

ii) If the number of teams beyond 32 is an odd number, the number of teams participating in the Partial Double-Octofinal round shall be equal to the number of teams beyond 31 multiplied by 2: $[(N - 31) \times 2 = PDO]$ where N = the total number of teams with an average of 2 or more points per preliminary round and PDO = the total teams contesting the Partial Double-Octofinal round].

iii) All teams qualified to compete in the single elimination phase of the competition but not selected to participate in the Partial Double-Octofinal round shall receive a bye directly into the Octofinal round and assume their appropriate seed therein according to their ranking per 4(a).

iv) In the Partial Double-Octofinal round, the teams in each round shall be ranked to determine which teams advance to the Octofinal round and to determine their seeding in the Octofinal round.

(1) The team ranked first in the round shall assume the highest Octofinal seed available in that particular Partial Double-Octofinal round; the team ranked second shall assume the second highest Octofinal seed available in that particular Partial Double-Octofinal Round.

(2) In the case of an odd number of teams with records averaging at least two points per preliminary round, one Partial Double-Octofinal debate will advance three teams into the Octofinal round. This debate shall be known as the "odd debate" and shall be the debate that includes the lowest ranked team with an average of at least two points per preliminary round and the other teams appropriately placed in that debate according to the Swiss draw system. The team ranked first in the odd debate shall assume the highest Octofinal seed available in that particular Partial Double-Octofinal round; the team ranked second in the odd debate shall assume the second highest Octofinal seed available in that particular Partial Double-Octofinal debate; the team ranked third in the odd debate shall assume the third highest Octofinal seed available in that particular Partial Double-Octofinal Debate.

v) At the conclusion of the Partial Double-Octofinal round, the teams advancing from the Partial Double-Octofinal round will assume their appropriate seeded positions in the Octofinal round.

e) At the conclusion of each of the Octo-Finals, Quarter Finals and Semi Finals, the adjudication panel shall select two winning teams from each debate. These two teams shall progress to the next

elimination round.

f) In the Final, the adjudication panel shall select the one winning team and the three runners-up. The three runners-up shall not be ranked in any way by the panel.

Canada: first propose, then questions about mechanism, then debate. We had idea about it. Majority had support to expand the break, not agreement how. This proposal most accurately fixes that. Unless WUDC falls below 250 teams, which is not foreseen, we'd still have a similar % breaks. It is prestigious to debate in these out rounds. Last year, I wasn't present, this proposal had the most support, so most appropriate to bring back. How does it work? No matter what the speaker score, all teams on 18 team points break. To get it down to even amounts, there is an partial double octo's, which is a round before octo's were not everyone debates. The amount of teams competing in the partial double octo's is to make up the numbers to 32. Two situations can occur: this tournament there are about 64 teams on 18, which would mean partial double octo's. If we have an odd amount of teams on 18 or more, there is a mechanism to deal with this. One of the rounds, 3 teams break from that round. It consists of the top 3 teams in partial double octo's, and 1 bottom team. Judges would have to be informed that 3 go through, but not the breaking order of the teams. The reason that we have 18 team points as cut off: there will be good teams excluded no matter what. Fact is that 18 emphasizes doing well in preliminary rounds. Number of breaks have been decided on a couple of speaker points. Standard deviation needed to be used to determine the break. This model is a clear line. Clear to debaters. Easy to understand that's how you move forward. You often only know speaker scores often right at end, so there is often less weight put on them.

