

Minutes WUDC Council Meeting
January 1, 2013

Agenda:

1. Preliminaries
 - a. Welcome
 - b. Roll Call
 - c. Approval of agenda
2. Old business
 - a. Ratification of Manila minutes
 - b. 2012 WUDC Reporting
 - c. 2013 Worlds Report
 - d. Confirmation of 2014 bid from Chennai
3. New business (this was not followed precisely)
 - a. Consideration of bids for 2014 WUDC
 - b. Restructuring of points WUDC ranking points earned in outrounds
 - c. Clarification of 2/3 requirement for constitutional amendment (England)
 - d. Codification of "Observer" status for nations attending for first time
 - e. Proposal to have 10 preliminary rounds
 - f. Language criteria
 - g. Prohibition of changes to the tournament within a specified time period
 - h. Support Spanish Language WUDC
 - i. Inclusion of speaker point guidelines on ballot / in each room
 - j. Allowing ESL / EFL teams to break "double"
 - k. Registration payment delay
 - l. Registration reform
4. Reports
 - a. President
 - b. Registrar
 - c. Secretary
 - d. Language
 - e. Women's
 - f. Equity
 - g. Regional representatives
5. Elections
 - a. President
 - b. Registrar
 - c. Secretary
 - d. Women's Officer
 - e. Equity Officer

1. Preliminaries

- Several items added to the agenda. Australia moved to approve the agenda. Approved.

2. Old business

- a. Ratification of Manila minutes**

- Chair: Let the minutes reflect that there was concern over the issue of Slovenia's vote at the 2012 Council
- England: Let the minutes reflect that there was contestation over the question about how to count 2/3 support
- **US motions to ratify Manila minutes. Seconded by Canada. By unanimous consent, the minutes are accepted.**
- b. 2012 WUDC Reporting**
 - Dino explained that the university covered a \$34,000 deficit and offered a few ideas for future Worlds:
 - Worlds magazine with eight editions better informed world community and maximized exposure for sponsors
 - Three-day, two-night training camp for volunteers simulated the tournament and ensured that volunteers could answer any questions about issues across the entire tournament (and were trained in first aid). Training also included five modules of online education
 - Took feedback from the tournament, which can be found in the report
 - Sam Block summarized tips for future WUDCs from adjudication perspective:
 - Identify the types of decisions that can be taken in advance. Discussions about how to break judges or prioritize judge allocation (e.g., where two teams are eligible for ESL break v. one for open) are best had in advance
 - Could have better identified roles and responsibilities between adjudication team and org comm
 - Pleased to see the briefing document was adapted by Berlin. We hope that future Worlds will carry on using that skeleton to create more consensus
 - Tried to make independent adjudicator selection process blind to exclude bias. Discretion ought to be calculated so it doesn't overwhelm
 - Judge feedback: anyone who uses Tabbie to use Worlds in the future should look at database to aggregate judge feedback
 - Bob Nimmo has produced a document on tabbing international tournaments; it will be in *Monash Debating Review*
 - **Motion to accept report from DLSU. Moved by England, seconded by Australia. Motion passes unanimously**
- c. Report of 2013 Worlds**
 - Patrick spoke about the budget and other organizational issues:
 - 811,000 Euros of which 140-150,000 is covered by the scholarship. Budget for core competition is 660,000 euros. Of that, approximately 400,000 went into accommodation, 100,000 into food/beverages. Expected more funding a year ago, but most efforts proved to be unsuccessful. But within constraints of tournaments and funding we've had, we've managed to run a decent tournament
 - Diversity achieved at the tournament through support of OSF: 82 nations represented, which is the highest ever. Most African states since Botswana and most Latin American states ever
 - Building up an institutional knowledge base. 7-9 of Chennai team have been with us, and we've had volunteers from 8-9 different countries

- (Zimbabwe, Philippines, Serbia, US, Netherlands, etc.) to pass on institutional knowledge to other countries
- Doug added that Berlin borrowed as many procedures from DLSU as possible and is passing on advice to Chennai
 - Jens: From perspective of tab, I figured out that it is very hard to manage all of this data coming in because every team has a different perspective. Registration is not necessarily collecting data that tab needs and vice versa. I am still tracing down institutional clashes. Tracking all of these things with an unprecedented 270 institutions is very hard. This is also why you didn't get an n-1 report at the beginning of Council. Most in order, there are a few cases I'm still investigating
 - Questions:
 - England: what criteria did you use in selecting breaking adjudicators?
Doug: Nominal rank to begin the tournament, feedback was used. Also crosschecked for regional diversity issues. Members of adjudication team evaluated those most on periphery
 - England: When was it known that room allocation requests wouldn't be met? If it was early, why weren't we informed? Patrick: Theresa did the room allocation, so I can't speak to that. Until the 27th, we had 150-200 people, who hadn't set their preferences at all. Theresa: By the 21st of October, we had around 60% of the names (that didn't include room preferences). Regarding room allocation, first problem is that there were double, triple, quadruple rooms. Also, wanted to put observers and independent adjudicators in a different hotel, but there were requests to room with one another. In addition, immediate check-in was not available for all rooms. We did everything we could, and booked an extra room for one participant, who wasn't happy with the situation. England: As a matter of record, do you know how many teams had filled in all of the correct details by December 1 when you were doing allocations. Theresa: 90% on team details, but don't know about preferences. Also, another problem was cross-checking roommate preferences
 - Jamaica: Concerned about communication – didn't get quick responses. Wanted to remind India that this is important. Patrick: Got down to 7-10 days for responding to emails; occasionally one slipped through, but we were surprised by the amount of communication that we had to do. Want to point out to future potential hosts: imperative to have at least five people answering emails (starting on Jan 1), and we struggled initially
 - **Russia moves to accept report from 2013 organizers and adjudication core. Seconded by Scotland. Unanimously accepted.**
- d. Confirmation of 2014 bid from Chennai**
- Chair: We delayed ratification until this point, even though it's three months late according to the Constitution (necessary to do so given June bid vote). Regional representatives ratify these bids. Absent concern from majority of regional representatives, the bid is ratified.
 - REC bid then provided a presentation on the progress they have made concerning their bid in the past seven months and fielded questions:

