

2015 WSFS BUSINESS MEETING AGENDA
SASQUAN, THE 73RD WORLD SCIENCE FICTION CONVENTION
SPOKANE, WASHINGTON
Thursday, August 20;
Friday, August 21;
Saturday, August 22, 2015; and
Sunday, August 23, 2015

Table of Contents

PRELIMINARY BUSINESS MEETING, THURSDAY, AUGUST 20, 2015 6

B. NEW BUSINESS 6

 B.2 Resolutions 6

 B.2.6 Short Title: PI Scope..... 6

A. BUSINESS PASSED ON FROM LONCON 3 7

 A.1 Short Title: Popular Ratification (“2 plus 1”) 7

 A.2 Short Title: A Story by Any Other Name 9

 A.3 Short Title: Hugo Finalists 10

 A.4 Short Title: WSFS Membership Types and Rates 11

B. NEW BUSINESS 12

 B.1 Constitutional Amendments 12

 B.1.2 Short Title: The Five Percent Solution 13

 B.1.5 Short Title: Multiple Nominations 13

 B.1.6 Short Title: Nominee Diversity 14

 B.1.7 Two-Year Eligibility 15

 B.1.3 Short Title: Best Series 17

 B.1.8 Electronic Signatures 20

 B.1.1 Short Title: 4 and 6 23

 B.1.4 Short Title: E Pluribus Hugo (Out of the Many, a Hugo) 26

 B.2 Resolutions 37

 B.2.1 Short Title: I Remember the Future..... 37

 B.2.2 Short Title: Hugo Eligibility Extension for Predestination 37

 B.2.3 Short Title: Hugo Nominating Data Request 38

 B.2.4 Short Title: Open Source Software..... 38

 B.2.5 Short Title: MPC Funding 39

C.	COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MOTIONS.....	40
C.1	Standing Committees of WSFS	40
C.1.1	Mark Protection Committee (Including Nominations for MPC)	40
BUSINESS MEETING, FRIDAY, AUGUST 21, 2015		44
C.	COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MOTIONS (continued)	44
C.1	Standing Committees of WSFS	44
C.1.1	Mark Protection Committee	44
C.2	Standing Committees of the Business Meeting	44
C.2.1	Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee.....	45
C.2.2	Worldcon Runners Guide Editorial Committee	45
C.3	Special Committees.....	46
C.3.1	Formalization of Long List Entries (FOLLE) Committee	46
C.3.2	YA Hugo Award Study Committee	46
C.3.3	WSFS Membership Types and Rates Committee	48
B.	NEW BUSINESS	48
B.2	Resolutions.....	48
B.2.1	Short Title: I Remember the Future.....	48
B.2.2	Short Title: Hugo Eligibility Extension for Predestination	49
B.2.3	Short Title: Hugo Nominating Data Request	49
B.2.7	FOLLE Committee.....	51
B.2.8	YA Award Committee.....	51
B.2.9	Membership Rates & Types Committee	51
C.1	Standing Committees of WSFS	52
C.1.1	Mark Protection Committee (Election Results)	52
B.	NEW BUSINESS	54
B.2	Resolutions.....	54
B.2.5	Short Title: MPC Funding.....	54
C.	COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MOTIONS.....	54
D.	WORLDCON REPORTS	54
D.1	Past Worldcons & NASFiC	54
D.1.1	Millennium Philcon (2001)	54