Questions on mechanism first. Registrar: 5 minutes of clarification. Then move onto arguments for or against. *Ireland:* how do you decide at the top end of the bracket who goes to partial double octo's: speaker points or everyone on 18? *Canada:* the ranking exactly as it is used now. *Ireland:* so the difference between 32 and 33 still determined on quite arbitrary lines? *Canada:* ESL/EFL is also scaled to amount of teams. Not as similar but still some similarity. *Russia:* in your principle you ignore speaker points for break, what about the speaker prizes? Top speaker may not be correct? *Canada:* one reason is speaker points are less accurate than they could be. We also want the break scaled to the size of tournament. Not saying speaker points are entirely irrelevant. We will be stuck with those metrics, good system to deal with those metrics, decide break on team score which is what is most accurate. *Qatar:* when an odd number breaks, end up with teams in a partial double octo where 3 would go forward? *Registrar:* The odd debate is where the lowest ranked team faces the highest ranked teams. *Qatar:* in which case, the round in which that happens, you suggested the judges don't know? *Canada:* they do clearly know, that was my mistake. *President:* would you extend this principle to ESL and EFL as well? *Canada:* could be extended, but more research needs to be done. Can't be done directly, could in future, and potentially it should be if Council wants to. *President:* of course it's very difficult to prescribe, but could include lowest team on same ranking points as the team in semi's to be included in partial double octo's. *CA Sam:* multiple teams going through from potential partial double octo. How do you decide which real octo they get into? Is that decision based on the partial double octo or on the tab? *Canada:* involves result of the partial double octo. *Registrar:* rather than just two teams to go through, you would actually have to rank the teams. That decides the place in double octo's. *Canada:* on the screen now. Odd number of teams, 4 teams and 3 spots. Teams 3rd in that round, seeded where normally 2nd seeded team is seeded. See screen. *Croatia:* what is special about 18 points, cause? *Registrar:* Wait debate for these questions, this is just about the mechanism. *Newly elected women's officer Deirdre:* enshrined speaker points are arbitrary. If ESL teams on 14 points to quarters, shouldn't all ESL teams on 14 break go to quarters? *Canada:* only involve open break, not any effect other breaks at this time.

Debate: extended another 15 minutes. *North America:* start useful to have a straw poll of Status A nations to see any support at all. *Registrar:* not vote. Good idea proposal in principle. Last year majority of nations voted in favour, but not 2/3 of status A nations, which is a constitutional requirement. So only status A nations first.

Strawpoll status A nations
18 point break proposal
Australia abstain, Bangladesh yes, Canada yes, China abstain, England no, Germany no, Hong Kong yes, Indonesia yes, Ireland no, Japan yes, Korea yes, Malaysia no, Scotland abstain, South Africa no, USA yes.
8 in favour, 4 against, 3 abstained.

Strawpoll all
18 point break proposal
Aye: 10. No: 11. Abstain:

Strawpoll status A nations
Could you move or are you instructed to stay with this opinion?
Australia: no fixed, Bangladesh: yes fixed, Canda: yes fixed, China: yes can change, England: no fixed, Germany: no can change, HongKong: yes fixed, Indonesia: yes fixed, Ireland: no fixed, Japan: yes fixed, Korea: yes fixed, Malaysia: yes fixed, Scotland: abstain can change.
8 in favour, 4 against, 3 abstained.

Debate reopened: *Croatia*: you emphasize is technical. We've heard about standard deviation before. Why do you think teams that get 18 points, are winning teams? Registrar: simple, in general the top half can be considered to have won the round. There's an analogy with most elimination rounds. *Croatia*: very simplifying model. You can get 18 points maybe you when lose 2 times, or maybe 2x 3rd, and 1 loss. Not 9 times second. *Ireland*: one, changes the nature and judging of out rounds when in some cases you put more teams through and have to rank them. It doesn't change any arbitrary distinctions, when speaker points are still used later on, and in the ESL/EFL breaks. *Europe*: it only solves the arbitrary nature of the break between teams on 18 points. Instead it moves that from 32 and pushes it further up the draw. So it still impacts teams on 18. *England*: we don't like the idea of two breaks, which in practice it will be. People will ask which part of break are you in? *Japan*: we should look at this arbitrariness in a comparative manner. Moving arbitrariness, why is that higher than down the bottom. It's the difference of breaking or extra break. Difference is whether they can debate in the out rounds and that's more important. *Singapore*: you still on average 18. So on average you end up on the top half of rooms. This case all metrics can be arbitrary, damage is less. *The Netherlands*: honestly not fair if the open break is so different from ESL/EFL breaks. Some number of teams, the esl break is always a %, at this moment it always necessarily a certain number. *Europe*: worlds is not about breaking but wining. You're not more likely to win but more likely to have to do an additional round. This asks 5 out rounds from teams. Makes it less fair or likely for these teams to do well. *Ireland*: the arbitrary creates more harms, violates principle of judges, how do you format out rounds as well principle of equality between breaks. *HongKong*: begin in the tophalf means good debates. Often teams lose points early rounds or later rounds. Consider arbitrariness. Not fair to them. *Newly elected women's officer Deirde*: policy enacted quite offensive. Being arbitrary is alone relevant for the Open break, but it's ok in the ESL/EFL?! It makes those categories look less important. *Scotland*: undecided yet: most of the opposition arguments do not change the arbitrariness. Everything is just against scale in principle. Or scale to tournament. *Germany*: agrees NL and Women's officer. And it's a burden to have 3 extra break rounds on org comm. *Japan*: we accepted to expand break, in principle agreed. If it's a legitimate problem, there are ways to get around it. CA teams came and said it was possible. Why not apply the same criteria to ESL, if we can agree that team points are superior to speaker points. No one can say that's not true. *Singapore*: in principle it's not a problem to apply this to ESL, but it's a separate discussion, the logistics are more complicated. Here easier to fix to 18, historically score to break to speaks. No way say in principle not extend it to ESL/EFL. Only concerns for complicatedness.