- Women's Officer: Are you happy to work with women's night and women's forum? REC: Yes
- Where would the cuts be made? India: There is room to cut on publicity and socials (\$300,000), and food if absolutely necessary. We will not cut hotels, adjudication quality, and venue quality
- IONA: If you raise over the amount you expect, you've given us things you will spend more money on. Why is cutting the registration fee third? REC: We already have the lowest registration fee since 2005, so we think it is already competitive.
- IONA: Have you factored in bottled water, as well? REC: Yes
- Germany: How many teams under Steve Johnson proposal? India: 44 for Berlin break, it would be around 50 here I imagine. Germany: How many without reserved teams would get more than 1 team? REC: Not many
- South Africa: How do you hope to encourage more African teams and adjudicators to attend, and how will they be represented on the adj core? Latin America: Latin America has the same concern. REC: Hope to get OSF to help. Regarding regional representation on adjudication team, will send members of adj core to tournaments in different regions, but we didn't want to expand adj core too much
- IONA: How many spots will be reserved for your scholarship program (Berlin reserved 30)? India: We won't have more than 35 (30 is a good number). It may also depend on whether we increase the team cap
- Chair: Arindam raised concerns about the org comm and number of people involved, so I'd be remiss not to report it. REC: 9 members of REC org comm here at the tournament. Trying to take away some pressure from the org comm in terms of the socials. Already have several individuals who have been involved in running Worlds, Euros, etc. Will make more announcements about individuals working with org comm soon. We plan to import for areas where we're weaker. Chair: Where will you recruit the volunteers, since there are very few people involved in the REC debating organization? REC: Not a concern. Tournament is being run during the holiday season of the institution. Institution has 6,000 students, and we have pledged support of students and faculty members in every possible way. Will offer free accommodation to students if they stay and volunteer. In terms of training of volunteers, we'll be running training sessions
- Latin America: Airline discounts? REC: Talking to Etihad and Singapore Airlines. We're confident that there will be a deal to reduce costs
- Germany: If you can't get a scholarship program funded by OSF, would you self-fund one? REC: In principle, yes. I'd want to talk to the org comm and administration before giving a definitive answer. IDEA/OSF doesn't seem to be worried about their ability to contribute
- Chair: Harish has been extremely forthcoming about questions I've asked. Prof. Praveen has confirmed REC's backing. Nonetheless, I want to express concern that I was caught by surprise by the personnel change. Will you commit to being more forthcoming with communication should

problems arise? REC: Didn't announce convenor change because original aim was for it to be temporary

- Chair: Article 22.4 requires that every registrant provide documentation to prove that they're students. Will the org comm commit to being willing to collect and review documentation of student status, so that we can verify that those students who are registered to compete are in fact eligible?
REC: Happy to commit to that
- India: Will REC underwrite the bid if it's necessary? REC: We'll formalize sponsorships by March, and we think this is highly unlikely to be necessary. Michael Baer: Between registration fees and sponsorships we've already received, we have over \$1,000,000 USD. We are especially confident in the financial standing of the bid
- Chair: absence of objection constitutes ratification, and registrar can design any kind of voting system that they like to make ratification clear
 - Ayes: Iona, Latin America, N. America, Europe, Africa, Asia
 - Not present: Oceania
 - **The bid has been ratified**

3. New business

a. Consideration of bids for 2015 WUDC

- Chair: 15 minutes of presentation, 15 minutes for questions, we can extend in 5-minute increments by motion. Goal is to ensure that each team gets the same amount of time. If first team gets 25 minutes of questions, the second will get the same amount of time. Flipped a coin to determine that Malaysia will present first. Tradition is that the team not presenting leaves the room. Reminder that voting is by secret ballot, and we'll publish only the final numbers.
- Malaysia presented and then fielded questions:
 - Latin America: Can you talk about diversity of adj core and air travel?
JLM: Want to expand scholarships and workshops on debating and judging. We'll members of the adj core to tournaments in the Americas to develop adjudicators. Malaysian Airlines is part of One World - no problems with accessibility
 - Australia: How will sponsorship/adj core overlap between Australs and Worlds impact your ability to organize Worlds? Malaysia: Government backing opens up corporate opportunities, so the pool is substantial
 - Israel: 2004 Malaysia bid promised entry to Israelis with the end result being that no Israeli debaters or judges could enter. First, what has changed since 2005 that now allows you to do this? Could you describe the procedure and not just say hassle-free? Second, how secure will our people be there? Third, can we receive travel insurance information if Israelis lose their passports? Malaysia: This bid has the backing of the government this time when it did not in the past. Most events will be held on campus, which will have active security at all times.
 - Asia: What roles do ACAs perform? Are they involved in motions, etc.?
JLM: They mainly exist because some judges and debaters felt that it was sometimes difficult to get specialized pieces of feedback or questions to

the adjudication team. Their main focus is being a person to give feedback to between rounds. They may be involved in tab or motion selection, but they're fundamentally a communication person between the adj team and the rest of the tournament

