

Minutes WUDC Pre-Council Meeting 28th of December 2011

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Roll call and voting status verification
3. Equity Officer / Women's Officer
4. Reports: Botswana and Berlin
5. N-1 Issues
6. Other eligibility issues (including grandfather rule and composite teams)
7. ESL / EFL Participation
8. Agenda setting
9. Bidding issues for WUDC 2014
10. Adjourn

Addendum to minutes:

Proposal for bidding for WUDC 2014

1. Welcome

President: I'd like to welcome you all to pre council session. 42 countries are present in Manila and 207 institutions. It's the most diverse world ever, round of applause. Like to keep it short. All received two pieces of paper, yellow and green. Tell you what we'll be doing next couple of days. Not any very big issues, let's keep it that way. If crops up give it time to be discussed. Firstly, Ahyoung Kim is not able to attend, so she won't be Council Equity Officer. We have asked and appointed Tasneem Elias. The Council Equity Officer is required as part of the appeals procedure regarding equity and also responsible for the equity forum. Secondly, the Women's Officer, Sonia Loudon, is also not here. She has appointed Jacqueline Yates as her replacement. If she's not here or this information is incorrect, we will let you know who the officer in charge is. Final preliminary thing: there is always a slight irritation what the procedure is for Council. We're using an abbreviated version of Roberts Rules. We will try to print copies for council. Finally, today's agenda: when speaking, raise your placard, so please find your country's placard. There will be voting status verification. Registrar Steve has counted, and will explain how it works. The point on the agenda is just a reminder, not to be discussed here. We need to talk about N-1 and any other eligibility issues that need to be discussed. Hopefully Anne Valkering will be here for ESL /EFL participation. We also have to figure out a way to bid. We're not aware of any bids, but will say more at the end. Any questions or additions? – no.

2. Roll call and voting status verification

President: Hand the floor to Steve. *Registrar:* Voting status accorded based on historical representation at worlds. [refer to WUDC constitution for rules on voting status, refer to Registrar's addendum for list of country's voting status].

Croatia: to my knowledge, Croatia is status A. *Registrar:* Last year had 3 institutions, lapse year applied, now 2 institutions so demoted to B status.

Qatar: weren't we promoted? *Registrar:* can only make one rise a year, so if 4 institutions next year, will be promoted to status A nation.

Venezuela: wasn't called. *Registrar:* status D.

3. Equity Officer / Women's Officer

President: already informed you about our interim Council Equity Officer, we'll have to confirm with Jacqueline Yates that she's actually holds this status as Women's Officer. Will update you whether that changes.

4. Reports: Botswana and Berlin

a. Botswana

President: Have to hear reports at Council. Logan informed us that Botswana org comm is preparing or has prepared a financial report and audit of that report. We haven't received it yet. Hopefully we'll get it. Logan has sent a CA-report, we will forward it to you in the next days. *Current convenor Dino:* convenor not officially registered, but in Manila, so he should come to Council.

b. Berlin

President: Berlin have sent the bid defense two weeks ago, we haven't forwarded it yet. They will present the report at Council. Who are the reps from Berlin if there are any questions? *Future convenor Patrick:* the report is online on our blog. *Manuel, communications officer:* go to our blog and the documentation tab for the report.

5. N-1 issues

President: Hand over to Lucy to tell is whether there are any N-1 issues.

CA Lucy: Three institutions are in violation. Colgate University, because of special visa problems one the debaters encountered, participant turned away when boarding plane. We would have helped had we known. Amhurst College has sent 3 teams and 1 judge. University of Split has sent 3 debaters and 1 judge. We hadn't been informed beforehand.