President: we are revisiting exactly the same debate as last year, I have not heard new argument. This discussion can be very aggravating so instead be nice.

Asia: proposal is on the open break, which all consider is unfair. Arbitrariness comes above country or region. Proportional level of break is important, now lower than 11% and is this now fair enough to rep break? *Ireland:* re Scotland's question. Rather break on 19 than 18, at least they've fully won one round. Number of 32 is significant achievement in the culture of debating in general, in IONA and Ireland.

President: which issues could convince you? Instead of reviewing old arguments.

Canada: re Scotland's question, this expands the break. Believe the break should be scaled to the size of the tournament, with more people the break should be larger. Otherwise it's logically more difficult. You should support this. *Europe:* strange effect when told speaks are no longer as important though in similar breaks they still matter massively. Break is a low proportion, but before we mandate this, we can't any institutions to bid now. It's very probable that worlds won't be as large in future years. *Croatia:* on average it's a nice temp, yet both sides hurt. To change the break ok, but this is not the right model. *The Netherlands:* Firstly, do we have to keep on discussing extending break? Or can we do a poll whether we actually want to? Secondly, it's not bad if it's hard to break. Thirdly, when same criteria on ESL/EFL are referred to, then the ESL team break should have similar system. *President:* we would need a motion to retract last year's motion to expand the break. *Malaysia:* speaker points arbitrary in all rounds, distinction, already platform better teams forward. Deserving teams not opp to prove themselves. Only mechanism to make it better. *Newly elected women's officer Deirdre:* tying hands of future tournaments to hold even more extra rounds. 18 is achievement that is not applied to ESL, differs every year.

North America: call question. Ireland seconds. Need a simple 2/3 majority, so 20 votes to end debate.

Procedural Motion
To end debate and vote
Yes: 19 votes. No 3
Failed

Singapore: no doubt break is difficult as more and more participate. Should ask whether remains fair or get absolute min represented in break. *England:* ultimately England opposed full stop. Appreciate all arguments said. It all reflects a position. No point in more debate. *Japan:* use word principle very carefully. No reason why principle so important, why when it has been that way, it should stay that way. Tournament changed in nature, the break is valued by lots of teams. If you accept arbitrariness, don't see what's more proper or fair than 18. Registrar: sympathetic to make proposals with the same principle. Not standard of difficulty. 11% is difficult break. *Ireland:* ask whoever is still open to change? Some are restricted by country vote. Otherwise we'll just go round in circles. *Germany:* agree that the nature of tournament has changed. The numbers have increased, but maybe not of native speaking teams. Lots of non-native speaking teams have entered. Doubt this increase has effected the break. *Secretary:* question to those who say ESL and EFL breaks should not be considered. If this proposal is voted in and council says speaker points are arbitrary, how do you see the influence on the speaker prizes and the ESL/EFL break? *New Zealand:* Scotland vote will close the debate, that's the one to try and convince. *Singapore:* ESL break is not pegged to a particular point. If it requires break 12 on points, applies to all 12 points teams, in a different year all 13 or 14 point teams. *Canada:* arbitrary main point is that team scores should be weighed more highly. Not saying speaker points are unimportant or arbitrary. It should be removed from the break and only that.