- Israel: No answer was given regarding procedure. If everything is so simple, why can't the government send documentation to this effect to our Foreign Ministry? Malaysia: We are at the immigration department even before you cross over to the other side. That's how we do it with professors, doctors, accountants, and so on. The application process is on an individualized basis, and we can't account for special circumstances for individual participants, so we'll extend individual invitations
- USA: Is the tournament held in three different cities? Malaysia: Located in three cities mainly, all in proximity. USA: How long will it take to travel from hotel to tournament venue? Malaysia: 20-30 minutes. We presume delays will only be significant to debating venues, not social venues. Traffic jam is the same that you face in Manila or India.
- N. America: Even if the skepticism is unwarranted and everyone can attend, can you speak to the catering service that you could provide for those accommodations? How can you provide Kosher food if you don't allow Israeli nationals in? Malaysia: Over 40 providers of Kosher food in the country. Many non-Israeli Jews attend
- Canada: Can you speak to what New Year's will look like? Malaysia: Alcohol will be provided at all social events. If you're a delegate, you can enter a 24-hour nightclub for free
- China: Does adjudication subsidy include travels and registration fee waivers? Malaysia: Inclusive of travel only (but also get reg fee waiver)
- USA: What types of accommodations and concrete examples can you give of situations where you supported non-Israeli Jews in Malaysia in the past? Malaysia: One DCA was an English Jew in 2005 Malaysian Worlds
- New Zealand: About ¼ of our squad is homosexual. What protections would we have if we were assaulted at a social event or in the street? How would the police respond to actions committed against homosexuals? This was an issue at Koc. Malaysia: Legal protection against assault/battery extends to all individuals. Laws have never been used to harass homosexuals. We have many Malaysians who are homosexual and can testify to general safety of Malaysia, including the Malaysian delegate. Malaysian Delegate: PDA is frowned upon for everyone, but there are gay bars, motels, saunas, massage parlors, and so on. I've never been assaulted or approached by an individual or prevented from self-actualizing. Assaults aren't responded to differently based on the reason you were assaulted. There are anti-discrimination laws
- Australia: One problem at Koc Worlds is that two gay people made out. Couldn't that be an issue at New Year's? Malaysian delegate: the club is a gay-friendly club, and private security exists only to avoid fights from breaking out. As long as you're not making out on the streets in front of many people, there is nothing to worry about

- Mexico: Could any documentation be presented to show that Israelis have effectively been in the country? Malaysia: We can get documents that Israelis were in the country
- Chair: we're at 25 minutes. If we want to extend debate, need a 2/3 majority to extend it for five more minutes. **Israel moves to extend debate for five minutes. Malaysia seconds. Motion passes unanimously.**
- Israel: Obviously our institutions have legitimate reasons to be concerned about sending students to your country. Lack of documentation makes this difficult, given that I can't just tell Israeli institutions that a government official said it would be ok at this meeting. Malaysia: We will decide on an individual basis but can't allow anyone. Israel: Not asking for every Israeli but need to know broad support. Malaysia: We will send this letter to Israel. Israel: By when? Malaysia: By the end of January
- Auckland bid presented for fifteen minutes and answered questions
 - Women's: IONA has major issues with gender diversity, so it's disappointing to see no IONA females on your bid. Auckland: Lots have pointed out deficiencies, but we are committed to that issue
 - Uganda: Lots of African countries have visa trouble when traveling to Europe. Might this be a problem for Auckland, too? Auckland: Working with New Zealand on visas, and it's someone's job to help with that. Regarding sponsorships, working on scholarships that brought African teams here.
 - England: New Zealand budget has breakfast/lunch at 7 NZ dollars per person. Dinner budgeted as part of socials. Less than \$2.5 USD for dinner, which seems a bit low. Auckland: those numbers reflect money mostly set aside for food. Already have wine sponsors. Lots of finger food for social events provided for free.
 - IONA: Currently flights with Emirate start at 1,200 pounds. This price would effectively exclude all but three of the institutions that broke yesterday due to self-funding. Heathrow spikes around Christmas. So to successfully participate, most institutions from IONA would need to buy their flights 9-10 months in advance. Can you open registration in January, so that we can send teams? Auckland: Lots of airlines fly to New Zealand. Plenty of airlines like Malaysian Airlines, Air France, etc. have periodic specials. In principle, we're ok with Jan/Feb reg opening date
 - Canada: We're a country with two circuits, one in French with virtually no exposure to English and BP as a format. Given that many native-French speakers grow up in environments where line between ESL/EPL are unclear and have never had assessments, are there any procedures where prior to coming to Auckland Worlds, they could gauge language status. Anne: Native African speakers from S. Africa got ESL status at this tournament. It shouldn't be a problem
 - South Africa: How close is your relationship with organizing committees of other tournaments in the area? Auckland: If you came two weeks out from Worlds, that would increase the cost of the trip, but we've factored

that in. Accommodation at the Sydney tournament (hostels: ~\$20/night, plus \$100 for the extra flight from Sydney to Auckland). In terms of visa requirements, Sydney tournament could give less visa assistance, but we're integrated with the University of Sydney Union and have staff members who regularly provide visa letters