Split Croatia: one team and two adjudicators. Is that violation? Do we have to have exactly N-1 or can we send more judges? *CA Lucy:* not a problem. *Current convenor Dino:* not for judging, but maybe unfair for institutions that wanted to reg more people. Institutions were rejected to reg more judges. Even spots for independent judges were subject to approval adj core. *Europe:* initially they regged two teams and one judge, and paid for all? *Croatia:* in reg system recorded one team one debate more and one judge. *President:* why was this not raised earlier? *Croatia:* we have spoken to org comm. *CA Lucy:* two teams and one judge originally. *Current convenor Dino:* when arrived, just one team, two judges. Concern for other institutions who were not allowed to exceed N-1. Up to council to decide whether that's fair. *CA Lucy:* did pay for 5 people. Not such a problem in terms of slots, because they have paid for beds in hotel. *Australia:* Does this mean there is a team missing from the tab now? *CA Lucy:* now? *Australia:* Capacity of the tournament; Split has extra judge, Colgate and Amhurst are missing judges. So there were 3 people we were expecting. Is there room for more people since 3 not all the judges showed up? *CA Lucy:* very short on rooms. Org comm people supposed to be in hotel, moved to sleep on floors because we made room for more teams. We're very happy to have extra beds in the hotel. *England:* ULU were awarded team and judge, the judge spot erroneous. Possible to convert this judge to either Amhurst or Colgate. Would solve N-1 and not take up extra space as the judge is already here. *CA Lucy:* first Split, than access capacity. *Registrar:* We need a motion to disallow Split to register another judge, N-1 has never been an absolute cap, this has been left to the discretion of org comm. So we'd need a motion to decide. No motion, Split issues closed.

President: both others now.

England: the judge representing ULU is present, she could fill the N-1 spot for Amhurst.

Colgate Ireland: proposes motion 1, Australia seconds.

Motion 1
To allow Colgate their N-1 violation due to the specific circumstances of problems in obtaining a visum.
Votes: unanimous
Passed

ULU/ Amhurst CA Lucy: A clarification: ULU was awarded a team last minute. At the same time, there was a different issue. A judge looking for a spot, tried to reg for 3 different institutions, no confirmation of spot, no payment made, no reg. But the judge got a reg number and did the test. There was the option to self-fund as a judge the whole time, for people without subsidy or N-1. Immediately corrected error in email, can no longer come. She jumped at the ULU spot. Judge still came despite knowing she wasn't regged. Was still offer the self-funded option, she still turned it down. Refused to pay. *President:* recommendations for Amhurst? *CA Lucy:* plenty of N-1, we'd allow them to compete. *Registrar:* does this mean ULU in violation without this judge? *CA Lucy:* no. *Current convenor Dino:* there was an error on our part when we offered the last minute spot to ULU. *President:* recommendation for CA team to excuse Amhurst from N-1? *Registrar:* did Amhurst reg 2 judges? *Australia:* if no one is here to plead the case, we don't think we should exempt them. *Slovenia:* how many people did they pay for? *CA Lucy:* 3 teams, 2 judges. *England:* we need to enforce N-1. Possibly to have it time limited, say within 24 hours? If they can find a judge before then, we would be fine with it. *IONA:* hard to kick out now. Maybe they didn't know they needed to defend themselves here. *Europe:* It's still lunch, could we get someone from USA/ Amhurst? *President:* N-1 one of clearest rules. All country reps know about pre-council. *Japan:* did any of the org comm notify the teams that they have come here to defend their case? *Current convenor Dino:* informed at registration, presume they knew they'd have to be here. *Registrar:* does the CA team or Org comm have a clear position here? *Current convenor Dino:* more difficult for us if we break up a team. We'd have to provide swing teams etc. *CA Lucy:* they've come all the way here and payed for all of the slots, seems to be intent on going through with N-1. We can't accept any more judges, they would have to use an independent judge. *President:* table to end of session, see if someone for Amhurst/ USA rep shows up. Or if anyone wants to field motion to exempt them. Issue is delayed till end of meeting.

6. Other eligibility issues (including grandfather rule and composite teams)

Registrar: My assistant updated all the information on the 4 year speaker rule, we're aware of no violations of the 4 year rule at this tournament. Open to any concerns or challenges about eligibility. *Org comm:* no composite teams. *President:* all teams are eligible. Some debates registered without saying which teams they're in. That's not an issue for council itself but could the representatives please inform these delegations? *Org Comm:* Bates College, Brown, Carnegie Mellon, Debate Association of UA, McGill, Oxford, Science Po, Lahore, University of British Columbia, New South Wales, Sydney, Uni of Tech Jamaica. *Qatar:* we did email org comm. *President:* please come and confirm with org comm after this meeting.

7. ESL / EFL participation

President: the language officer, Anne Valkering unfortunately isn't here. *Secretary:* I've received a text that the language committee is still busy, organising interviews right now, so we don't know how many speakers and teams qualify as ESL or EFL. *Ireland:* question to org comm: are you willing to have quarters if there aren't more than 80 teams? *Org comm:* yes, everything is in place. *Russia:* how many teams do you need to have quarterfinals? *President:* ESL and EFL combined have to be more than 80 to have quarterfinals, as EFL can also break ESL.