- A. BUSINESS PASSED ON FROM LONCON 3 55
 - A.1 Short Title: Popular Ratification (“2 plus 1”) 55
- B. NEW BUSINESS 58
 - B.2 Resolutions 58
 - B.2.4 Short Title: Open Source Software..... 58
- BUSINESS MEETING, SATURDAY, AUGUST 22, 2015 61
- E. SITE SELECTION BUSINESS 61
 - E.2 Question time for the Seated Worldcons 61
 - E.2.1 MidAmeriCon II (Worldcon in 2016) 61
 - E.1 Report of the 2017 Worldcon Site Selection and Presentation by Winners 61
 - E.2 Question time for the Seated Worldcons (continued) 63
 - E.2.2 Worldcon 75 (Worldcon in 2017) 63
- A. BUSINESS PASSED ON FROM LONCON 3 (continued) 63
 - A.2 Short Title: A Story by Any Other Name 63
 - A.3 Short Title: Hugo Finalists 66
 - A.4 Short Title: WSFS Membership Types and Rates 66
- B. NEW BUSINESS 67
 - B.1 Constitutional Amendments 67
 - B.1.2 Short Title: The Five Percent Solution 67
 - B.1.5 Short Title: Multiple Nominations 69
 - B.1.6 Short Title: Nominee Diversity 70
- BUSINESS MEETING, SUNDAY, AUGUST 23, 2015 72
- B. NEW BUSINESS 72
 - B.1 Constitutional Amendments 72
 - B.1.5 Short Title: Multiple Nominations 72
 - B.1.4 Short Title: E Pluribus Hugo (Out of the Many, a Hugo) 73
 - B.1.1 Short Title: 4 and 6 78
 - B.1.3 Short Title: Best Series 82
 - B.1.6 Short Title: Nominee Diversity 82
 - B.1.8 Electronic Signatures 84

- E. ADJOURNMENT 86
 - E.1 Adjournment Sine Die..... 86
- D. WORLDCON REPORTS 87
 - D.1.2 Anticipation (2009)..... 87
 - D.1.3 Chicon 7 88
 - D.1.4 LoneStarCon 3 89
 - D.1.5 Detcon1 92
 - D.1.6 Loncon 3 95
 - D.2 Seated Worldcons..... 98
 - D.2.1 Sasquan 98
 - D.2.2 MidAmeriCon II 103
- C. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS 105
 - C.1 Standing Committees 105
 - C.1.1 Mark Protection Committee 105
 - C.2 Standing Committee Appointments 105
 - C.2.1 Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee..... 105
 - C.2.2 Worldcon Runners’ Guide Editorial Committee 105
 - C.3 Special Committee Appointments by Resolution 105
 - C.3.1 Formalization of Long List Entries (FOLLE) Committee 105
 - C.3.2 YA Hugo Study Committee 106
 - C.3.3 WSFS Membership Types and Rates Committee 106
 - C.3.4 Best Series 106
- F. ANNOUNCEMENTS 106
 - F.1 Former Worldcon Chairs Photo Session 106
 - F.2 Mark Protection Committee Meeting 106
 - F.3 How to Join SMOFs Email List 106
- APPENDIX 1..... 108
- APPENDIX 2..... 117
- APPENDIX 3..... 128
 - B.1 Constitutional Amendments 128
 - B.1.1 Short Title: 4 and 6 128
 - B.1.4 Short Title: E Pluribus Hugo (Out of the Many, a Hugo) 129

2015 WSFS BUSINESS MEETING AGENDA
SASQUAN, THE 73RD WORLD SCIENCE FICTION CONVENTION
SPOKANE, WASHINGTON
Thursday, August 20;
Friday, August 21;
Saturday, August 22, 2015; and
Sunday, August 23, 2015

All meetings were held in Room 300AB of the Spokane Convention Center in Spokane, Washington, with Kevin Standlee presiding over all sessions of the Business Meeting. The Officers were:

Presiding Officer:	Kevin Standlee
Deputy Presiding Officer	Jared Dashoff
Parliamentarian	Donald E. Eastlake III
Secretary:	Linda Deneroff
Timekeeper:	Jesi Pershing
Videographer:	Lisa Hayes
Sergeant-at-Arms	Joyce Reynolds-Ward

The debates in these minutes are not word for word accurate, but every attempt has been made to represent the sense of the arguments made. These minutes are complete and accurate to the best of the Secretary's knowledge, based on contemporaneous notes and verified against the video, and the Presiding Officer has reviewed them.