- Malaysia: Participants took own transport to all events at Australs. Is that precedent? Auckland: \$15 travel from airport, travel to debates is a seven minute walk. Malaysia: What is your financial stability at this point, or how do we expect to measure your sponsorship trajectory? Auckland: University prepared to fund to same degree as Australs (120-150,000 NZ dollars). We're being given rooms for free, which is hugely valuable. Raised lots of sponsorship last time, and we're in discussions with 3-4 major sponsors. Malaysia: Two spots left in adj core, but three regions not represented. How do you plan to solve the mismatch? Auckland: We're committed to broad representation, provided that we have qualified candidates. Remaining spots likely will go to regions not represented
- Latin American: First concern is same as IONA, but also have problem with visa expense (it's more than \$200) and some countries don't have consulate of New Zealand or Australia. Auckland: Without a consulate, you put passport in tracked courier and send it to embassy. Cost is unfortunate, but we try to show that we give you value to make it worth it
- Europe: Could you indicate amount of sponsorship of last tournament you hosted. Are you prepared to run Worlds without any budget from sponsorship? And are you prepared to put one person on the task of reducing flight costs? Auckland: Australs raised about \$180,000 NZ dollars. Locked in with about 100,000, prepared to run it with nothing. University would increase its participation because they're so keen to have it. We'll add a transport person.
- Zimbabwe: Team caps for warm-up tournaments? Auckland: Unlimited tournament capacity because we have unlimited rooms. We've never capped any of our tournaments because all of the east coast Australian universities have sponsorship agreements with their judges going to Worlds that they have to judge a certain number of tournaments
- Austria: How would you reduce bias towards ESL debaters? Will there be central European regional representation? Auckland: We'll look at whether judges tend to high-ball or low-ball speakers based on their ESL/EPL status. We could also do that for gender and region, and we're exploring that. Not always statistical significance, but another data point for evaluating adjudicators.
- Germany: Are you prepared to work with your government to persuade them that debaters want to change things in their own countries and not just stay in New Zealand? Also, facing higher prices, could you address the fact that expectations for Worlds are so high that many countries fear to bid because they can't provide same fanciness as countries that seemingly have endless budgets? Auckland: Yes, we'll work with them.

We had no issues with Australs. We approached our budget conservatively, so that we don't overpromise

- **England motions to extend by five minutes. Passes unanimously.**
 - Asia: Talk a little more about ESL bias measures. Auckland: There will almost certainly be another ESL DCA on our bid. May also let adjudicators request their stats
 - USA: One of most persuasive parts of bid is the tab team. Could you talk about that? Auckland: Secured Bob Nimmo, who tabbed Cork and Manila Worlds, two of the best tabbed Worlds in recent years. We'll improve use of electronics in tabbing to speed up how tournament runs. A big thing we're attracted to is e-ballots (adjudicators can enter data electronically to speed up process)
 - IONA: Lots of institutions might be only to send one team. Some assurance that you can properly get enough adjudicators? Auckland: absolutely, plus lots of talented debaters in the country would be training you. Have a formal process of accreditation
- Malaysia was invited back for an additional five minutes but declined.
- Chair: registrar will explain process, we'll vote by secret ballot after a five-minute recess. Ballots will be taken between 4:00pm and 4:05pm.
- b. Motion regarding the restructuring of WUDC ranking points earned in outrounds. US moves, Canada seconds.**
 - Article 33 "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:
 - a ~~Where three teams advance from an elimination round, two points shall be awarded to each advancing team;~~
 - a Where a team receives a bye to a subsequent elimination round, they shall receive three points for that bye.
 - b Where two teams advance from an elimination rounds, three points shall be awarded to each advancing team;
 - c Where one team is selected as the Champion in the Main Grand Final, six points shall be awarded to that team." **Passes unanimously.**
- c. Motion regarding the codification of observer status. US moves, Canada seconds.**
 - Article 7.11 "Status D nations are nations represented by teams eligible to participate in the final series of the Championships from one recognised institution for two consecutive years. Nations attending for the first time, or who have had a lapse in attendance of more than 2 years, shall be accorded Observer status." **Passes unanimously.**
- d. Motion about prohibiting changes to the tournament within a specified time period. Europe proposes, Austria seconds.**
 - England: Council can't force a tournament to adopt changes, so it's not necessary
 - Patrick: This is good for alleviating social pressure to accommodate such changes
 - Australia: This could let tournaments not do things they don't want to do
 - India: Key question is what is a reasonable change