8. Agenda setting

a. Procedure

President: we will have a timed agenda. We'll allocate time slots for all issues to be discussed. Council will have the discretion to prolong time, but will have to pass a motion to do so. We'd like to have a 30 sec speaking rule, so no individual contribution should be no more than 30 sec. Then, we will not include any item to the agenda that does not have motion attached to it. Finally, we would like all your motions in writing. Bring printed copies of the proposals, about 50. This makes for a quicker discussion than just talking. Council will be held here because the hotel would mean extra costs.

b. Proposals

President: we have outlined a number of issues in our email of November, but have gotten very little response. Some of the issues on the agenda now. Org comm has raised the issues of whether org comm is allowed to field teams? It was disallowed at this competition. Second one, adj core of bids should be funded by the bidding team at same time of bid defense, same for reports year after competition. Third issue concern tabbing: namely, that all pull ups are now random. Tab master current and future WUDC agreed, that teams that have already been pulled out should be exempt from the next pull up.

Registrar: three issues on agenda: proposal to add the rules as addendum to the constitution with mechanism to alter rules specified in addition. Second, to continue the ranking of teams Colm used to maintain for historical reasons. Third, potentially, whether time has come to allow electronic resources at worlds.

England: would like a clarification on dual eligibility where a speaker could speak for two institutions. England has its own rules, we want to check if they're in line with the worlds constitution. *President:* not aware of any other issues here.

Canada: a motion from last year we'd like to bring forward again. All teams that have winning records, all on 18 point, regardless of speaker scores, would break to partial double octos.

England: every institution that registers gets a team. This is now at the discretion of org comm. We want to inscribe that in the constitution. *President:* concern about reg reform last year was whether there would be enough qualified judges. The worries from Australia are not as strong, so the issue is no longer on the agenda.

Ireland: will these motions be circulated in advance? *Registrar:* we invite all reps to enter their name, email and function on my computer at the end of the meeting. Secretary will send out the agenda and proposals.

Ireland: we would like a conversation about general keeping of history, archives, tabs, hall of fame.

President: I have looked at a general overhaul of the constitution, no one knows what's in it anyway, but it's so much work we would need another year as it would require more discussion.

9. Bidding issues for WUDC 2014

President: At this point we're not aware of any current bids. There are a few ideas, few institutions expressed abstract interest, but prefer not be named. Have tried to contact institutions, but there will not be a proposal presented to council January 1st. Firstly, all of our interest is to reach out to people interested in bidding, secondly, we would like to propose an extended bidding process. Would like interested parties to come forward and present some basic information. *Registrar:* the constitution offers no guidance if bidders are absent. Invite prospective bidder at council. Intend to provide all potential bidders the opportunity to provide any information they would have. Talking only in the most abstract and provisional of terms. Then extend process by 4 months. Offer all potential bidders with opportunity to build by March 1st, opportunity to present to Council by March 16th. Should no formal bids arrive, this would grant the executive the opportunity to extend the process. *Russia:* what is the procedure if there is only one bid and most of us not agree with it? *Registrar:* cross bridge when we

come to it. *Ireland*: the bit would not be ratified and we'd open process again. *Jens*: it would be interesting to find out why people aren't bidding? Is worlds too big? Would like to keep the procedure open.

Steve: anyone would like to make motion to accept the bidding process from the Council Executive. Ireland proposes motion 2, seconded Australia.

Motion 2
To accept the proposal for bidding process provided by the Council Executive [see addendum].
Votes: unanimous, except 1 abstention.
Passed

5.1 Eligibility Issues

Amhurst. *President*: paid 3 teams and 2 judges. In terms of payment not in violation, just short a judge in personal terms. Have tried to contact them and USA rep. Recommendation to give a waiver from the CA team. What do we do? *Australia*: if we don't grant an exemption, would we dissolve a team and have two debaters judge, or alternatively only have 2 teams eligible to break and a 3rd team unable to break? This stage unclear why extra person is not here. Is there a case that they are here but haven't registered? *Ireland*: this sets a precedent that you can pay for a judge and not send one. It's very cheap to register the judges and pay, and not have to pay the expensive flights. *Zimbabwe*: is it essential to vote now? *President*: yes has to happen before competition starts.

Canada: is an option to give them a choice? To break up a team or compete and not break. Agree with Ireland that we have to avoid precedent. *Slovenia*: First, it is a violation. Could lead to a WUDC with just teams and no judges. This institution has been here before and are even native speakers. Propose motion 3: let them all compete. If in council reasonable explanation, we can still allow them to break. Council is only after break announcement.