- 15 minutes - break then motion to vote

Europe calls the question, Ireland second. Majority of 24 vote in favour of ending discussion.

Votes Motion 12
18 point break [see above]
Votes status A nations:

Australia no, Bangladesh aye, Canada aye, China Aye, England no, Germany no, Hongkong aye, Indonesia aye, Israel absent, Ireland no, Japan aye, Korea aye, Malaysia aye, Scotland aye, South Africa abstain, USA aye.

Results 2/3 status A: 10 in favour, 4 against, 1 abstain

Votes rest:

Status B: Croatia no, New Zealand no, Philippines aye, Qatar aye, Singapore aye,

Status C: Jamaica aye, Netherlands no, Russia nay, Thailand aye, Turkey abstain,

Status D: Australia aye, Botswana absent, Estonia absent, France absent, Macau abstain, Pakistan absent, Romania absent, Serbia nay, Slovenia nay, Venezuela aye, Wales absent, Zimbabwe abstain.

Overall, weighted vote: aye 55, nay 27, abstains 4

Passed

- Added point: change in ESL criteria -

LP: comprehensive and large reform [see motion 13]. *President:* in terms of procedures, it was a long process to get to the current criteria. General point to be made, is that council is famously ineffective in making new rules and what this should mean. This is a motion to change the constitution. It needs to be seconded to open debate. Macau seconds the motion.

Motion 13

Proposed revision of article 31

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 team 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.
1. The Language Review Officers shall evaluate the inevitable burden of a speaker with regard to the amount of previous exposure to spoken English, as well as the level of complexity if said exposure
 - a. A Language Review Officer will be elected by Council, who will be responsible for appointing a committee to ascertain the English status of speakers.
2. Speaker 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 6 years as a primary language in their home, or social circle, or workplace, or school in a country where English is the primary medium of exchange, or
 - b. Recognizing that an educational program where English is the effective medium of instruction in a non-native English environment is not equal to one that is in a native English environment because the quality of exposure, content, structure, English used for instruction, and the persons instructing the speakers, therefore,
 - i. Each year of education in a non-native English environment would roughly approximate $\frac{1}{2}$ of a year of education in a country where English is the primary medium of exchange, accounting for; country of education, percentage of education in English instruction, and persons instructing.
 - c. Recognizing that exposure to countries where English is the primary medium of exchange can vary acquisition and may diminish as the separation from that exposure increases, have spent more than 6 years in a country where English is the primary medium of exchange,
 - i. Each year of exposure to an English environment from 12 years of age to current should count as direct years of acquisition of English.
 - ii. Each year of exposure to an English environment from 6 years of age to 12 years of age should be equivalent to $\frac{1}{2}$ year of direct exposure to acquire English, only if every subsequent year after has been in a non-native English environment.
 - iv. Each year of exposure to an English environment from birth to 6 years of age should be equal to $\frac{1}{4}$ year of direct exposure to acquire English, only if every subsequent year after has been in a non-native English environment.
 - d. The cumulative period of time under which at least one of conditions (a) to (c) is fulfilled may not

exceed 6 years.

3. Speakers are expected not to be suffering a sufficiently significant disadvantage to qualify as EFL when the cumulative period of time under which at least one of the conditions (2.a) to (2.c) is fulfilled may not exceed 2 ½ years.
4. An appendix of working guidelines for committee procedures, a list of countries primary medium of exchange, and institutions which use English as their primary medium of instruction will be maintained across competitions.
5. A consistent classification of speakers should be maintained across the competition.

Germany: postpone to a certain time, this is not the right circle or time. Just been given today, no time to consult with delegations especially concerns their classification, we need time to talk to our delegates.

Germany motion to postpone, seconded Netherlands.

Procedural motion 14
To postpone the proposed change in language criteria in motion 13 to next year.
Passed

President: hopefully find a way to propose this so people can engage with the idea beforehand. LP: there will be a process next year.

17. Who should fund persons presenting bid defence and report?

Current convenor: bids have lists of subsidized judges. During this year applications of CA's of previous worlds and CA's and DCA's for next year. We think it's the responsibility of the host to send representatives to bid defence and bid report.