- **Europe rescinds motion. England proposes new version, Russia seconds.**
- England: no problem with reaffirming the status quo. Making it clear is helpful
- **England moves to close debate. Seconded by Russia. Passes unanimously**
- **Motion to change Article 7.12 “Where Council makes any substantive change(s) to the rules and procedures of the WUDC that may affect the logistics of hosting the event (i.e.: additional in- or out-rounds, meetings, social events, etc.) within 10 months of the start of the Championships, the host, represented by the Convenor(s) and Chief Adjudicator(s), may apply to Council to opt out of those changes.” Motion passes 91-3-6**
- **Eoin announces the results of the voting for the 2015 host of Worlds. Malaysia wins 57-41.**
 - JLM: If any members or supporters of the Auckland bid apply for DCA spots or any other spots, they’d be treated exactly the same way as everyone else
- e. **Motion to support Spanish WUDC**
 - **Russia moves, Zimbabwe seconds. Unanimously passes.**
- f. **England proposes a motion to clarify Article 7.12 (2/3 requirement for constitutional amendment). Scotland seconds.**
 - Motion to clarify Article 7.12 reads: “Where there is placed before the Council a substantive motion which proposes an amendment to this Constitution, such a motion shall not be carried unless it gains yes votes from at least two-thirds of Status A Nations present and at least two-thirds of weighted votes overall.
 - England: Makes it clear that it’s a weighted vote, rather than waited support. Many times people can’t vote for something because need to converse with caucus. If you abstain, it’s not a yes vote. But you’re still present.
 - Canada: Abstain vote then has the same effect as a no-vote in terms of calculus
 - South Africa: What happens when nations are absent?
 - Canada: If someone is not present for the vote (out to bathroom), how does that play in? England: Counted as not present, but quorum still applies
 - Chair: I think this is a bad idea. If they attempt to abstain, essentially vote no, which might go against interests of constituency
 - Australia: I think it’s good if abstentions count as no. The premise is that it should require more than just a majority and you genuinely need 2/3 of people to be behind it. Also, the conception of the alternative is a weird one
 - Sweden: Under the status quo, if we have quorum and 3 vote yes, 1 no, 20 abstain, would it pass? Chair: Yes, in that ridiculous example
 - South Africa: It seems clear that abstain means you don’t want your vote to have any effect on the vote
 - USA: Abstentions do signify an instance where you can’t make a determination, and countries that don’t want to vote down a motion, but don’t feel comfortable passing a vote, might feel uncomfortable if they know that abstentions are actually being counted
 - Australia: By abstaining I’m not saying I necessarily oppose, but there are structural circumstances that prevent me from voting yes/no. That’s why they need to be counted this way.
 - **Motion passes with none opposed and 3 abstentions**

- g. US proposes motion to add 10th preliminary round (anywhere the Constitution references 9 preliminary rounds, it would now say 10). Canada seconds**
- US: Makes things less statistically noisy and reduces randomness based on position in round 9. Extra round would happen likely on the first or second day
 - England: two brief points. First, one of the key advantages of expanding the break is that it deals with inadequacies of only having nine rounds. Second, there are technical questions about to what extent you get better sourcing. Best dealt with when we have more time
 - JLM: does create certain organizational difficulties. If there were a chance it would create problems, we might not want to have to do this. It would be more accurate, though, especially as tournament size increases
 - Michael Baer: We'd be in a position to do this, but it would have to be on day two. I'd urge Council to consider that it likely means a pretty late day (end at 10).
 - Latin America: Why 10? Doesn't seem to solve the problem.
 - Australia: Four rounds in a day leads to less representative tab. In Botswana, it started at 11pm. The more debating there is, the more tired people become
 - Registrar: People are required to be here for briefings. No reason why we couldn't hold a next round after briefings. I think you should decide based on the debating merit. I think we need more time to look at the statistics
 - IONA: I want to echo sentiments for need for data. Euros has previously had four rounds on one day, and it would be useful if we could produce something together on this issue of debate fatigue based on experience of European circuit
 - South Africa: Isn't this dealt with by the expanded break?
 - US: Based on the modeling that's been done by Shengwu, this is more accurate even with an expanded break
 - Asia: Jens at Botswana Worlds Council made that comparison and it was something like 12-rounds needed
 - North America: Logistically, you can't do it on the first competitive day. In terms of the principle of it, we're all here. We spent lots of money to get here. I think if it makes the tournament even marginally more fair, that's probably beneficial
 - JLM: I was DCA of Amsterdam Euros where we did four rounds in one day. People thought it was fatiguing but worthwhile. The question is whether you want it to be an extra closed round or open round. Also, Worlds is bigger, so more time might be added
 - Israel: Briefing day is a jetlagged day for some of us. We do it in part to help people adjust to the new time zone.
 - Sweden: Adding one more round adds the fairness to ESL/EFL teams, which this double octo doesn't do. Another round also widens the gap between break for open bracket and ESL
 - Registrar: Need to look at this in much more detail. Logistically, there's no reason why this needs to take place over three days. We just think it has to be done that way. I think you should do it based on debating issues and not just logistics. Don't be emotionally attached to New Year's as the day the break is read
 - Women's: I almost fainted after four rounds in a day. This could create medical problems if people get stressed and dehydrated.