Voting is done in a variety of ways in the course of the Business Meeting. The Mark Protection Committee members are usually elected on paper ballots, using the preferential "instant runoff" ballot. Most voting in the course of the meeting is done by an uncounted show of hands or, less commonly, by acclamation. If a voice or show of hands vote appears close or if a counted vote is considered important, a counted "serpentine" vote is held.

The proceedings of these meetings will be recorded per Standing Rule 1.6. Any member may make their own recordings and distribute them at their discretion.

If the agenda order is rearranged, the minutes will reflect the order in which items took place, but the items will retain their original numbers from the agenda.

PRELIMINARY BUSINESS MEETING, THURSDAY, AUGUST 20, 2015

The meeting was called to order at 10:10 a.m. The business meeting staff consisted of Kevin Standlee, Presiding Officer; Jared Dashoff, Deputy Presiding Officer; Donald E. Eastlake III, Parliamentarian; Linda Deneroff, Secretary; Jesi Pershing, Timekeeper; Lisa Hayes, Videographer; and Joyce Reynolds-Ward, Sergeant-at-Arms.

The Business Meeting was conducted in an order different from that shown in the agenda. These minutes follow that new order, but follow the numbering in the agenda.

B. NEW BUSINESS

B.2 Resolutions

B.2.6 Short Title: PI Scope

Moved, to amend Standing Rule 1.2 to clarify that Postpone Indefinitely does not apply to constitutional amendments awaiting ratification, and furthermore to clarify that Postpone Indefinitely may apply to new constitutional amendments, by inserting words as follows:

Rule 1.2: Preliminary Business Meeting(s). The Preliminary Business Meeting may not directly reject, pass, or ratify amendments to the Constitution; however, all motions adhering to a Constitutional amendment are in order if otherwise allowed. The Preliminary Business Meeting may not refer a Constitutional amendment to a committee unless the committee's instructions are to report to the Main Business Meeting. The Preliminary Business Meeting may not postpone consideration of a Constitutional amendment [pending ratification](#) beyond the last Preliminary Business Meeting. The Preliminary Business Meeting may not amend a Constitutional amendment pending ratification. The Preliminary Business Meeting may consider any business not expressly forbidden to it by the Standing Rules or expressly reserved to the Main Business Meeting.

Moved by: The Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

Commentary: This change clarifies the legislative intent of the motion to Postpone Indefinitely. Postpone Indefinitely was not intended to apply to constitutional amendments awaiting ratification; however, it was intended to be applicable to new constitutional amendments. This change also incidentally allows the Preliminary Business Meeting to Postpone Definitely a new constitutional amendment to the Main Business Meeting; however, this is not a significant change and the Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee does not anticipate that this would result in any substantive effect.

The committee also moves to Suspend the Rules and adopt this rule immediately.

Additional Commentary: A new rule was adopted last year called "Postpone Indefinitely," which is a replacement for an older rule called "Objection to

Consideration.” Just recently, however, the Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee realized that there’s a small inconsistency between it and another Standing Rule. A move to postpone indefinitely can be made only at the Preliminary Business Meeting is to kill the targeted motion for the duration of the current Worldcon, although it can be reintroduced at the follow year’s Worldcon. It’s not supposed to be allowed on motions that are up for ratification in the current year (having been passed the prior year), and it is debatable for a total of four minutes, split between pro and con, to discuss whether we should consider the question. A two-thirds vote against consideration kills the motion.

Discussion: Tim Illingworth explicated why this resolution took precedence. It was discovered that no Constitutional amendment could be postponed beyond the Preliminary Business Meeting, which was not the intention of the resolution. “Postpone Indefinitely” may be applied to new business, but not to existing business, e.g., motions awaiting ratification. Adding the phrase “pending ratification” after “consideration of a Constitutional amendment” will make Postpone Indefinitely work properly for new business.