Ireland: propose motion 15, financial obligation of hosts no surprise you have to come to Council before or after. Costs has always been born by host institution. Always ratified council reports. CA
Sam: clarify this refers to agreed expectations amongst hosting institutions. Europe seconds.

Motion 15
The hosting institutions should host their CA and convenor to present their bid defence year before hosting tournament and their bid report year after hosting tournament. This should not be the responsibility of the current host.
Votes: unanimous
Passed

18. Archives of WUDC

President: not expect any opposition to having archives, question is how to do it. *Registrar*: is there a suggestion to host archives at ESU? *Europe*: would council mandate to host the archives? *President*: registrar is in charge of holding archives, so we can't mandate others without a constitutional amendment.

12. Discussion on Future of Worlds

President: there not a motion, but two interesting propositions. These concern both 2014 and 2015. We'll have 5 minutes max. to just hear ideas and answer questions. The bid deadline is extended till March 1st, so these are non-binding commitment. It should be interesting to hear ideas.

North South University of Bangladesh, Potential bidder 2014: We heard no intention to bid for 2014 WUDC, we're thinking we'd take the chance to bid. But we're yet to go back and talk to our university and government. Need their permission, without it can't confirm a thing. Need time to check out the feasibility. Have hosted Asian BP with 80 teams and 60 judges. Realise WUDC would be 5 or 6 times bigger. Think of taking a step out. Importance for support for bid from South Asia. University campus is big enough to hold. Can have 400 teams in theatres, not ensure we have the

capacity to allow 400 team. Round about 300 team cap. Approximately 75 debating rooms, that we'll take care of. In terms of accommodation, hotels are tough during Christmas. Have hosted participants in hotels before. Already affiliated financing when hosting Asian BP. For regfee we can't confirm a thing. Had 3 or 4 days to think about it. Dollar rate has increased in last month. If it increases, there will be a very slight increase. Concerns: want to make an informed choice. Do best to keep up with equality, can't promise. Having 9 rounds and a final is more important than a 5 star hotel. Do our best for org comm and adj core. Try to come up with something concrete by 6 months. By 3 months able to come up with something concrete but not everything yet. Strongly want to host worlds, but should also consider other bids.

ULU, Potential bidder 2014: Rumour on twitter for London to bid for worlds. Not at the moment a bid in place for 2014 or 2015. There is an exploratory committee. Is at advantageous committee. Official line: close to say we'll announce the bid. I, Fred Cowell, am just a consultant for the bid. Probably won't be till 2015. Know it in 2 months' time, but strongly encourage someone else to bid. Hope to hoist entire final day in the Houses of Parliament. Unable to offer any meaningful luxury, the exchange rate is crippling to all of you. We'll offer the best judged world ever. Amount of people living in London means ample judges. Unlikely to host 400 teams, closer to 320/340. Only information I can pass on for now.

Indonesia, Potential bid 2015: Not have an official bid yet, but parliament of education have been sending reps here as observers. Observed interest to host in Bali. Very unclear of yet, unclear whether university or government and how to recruit. Interest is being developed, looking into funding. Not know how many teams we will host. Any suggestions, feel free. That's the only information we have. Previous experience, Indonesia has hosted BIND, local BP tournament 3 times. When we'll have a formal bid, will present in Germany next year.

19. Committee reports

President: This year was about cleaning things up and getting things straight and in order. No high aims. One thing I hoped able to accomplish, was try to connect circles around the world. Meeting regional reps. Strong disconnect way worlds is organised and how Council functions. Org comm has been excellent. For council creative thinking is difficult. Quite a few small things take a lot of time. It's one thing to be head of parliament, and another to be the executive with means to implement decisions. Most questions should have been handled a different way. One way is to have another body (executive or regional reps) to decide and then come back to council literally for the voting. Between worlds' council doesn't exist, so there are ways we can improve how we work. Sad that couldn't accomplish all I wanted, I'd like to rewrite the constitution. Can potentially spend time on that next year.