- Chair: One thing that hasn't been mentioned is position advantage. Ideally we'd get 8, 12, etc., but at least 9 vs. 10 is an improvement. Statistically significant difference between being in the opening and closing half.
- Australia: adding a fourth round in a day creates inaccuracy. Someone needs to do the math for next year's Worlds. We shouldn't decide this at Council today. There are convincing reasons for it to go either way
- IONA: Let's set up something on one of the debate blog sites that deal with these sorts of issues and accepts papers. Prior to next year's Council, delegates review this before attending and we can have a much more informed discussion
- JLM: There's good stats out there and I'm not able to give you precise figures, but I want you to get out of the idea that there's a correct amount of rounds. It's just that each round adds statistical accuracy. Increase per round is marginal, but it's more important the more teams you have in the tournament
- Zimbabwe: Would you still have the 48-team break?
- Chair: This does not affect the 48-team break
- **Russia moves, IONA seconds. Unanimously close debate**
- **The motion fails by voice vote.**
- Chair: I encourage future investigation of this
- **Ireland proposes a motion to include the speaker scale on the ballot. Ireland proposes, seconded by Scotland.**
 - **Motion: "Council mandates that all future World Universities Debating Championships issue a copy of the tournament speaker scale in each room for every preliminary round."**
 - Ireland: Important for less experienced judges. Allows us to avoid bias. This could be done with a loose copy of the scale or printing it on the back of the ballot
 - England: Wings changed brackets based on speaker scale when the sheet was there. If it's not mandated, you rely on individuals to do it and get variability
 - IONA: There are probably around 100 tournaments/year held in Europe in BP. This means that if you come from a certain region, there are organic shifts in speaks. This is necessary for Worlds in particular
 - **US motions to close debate, seconded by Russia. Unanimously close debate**
 - Chair: This is not an amendment, so we require only a majority
 - **The motion unanimously passes**
- h. **Netherlands proposes to allow ESL/EFL teams to break double. Malaysia seconds.**
 - JLM: Logistically very problematic. Means that it would be impossible for any bid to schedule ESL/main rounds simultaneously
 - Russia: Hard for teams to compete in back-to-back rounds; could influence both results.
 - Australia: What if you let them opt out of main break at beginning of tournament? Shouldn't be able to compete in both
 - Chair: That received strong opposition when it was proposed initially
 - Women's: You'd end up prepping during one round for the next and wouldn't have time between rounds. Scheduling would be hugely problematic
 - England: If teams underperform as a whole, that's bad. Let them declare in advance to reflect personal preferences. Already happens in other competitions

- Netherlands: No objection to any proposal that allows them to do ESL and not main break
- Israel: Make sure it clearly states that it should be a private discussion. Don't want one team to pressure another to drop into ESL break
- Europe: This decision would have to be made before the competition
- JLM: Needs to be clear whether they can change it mid-tournament before the break
- **Scotland motions to close debate, England seconds. Unanimously close debate**
- **Vote: Motion fails unanimously**
- i. Germany proposes a motion to recognize Venezuela's registration payment delay, Russia seconds.**
 - **Motion: "Council shall recognize that Venezuelan institutions receives a general payment delay waiver and are only required to pay registration fee upon arrival."**
 - Germany: Venezuela has national requirements that prohibit large transfers to foreign countries. Botswana and Manila gave them waivers; we think this would give needed clarification
 - JLM: Good to issue a recommendation perhaps, but not to issue this as a strict ruling. Other institutions might claim to have the same technical difficulties. That could be enormously problematic for hosts that need the money in advance
 - Venezuela: We've been participating for four years, we have a very awkward situation that no other nation has (currency exchange control). Only \$3,000/year
 - Registrar: Recommend that this be accepted, but host should have discretion
 - Venezuela: Other nations don't have this restriction. Chennai knows this problem, and Malaysia knows also. We promise that we can pay tomorrow.
 - Canada: Why is there a need to codify?
 - **North American calls to question, US seconds, unanimously end debate**
 - **Vote: motion fails**
 - JLM: Put it in convenor documents. We'd be happy to do it and I'm sure Chennai would be happy to do it
- j. Russia proposes that the presentation of bids be made at Pre-Council. This would not affect voting on bids but presentations by bids. Malaysia seconds**
 - Russia: No opportunity to speak to delegations to switch the voting
 - JLM: Can't speak for Auckland, but I think we both would have appreciated this. There was confusion over issues that could have been clarified at pre-Council
 - IONA: Great idea, information dissemination is really problematic. Delegates may need to email back home to get a wider caucus
 - North America: probably decreases number of caucuses needed
 - US: Would the bids still come back in during Council to answer last minute questions? Chair: Yes, we certainly can consider that
 - Russia: It might make pre-Council longer. Chair: But this day would be shorter
 - **England motion to close, seconded by North America, unanimously end debate**
 - **The motion passes unanimously**
- k. Registration reform proposal**