Without objection this amendment was adopted; additionally, without objection, the rules were suspended to allow the change to take effect immediately. Dr. Andrew Adams asked if the four-minute debate time limit on the debate was amendable. It is, but it takes a two-thirds vote to change debate times.

The purpose of the Preliminary Business Meeting is to set debate time limits on Constitutional amendments and take nominations for the Mark Protection Committee.

A. BUSINESS PASSED ON FROM LONCON 3

The following Constitutional Amendments were approved at Loncon 3 and passed on to Sasquan for ratification. If ratified, they will become part of the Constitution at the conclusion of Sasquan.

A.1 Short Title: Popular Ratification (“2 plus 1”)

Moved, to modify the existing constitutional amendment process so that proposed amendments passed by a WSFS Business Meeting and ratified by the following Business Meeting must be ratified by a vote of the members of the following Worldcon; to provide for special handling of the ratification of this proposal; and to provide for the transition between ratification systems, by ~~striking out~~ and adding words as follows:

1. Amend existing Sections 6.6 and 6.7 of the WSFS Constitution by consolidating them and by adding new provisions to modify the amendment process to a form of popular ratification:

Section 6.6: Amendment.

6.6.1. The WSFS Constitution may be amended by a motion passed by a simple majority at any Business Meeting but only to the extent that such motion is initially ratified by a simple majority at the Business Meeting of the subsequent Worldcon and finally ratified by a vote of the members of the Worldcon following the initial ratification.

6.6.2. Any member eligible to cast a Site Selection ballot may vote on the ratification of pending constitutional amendments in the same manner as Section 4.1; however, no fee beyond membership in the administering convention shall be required to vote on the ratification.

6.6.3. Ratification voting at the Worldcon should be available at least during the same times as Site Selection, and ratification ballots should be distributed at the same time as Site Selection ballots; however, a breach of this clause shall not render an otherwise legal ratification invalid.

6.6.4. The Business Meeting may provide by Standing Rule procedures for including arguments for and against the ratification of any Constitutional amendment.

6.6.5. Any amendment that receives more yes votes than no votes shall be ratified.

6.6.6. The results of the ratification votes shall be announced at the same session of the Business Meeting at which the results of Site Selection are announced, and may also be announced at any time after the votes have been counted at the discretion of the Worldcon administering the ratification vote. Failure to announce the results at the required time shall not affect the validity of the results.

Section 6.7: Commencement.

6.6.7. ~~Any~~ Unless otherwise provided, any change to the Constitution of WSFS shall take effect at the end of the Worldcon at which such change is finally ratified by vote of the membership. ~~except that no~~

6.6.8. No change imposing additional costs or financial obligations upon Worldcon Committees shall be binding upon any Committee already selected at the time when it takes effect.

2. Amend Section 6.3 of the WSFS Constitution to include references to ratification elections for pending Constitutional Amendments:

Section 6.3: Electronic Voting. Nothing in this Constitution shall be interpreted to prohibit conducting Hugo Awards nominating and voting, ratification elections for pending Constitutional amendments, and Site Selection voting by electronic means, except that conducting Site Selection by electronic means shall require the unanimous agreement of the current Worldcon committee and all bidding committees who have

filed before the ballot deadline. Valid paper ballots delivered by any means shall always be acceptable. This section shall not be interpreted to require that such elections be conducted electronically, nor shall it be interpreted to allow remote participation or proxy voting at the Business Meeting.

3. *Amend Standing Rule 1.3 to administer the provisions of Section 6.6:*

Rule 1.3: Main Business Meeting(s). The Main Business Meeting may reject, pass, or initially ratify amendments to the Constitution. One Main Meeting shall also be designated as the Site-Selection Meeting, where Site-Selection business shall be the special order of business. The results of any votes to ratify pending constitutional amendments shall be announced at the Site Selection Meeting following Site Selection Business.