Registrar: Nice to come and know I was going to be registrar. Allowed me to do several things that earlier needed to be done. Circulated names of delegates to all reps. This was an important step, that should be promulgated to the future. Did not fulfil the constitutional requirement that we check that students are actually registered. Tried to track down as many of the minutes as I could. Put the minutes up on a rudimentary website. Will work with Steve Nolan and whoever is secretary to improve this. Worked diligently to acquire all minutes past WUDC. Have them from 2001 onwards. Want to build a website where delegates could potentially meet up, maybe in an online forum. Thanks to most wonderful administrative assistant who updated the participant of the past 4 year worlds.

President: past EUDC approached by member of IDEA staff. They want to cooperate with WUDC more but nothing has happened. Most well-funded debate org wants to.

Secretary: Main aim was to be as efficient as possible. Thankfully(!) this year's meeting has been short. Have also tried to make as much information available beforehand as possible, to ensure we would all be as best prepared for the meetings as possible. Granted that hasn't always or completely worked, but the efforts has been made to spread as much information as possible. The happy news is that minutes are of this moment only 11 pages, and I would like to congratulate and thank you all for helping us achieve that.

Women's officer: I'm Jacqueline Yates, substituting for Sonia Loudon, and asked a couple of days before worlds. Women's forum main thing. Firstly, discussion of women's night in general. Should be role of women officer to find debaters, who should generally be judges, in high regard, with regional diversity: to increase popularity and more. Only whether the debate is run, still up to discretion of organizing committee. Secondly, in the elections for Women's Officer there were two candidates with an 18 to 18 split and no resolution on who should be women's officer. There was a motion Rosie Unwin from accept two people as women's officer. We couldn't see any effect of this running into worlds council, and would have more women this way to engage with issues of specific regions. Thirdly, reports of women's tournament across the world. Finally, a formal complaint was registered. We received text message draw was ready, none knew it was just then, with no communication beforehand or prior warning to finish on time. *CA Sam:* apology, didn't intend that confusion to happen. Just wanted to make sure that participants knew the draw was ready so texted you. *President:* heard of Bob Nimmo's reaction. There was a choice of prolonging the forum for half an hour and postpone entire draw. Not particularly fortunate. You under impression there were different times, the main issue is a lack of communication.

Equity officer: Appointed by proxy as was not elected. Best they can say, the less happens, the better. No one attended the forum so that was very good. All was on best behaviour, all getting along, not a bad thing. Gave the opportunity for any concerns. Generally the tournament was ok, pleased and satisfied. Thank organizers again. Never had less complaints about food, accommodation, or whatever else.

Regional reps.

Latin America and Caribbean: Very pleasing year in region. Major event WUDCSL. Was an astonishing success. First ever championship in this format in Spanish language. 10 different countries, 22 institution, 44 debaters and 22 judges from Spain and Latin America. Various other tournaments were organised. Debate with community leaders held in December. In Jamaica held national debating championships with many teams. Pre worlds tournament in Caracas in June. Worlds prep in Bogota. Trying to create a circuit of tournaments all around. Most important tournament will be WUDCSL in Santiago in Chili. Please encourage the Spanish speaking debaters in your country to apply to attend.

Asia: Interest in BP extended tremendously. Number of tournaments has increased regionally and offers lots of practice. A regional asian, wondered how tournaments would progress Asian BP. Always invite international judges around the world, to see, observe and learn from judges different background. Training has been increasing. Actively many tournaments and workshops in China. Also see debate spreading in Central Asia more. Involvement level in increasingly high. Two bids coming through hopefully, working closely to secure more bids.

Europe and Middle East: EUDC moved to 9 rounds tournament, think this will be continued. Galway was a EUDC good tournament though can't comment myself. We've sent EU debaters out to China for debate about the EU. Thanks for Jens and Steve Johnson for building those relationships. Now at least 3 competitions on at every single weekend. ESU is working with government in Jordan, hopefully Egypt and Tunisia to write debating into secondary education level.

Oceania: Only comment on the Australian perspective. Understand Australs was great success, octofinal break first time this year. Easters ran incredibly well, attracting new debaters. Assume similar positive things happened in New Zealand.

IONA: Very proud to host 6 major international tournament in 10 years. Think Galway did a great job. Huge increase in tournaments. Genuinely causing problems, not enough weekends to fit all the tournaments into. Novice tournaments or novice elements are being added to many tournaments (finals, speaker prizes, buddy tournaments). Also significant is the growth and success of the Oxford Women's Open. The International Mace now has teams from 4 nations. Finally, the ESU has sent trainers to Iceland, currently training high school debater.