Motion 3
To allow Amhurst to compete and decide in council about eligibility of their teams to break.
<i>Slovenia</i> : withdraw motion.

Qatar: early deadline for delegates coming in. What has happened in finding information about the judge? *Current convenor*: After settling account, trying to get participants details. Haven't given it, but paid so assumed they were coming. *England*: precedent is that teams aren't breakable, but could still get enough points would have broken. Unless supply judge before round one, only 2 teams eligible to break, and they have to decided which team doesn't break. *Registrar*: what does supply a judge means? Get an independent judge? *Current convenor Dino*: too easy to come with too few judges and hope you have friends with the independent judges. *England*: if Amhurst is not able to supply judge, which isn't necessary as an independent judge for CA team before round 1, all 3 teams speak, but only two are eligible to break. Amhurst would decide for itself which team wouldn't be eligible to break. *Australia*: waited long time to get any reg info. Did you have reg info from all other participants and not the one judge? Then they're not allowed to break. *New Zealand*: they need to explain themselves, so until they do... *Indonesia*: can't decide this right now as we don't have enough information, would be unfair to say they can't compete. We always have a ratification of breaking teams at Council, why not wait for council? *President*: Council meeting is after break announcement. So there wouldn't be time for Amhurst to explain themselves. Also we never have a ratification of the breaking teams at council. *Australia*: Amhurst paid for 3 teams, 2 judges, but they only ever supplied reg information for 3 teams and 1 judge. Council doesn't need to pass judgement on this issue if they are violating N-1. *Ireland*: with

a strict reading of the constitution, entire institutions would ineligible to break. *Europe*: proposal to avoid situation where, remove one 2 teams and 1 judge. We'd take team number 3 out.

- 5 minute break to discuss this -

Australia propose motion 4, Russia seconds.

Motion 4
Worlds council recommends to DLSU Adj Core that Amhurst C is dissolved and both participants are added to the judges tab.

Current convenor: the American rep was found and is on his way after the master debate ends, it's already in the second half, so maybe another 15-20 minutes. *England* proposes friendly amendment to motion 4:

Friendly amendment Motion 4
addition of ' Unless you can find satisfactory replacement by Round 1'
<i>Australia</i>: rejects the friendly amendment.

Japan: recommends means at the discretion of the Adj Core. *President*: yes. *Ireland*: clarify situation by org comm please? *Org comm*: paid for 3 teams and 2 judges. Submitted reg early, last update from them in April. Only names of 3 teams and 1 judge. When arrived at Sofitel to reg and shown participant details, made no edits to details, so no name added. *Qatar*: were they specifically asked at reg for an explanation? *Current convenor*: we're not in that position, we just reminded them that they were in violation.

Question called by Ireland, England seconded.

Motion 4
Worlds council recommends to DLSU Adj Core that Amhurst C is dissolved and both participants are added to the judges tab.
Fails

President: N-1 is not in the constitution itself. Council of WUDC '95 and '97 reconfirmed the principle, and it was published on the DLSU website. Harsh consequence entire institution banned from competition, leave rooms or rebook them. *England* proposes motion 5

Motion 5
if Amhurst is not able to supply judge, which isn't necessary as an independent judge for CA team before round 1, all 3 teams speak, but only two are eligible to break. Amhurst would decide for itself which team wouldn't be eligible to break.

Australia: Also intended to send 3 teams. Doesn't set a good example. Not appropriate to find a judge already at the tournament. This is not an adequate punishment to find a judge from anywhere. Harsh punishment is not to pass anything, which means they would not allowed to compete at all. *Canada*: open discussion or motion England? *New Zealand*: seconded it. *Canada*: hadn't had a change to come and speak to us. Not a 100% sure they didn't have someone. Do have to make a decision today. Provide a judge, either random person or break up a team. If not, all teams would be ineligible to break. Good for council to allow the chair of council to hear explanation and make decision. *England*: case Australia is a choice, but no one would choice. *Ireland*: based on precedent. Council can only decide a waiver to N-

1. Everything else is the discretion of Adj Core and Org Comm. Council recommendations are non-binding to org comm. *Registrar*: all recommendations are non-binding. *Current convenor*: policy on website, policy set by org comm. *Austria*: possibility to give CA team the vote? In some cases justified, in others not. Not good to decide on something we don't have the information on. *President*: only Council can waive N-1 violation on whatever reason. *Japan*: all motions are to punish in some way. Giving the decision to adj core is not in line with general feeling in the room. *Canada*: tried to floor a motion. Which motion are we discussing? *Registrar*: still England's motion. *Canada*: my 'motion' was a friendly amendment to the England motion. *England*: amendment not accepted. Canada proposes unfriendly amendment, Austria seconds. Needs 2/3 majority, amendment fails.