- Chair: My proposal tried to balance the need for diversity against the need for the best competition. Fast-finger contest has harmed the competition (institutions must register between 16 and 36 seconds after registration opens). We also allocated second and third teams simultaneously. Playing field is not level, and there are times when quality institutions are shut out, demonstrated by historic performance at Worlds (Melbourne ranked 8th in World, 11th in Colm Flynn's, broke two teams last year and one in each of previous years; this year they broke their single team). Of the 20, 10 were not able to bring as many teams as they wanted. This problem is likely to get worse, since we'll have high attendance rates (debate has exploded in South Asia). I think we've swung far to the representative side of the scale (OSF scholarships). I actually like Tom's proposal more than mine, though.
- England: Tom's proposal (detailed in a presentation):
 - Step 1: Within a 3-day window, register number of teams you want
 - Step 2: Compile ranked list on basis of average number of teams in any break in past three years
 - Step 3: Award first teams to all institutions. Could use up all slots, but this is unlikely to happen. This removes fastest finger
 - Step 4: Same is done for all 2nd teams
 - Step 5: Same is done for all 3rd teams
 - Step 6: Outstanding team requests form a waiting list
- Questions regarding Tom's proposal:
 - Russia: Now it makes it difficult for schools to improve because they have fewer teams. England: Averaged over three years, and better than Steve's because less ossification of positions
 - Austria: Your system discriminates against young institutions. No chance to break two teams because you only get one team. England: We need to help with development; the problem is that we have finite capacity. The advantage of doing this is we guarantee that everyone gets a first team.
 - Poland: Disadvantages younger countries; this is our first Worlds. England: There are already guarantees that each country gets represented. This de facto guarantees you a first team. If you're successful, you'll likely get a second team. The current system disadvantages new nations even more because it's fastest fingers.
 - India: This actively victimizes diversity of institutions. England: Need to balance success. Vic Wellington B couldn't be here because of reg system, and B teams often win Worlds. This allows some degree of new institutions (they get first team), but also ensures the strongest schools get additional teams
 - Australia: Right now, new universities do not get teams at all. That is bad for them. Under this system, is it the case that Oxford can't get a C-team until everyone else gets a B-team? England: Yes. 90-100 schools want to send a second team.
 - Germany: Clarification: does this mean one-team per institution policy, then a ranking for second-teams according to historical success? England: No, this doesn't guarantee one team per institution (it's a system for

prioritization). Roughly 250 institutions for ~400 spots, so no need to guarantee this. Chair: only risk of each institution not getting first team is if the entire thing fills up with first teams

- Austria: Why do we need this affirmative action for Oxford? England: Turns out that there are successful institutions that don't register quickly enough. Need some probabilistic assessments about whether second team could break at Worlds
- Michael Baer: Even if you break one team in one year, you move up the priority list. Question is solely: should new institutions get a second team before Oxford does? As much as we all want Worlds to expand, I find it hard to say that we choose a developing institution over Oxford to get a second team
- JLM: WUDC is unsustainable. Are we going to use regional competitions as gateways to World Championships?
- IONA: The current system increases randomness, not diversity. Status quo favors people with shorter team names. At least this is a realistic metric.
- Asia: Perverse incentive for ESL/EFL status. That positional break might advantage them in the next year. Nothing to fix, but just pointing it out that we need to make it more stringent
- Chair: Unclear why developing nations have a better shot at random drawing. Work all the way to the bottom of the list before established institutions get another team
- Poland: Prioritizes countries with a long debating history
- Australia: Knocks Oxford C out of existing, and they can go onto win Worlds. This screws the ESL teams because they break in the main break and then can't go back in ESL in following years (punishing them if they don't make the main break)
- JLM: Need information about how many institutions come in one year and then never return. Lots of institutions come once when Worlds is near them and never again
- IONA: This will be operating in tandem with the gradual regional rotation of Worlds and the grandfather rule (large number of societies flux and spike at different times). Possible to move up in terms of ability; won't be that much ossification. England: only 200 institutions at any given Worlds
- Australia: if you get three institutions on 17 teams, you lose out to an institution that happens to break one team. England: Comparatively better than other metrics for reasons previously explained
- JLM: Not about whether only Oxford C is valuable, but whether Tokyo C is more valuable than an institution that may never return to Worlds after coming. It's about all three breaks. Third institutions that are competitive for ESL/EFL are better than teams that will never return
- Russia: Let's accept this one, and then revisit it later
- Asia: Question to Chennai and Malaysia is whether you'd consider implementing this policy over Steve's policy

- Chair: Unless Council passes a proposal, they can design their own registration system. If we don't pass something, they can do whatever they want, although they've indicated an interest in Steve's proposal
- Michael Baer: We like a lot of what this does better than what Steve's proposal does. Steve's proposal is philosophically consistent, but if good tweaks had come along, we'd have gone with those. This seems like one of those tweaks. We'll start with something like this as a basis if nothing passes and solicit ideas for further improvements.
- JLM: We would alter Steve's proposals slightly if that's the popular opinion. Council should ask future Worlds to abandon the timestamp
- Austria: Don't get argument against using points as a measurement. Why should Monash get to send development team, while others get punished and can't send a development team. England: This supports expansion
- Slovenia: New institutions get a spot over old ones that haven't been historically successful
- Australia: Steve's proposal is better because this prevents existence of Monash C
- Canada: Couldn't we change ESL/main break rule?
- **Russia calls to end debate, seconded by Iona. Unanimously close debate**
- Chair: This is an advisory motion issued by Council that requires only a simple majority as does any other substantive motion that's not a Constitutional amendment (binding in spirit, but not in practice)
- **England made a minor amendment during a five-minute recess: Recommends a one-day reg window . If you're certain you want to go, you'll have looked up the date, and you'll reg within that one-day window even if you oversleep.**
- **The motion passes 61-18-19**
- Venezuela: Let's have a one-month period of discussion, followed by an online vote after the problems have been solved
- Chair: Online forum provides the ability to comment on this
- Michael Baer: We'll finalize the registration system at least a month or two in advance, but we'll certainly wait to announce it until we've seen more conversation and considered any tweaks