Africa: Invite all of you to come and train African debaters. Debate is growing, you can host lots of schools. 60 teams plus in many national debating championships. Cameron, Nigeria, Zimbabwe and PAUDC are the biggest and with international trainers. It was challenging when some of our Nigerian

delegates travelling in the bus back to their country had disaster in which one debater died. Would like to collaborate with the world more in terms of debating.

20. Elections

President: Europe nominates Steve Johnson, Ireland seconds. Steve Johnson accepts nomination. Accepted by acclamation.

Registrar: The Netherlands nominates Eion Kilkenny, Europe seconds. Asia nominates LP from Thailand, Singapore seconds. *Eion Kilkenny:* won't make a speech in LP's absence.

Motion 16
Selecting either Eion Kilkenny or LP from Thailand as Registrar of Worlds Council
Votes: Australia abstain, Bangladesh LP, Canada Eion, China LP, England Eion, Germany Eion, HongKong LP, Indonesia LP, Ireland Eion, Israel absent, Japan LP, Korea abstain, Malaysia LP, Scotland Eion, South Africa Eion, USA Eion, Croatia LP, India LP, Qatar abstain, Singapore LP, Jaimaca LP, NW Netherlands Eion, Russia Eoin, Thailand LP, Turkey Eion, Austria abstain, Botswana absent, Estonia absent, France absent, Macau LP, Pakistan absent, Romania absent, Serbia Eion, Slovenia absent, Venezuela LP, Wales absent, Zimbabwe Eion. Overall, weighted vote, Eion Kilkenny : 41, LP : 37, Abstain : 4
Eion Kilkenny is elected

Secretary: Canada nominates Coulter King, Coulter King accepts. Philippines nominates LP. *Registrar:* he has not agreed to be nominated as secretary, so we can't accept his nomination. Zimbabwe: nominates Simone van Elk, Simone van Elk declines. Korea nominates Tasneem Elias, Tasneem Elias declines. Coulter King is accepted by acclamation.

Equity officer: Germany nominates Tasneem Elias, Tasneem Elis accepts, The Netherlands seconds. Tasneem Elias is accepted by acclamation.

Regional reps: The regional reps are elected by regional elections.

21. End

Anne Valkering, as language officer: I personally pledge to as the language officer to get the process of the language committee started for next year's worlds through the council reps and the language committee.

The Netherlands: one minor point; this year two unions from the University of Split were able to speak, the University of Split, and the Union of Split debating. This has not been caught at council. Unless there are good reasons we want to prevent them being registered again next year. Ireland proposes motion 17. England seconded.

Motion 17
That next year's convenors do their best to ensure their won't be two institutions representing the University of Split at WUDC again
Withdraw with assurance from Germany

Croatia: Croatia reps but also representing Split, only one of these institutions represents the University of Split. *Germany:* on behalf of Berlin, sure will investigate case. *England:* England spends lot of time looking into eligibility before WUDC. Local reps should set up local guidelines. It should be regional and country based decision, not a council decision. And this is also the case per the constitution. Ireland withdraws with assurance from Germany.

Europe proposes motion 18:

Motion 18

motion of thanks to this year's council executive to make sure we weren't here for 32 hours.

Accepted per acclamation

Steve Johnson, newly elected President: once again thanks to Jens and Simone. They were terrific to work with, reason not here so late. We have a very important decision to make in next 3 months. Tendency of body to head back home and forget about it till we reconvene next year. It would be terrible if we did that this time. So please enter your email addresses on my computer so we can stay in touch. When I contact you, with all due consideration, with haste and with concern. Won't happen but for our dedication to make it happen.

Manos Moschopoulos on behalf of IDEA: want to reiterate what Jens said. There is a university fund that has 20 mln dollars. For more information, come and find me. Secondly, I have a leaflet to explain what happens with the new IDEA website. At the moment we have a lot of bugs and we want you to see what kind of functionality it has and contact us with ideas how to make it better. Thanks very much.

President: That concludes this year meeting. Thank you all very much!