Motion unfriendly amendment to Motion 5
To allow the chair of council to hear any explanation from Amhurst and make a decision accordingly.
Fails

Japan: discussing very long time, master round almost over. Much easier to hear from the US rep. We seem caught between two ends of spectrum. *Philippines*: in case US rep doesn't show up, and given that the unfriendly amendment motion failed, can assume most here would agree with adj core to allow the violation. *England*: earlier idea is that council could not decide on this. In article 10 of the constitution, council decides eligibility. Calls question on own motion.

Motion 5
if Amhurst is not able to supply judge, which isn't necessary as an independent judge for CA team before round 1, all 3 teams speak, but only two are eligible to break. Amhurst would decide for itself which team wouldn't be eligible to break.
Fails

Philippines: move to waive N-1 violation. Canada, Zimbabwe seconds.

Motion 6
To grant a waiver to Amhurst for their N-1 violation.

Zimbabwe: CA recommend to participate. *Ireland*: it sets a precedent for Council, that you can reg and pay for participants but not fulfil N-1. Institution will just register judges and not send them. It will kill N-1 as a policy. *Current convenor*: CA team is ok with making Amhurst decide which team wouldn't break. *Croatia*: is the team willing to accept the punishment? *President*: the CA team is willing to let Amhurst decide which team. This team has been paid for, makes me believe they were willing to send. *Venezuela*: very simple. We have to keep the rule. They didn't request permission from Council or Org Comm. Idea: let them pay an independent judge to be their N-1. Let them drop one of the teams completely out. *President*: we need more time to discuss this, but the 30 second rule comes into effect. *Qatar*: counter proposal, council not grant waiver because of the power of N-1, and in the strongest possible words. Org comm should take all reasonable steps to find out why. *Ireland*: It's our job to decide eligibility. No longer the responsibility for the CA team. *Slovenia*: you could pay 400 dollars not intent to send judge with tickets of 2000 dollars. Lublijana had the same problem. We posted a facebook call, within 4 hours, 5 people were willing to be our judge. It requires minimal effort. *Philippines*: clarification: we were under the impression that adj core wanted to waive N-1 violation. We withdraw our motion.

Motion 6
To grant a waiver to Amhurst for their N-1 violation.
Philippines withdraws motion

USA rep: not know anything about this situation. Didn't know they were at tournament. Proposes a motion, *Ireland* seconded.

Motion 7
Until tomorrow before start 1 st round, or whatever time necessary, Amhurst has the obligation to provide N-1 judges. If they don't, Amhurst breaks up team, with the ability to reverse decision if new information comes up. If they don't decide, their 3 rd team is broken up.

England: motion to determine whether have majority not want to grant waiver.

Strawpoll
not to want to grant a waiver
simple majority

USA rep: this motion would make any consequences reversible. Amhurst can make compelling case to make at President and he can decide for himself. Standard is an extraordinary compelling case. *Slovenia*: amendments: take away reversibility. No reason not to provide name in 8 months. *Japan* seconds. *USA rep*: not sympathetic, rejects amendment. Need some reversibility for the most extreme case. We've had cases in the past. *Australia* calls question on amendment: passes.

Motion unfriendly amendment to motion 7
Removes the ability to reverse the decision to break up an Amhurst team
Passes

Ireland calls the question on motion 7, *New Zealand* seconded.

Current convenor: apparently there was an email from the deputy convenor that Amhurst would be able to borrow a judge from here. Will check now whether such email exists. *New Zealand*: move forward as planned, if email shows up the whole discussion was useless. *Registrar*: motion on the table now is that if Amhurst is in violation of N-1 they would be required to break up a team.

Motion 7 - with unfriendly amendment
Until tomorrow before start 1 st round, or whatever time necessary, Amhurst has the obligation to provide N-1 judges. If they don't, Amhurst breaks up team. If they don't decide, their 3 rd team is broken up.
Votes: 17 in favour, ?? abstentions, 3 against.
Passes

10. Adjourn

Buses leave the Sofitel on 1st of January at 09.00 am.