4. Reports

a. Chair:

- 20th year attending Worlds. Some accomplishments as Chair included establishing a WUDC website, establishing the World Debating Forum, ensuring there were no violations of the four-year rule, putting rankings on the WUDC website, finding two great bids for the 2014 WUDC. I hope to do a major revision of the Constitution to capture past practices

b. Registrar:

- The big task I performed was conducting the online vote, which was a successful experimentation in voting online. I encourage Council to use online voting only for issues that are quite clear (like bids).

c. Secretary:

- Main issue related to my position has been the form that minutes take. Near transcription was past practice, but is not required (all that's needed is motions, votes, etc.). The minutes now capture much of what was said (but not a total transcription of the meeting, so as to avoid slowing everything down). I'll be putting together a summary sheet of all motions and major events, so people don't need to comb through the minutes to figure out the basics.

d. Language

- 425 people requested ESL/EFL status; committee granted 152 EFL and 200 ESL statuses, 69-70 EFL teams.
- First had people fill out details through FastRego system. Dealt with 350 statuses before getting to the tournament and reduced work at the tournament
- A number of minor issues: not everyone filled in details; in a lot of situations the delegate leader filled in reg, so we got the wrong data.
- 35 appealed, of whom 20 showed up. Decided on the other 15 based on info we already had, and 3/15 got the status they asked for.
- Found out from the process that in a number of cases we're pretty sure we were lied to on the basis of how much education they had in English and how much of their home life was in English. In one case, we checked the person's school online and are now pretty sure that person lied, but didn't pursue that since we didn't do that for everyone else.
- Saw that some people had been briefed on what to say in the interviews, which is not in the spirit of the system.
- Country leaders will be in charge of guiding order of the nation and ensuring that people are not actually lying, since we're not comfortable being the police
- Differences in early age English education and later age education in English (15-20). We think we might want to make some changes later, but we do want to suggest that we meet up to have a meeting with interested people tomorrow, and discuss this in an online forum.

e. Women's

- Women's forum produced good ideas, but it was badly announced and poorly attended. We'll talk to Chennai about putting it on the schedule more clearly. There was a good discussion of how to recruit and retain younger female debaters
- 37% of debaters at this tournament are female, 63% are male. Some think this is encouraging, but I think we still need to make lots of progress
- Hoping to ask future tournaments to record participants, so we have this data in the future for comparison
- Around the world, Australia is faring well, and Asia is thinking of holding a women's tournament with a novice break. Apparently some American women wanted to set up all-women tournament on campus and were denied by an all-male faculty. This appears to be a surprise to the US rep
- Upset that name of gender night was changed; Berlin had seen an earlier form of the Constitution and thought they were organizing it without consultation of women's officers. Chennai will call it women's night and work with the officers

f. Equity:

- Not a lot of complaints

g. Regional reports

- IONA:
 - For the first time ever, a Welch team broke. It's a developing circuit, so this is an amazing success. Come to our tournaments
- Latin America:
 - Trying to spread this format of debating in Latin America and Caribbean
 - Working to add new tournaments and improve them
- North America:
 - North America had a successful Worlds, breaking 12 teams
 - Lots of debating in North America: APDA and CUSID has tournaments each weekend, US BP circuit continues to grow
 - NorthAms hosted by Toronto last year, will be held by Syracuse this year
- Oceania:
 - It's going well
- Europe:
 - Created Debating League of Europe (points system with winner)
 - This is a European thing that hopefully works and may allow us to create a league scene
- Africa:
 - Many African tournaments, including PAUDC
 - Normally we've seen South Africa dominating, but we've managed to move the tournament to other parts of Africa (next PAUDC in Nigeria)
 - Despite African institutions breaking at IVs, still feel that they're not being invited to other regional tournaments. We'd appreciate invitations
 - Debate Africa Foundation – run training sessions in different African countries. Want to invite international adjudicators to run this program
- Asia:
 - Debate is thriving in Asia and has lots of growth potential
 - Asia BP and UADC Councils to discuss debate in Asia

5. Elections:

- President/Chair:
 - Venezuela nominates Steve Johnson, England seconds. Steve accepts
 - **Council unanimously re-elects Steve**
- Registrar:
 - Qatar nominates Eoin Kilkenny, IONA seconds. Eoin says he may not be able to come back next year, but he would like to serve if possible
 - **Council unanimously re-elects Eoin**
- Secretary:
 - Qatar nominates Zola Valashiya, Ireland seconds. Zola accepts
 - **Council unanimously elects Zola**
- Equity Officer:
 - South Africa nominates Tasneem Elias, India seconds. Tasneem accepts
 - **Council unanimously elects Tasneem**

North America motions to adjourn, England seconds. Council votes unanimously to adjourn