Provided that,

1. Section 3 of this proposal shall not become a part of the Standing Rules unless the constitutional amendment is ratified.
2. Constitutional amendments that receive first passage at or after the 2016 Worldcon shall be subject to this amendment.
3. This proposal shall be subject to re-ratification by the 2022 Business Meeting, and the re-ratification vote shall be automatically on the 2022 Business Meeting agenda. Should the 2022 Business Meeting fail to re-ratify this proposal, any constitutional amendments initially adopted at the 2021 or later Business Meetings shall not be subject to a popular ratification vote by members of a subsequent Worldcon.

Debate time was set at 10 minutes. [Please click here to jump to Friday's discussion.](#)

A.2 Short Title: A Story by Any Other Name

Moved, to amend Article 3 of the WSFS Constitution to clarify that eligibility for the fiction categories should be based on content rather than the format of delivery, by amending as follows:

By inserting a new section after existing 3.2.5:

Section 3.2.6: the categories of Best Novel, Novella, Novelette, and Short Story shall be open to works in which the text is the primary form of communication, regardless of the publication medium, including but not limited to physical print, audiobook, and ebook.

And amending section 3.2.5:

Section 3.2.5: In the story ~~written-fiction~~ categories (3.3.1 – 3.3.5), an author may withdraw a version of a work from consideration if the author feels that the version is not representative of what that author wrote.

Debate time was set at 6 minutes. [Please click here to jump to Saturday's discussion.](#)

A.3 Short Title: Hugo Finalists

Moved, to amend portions of Article 3 of the WSFS Constitution to change references to those works or people that appear on the final Hugo Award ballot to “finalist” and to change references to “candidate” from “nominee,” as shown:

Section 3.7: Nominations.

3.7.1: The Worldcon Committee shall conduct a poll to select the ~~nominees~~-[finalists](#) for the ~~final~~ Award voting. Each member of the administering Worldcon, the immediately preceding Worldcon, or the immediately following Worldcon as of January 31 of the current calendar year shall be allowed to make up to five (5) equally weighted nominations in every category.

3.7.2: The Committee shall include with each nomination ballot a copy of Article 3 of the WSFS Constitution and any applicable extensions of eligibility under Sections 3.2.3 or 3.4.

3.7.3: Nominations shall be solicited only for the Hugo Awards and the John W. Campbell Award for Best New Writer.

Section 3.9: Notification and Acceptance.

3.9.1: Worldcon Committees shall use reasonable efforts to notify the ~~nominees~~-[finalists](#), or in the case of deceased or incapacitated persons, their heirs, assigns, or legal guardians, in each category prior to the release of such information. Each ~~nominee~~-[finalist](#) shall be asked at that time to either accept or decline the nomination. If the ~~nominee~~-[finalist](#) declines nomination, that ~~nominee~~-[finalist](#) shall not appear on the final ballot.

3.9.2: In the Best Professional Artist category, the acceptance should include citations of at least three (3) works first published in the eligible year.

3.9.3: Each ~~nominee~~-[finalist](#) in the categories of Best Fanzine and Best Semiprozine shall be required to provide information confirming that they meet the qualifications of their category.

Section 3.10: Voting.

3.10.1: Final Award voting shall be by balloting in advance of the Worldcon. Postal mail shall always be acceptable. Only WSFS members may vote. Final Award ballots shall include name, signature, address, and membership-number spaces to be filled in by the voter.

3.10.2: Final Award ballots shall list only the Hugo Awards and the John W. Campbell Award for Best New Writer.

3.10.3: “No Award” shall be listed in each category of Hugo Award on the final ballot.

3.10.4: The Committee shall, on or with the final ballot, designate, for each ~~nominee~~-[finalist](#) in the printed fiction categories, one or more books, anthologies, or magazines in which the ~~nominee~~-[finalist](#) appeared (including the book publisher or magazine issue date(s)).

3.10.5: Voters shall indicate the order of their preference for the ~~nominees~~-[finalists](#) in each category.

Section 3.11: Tallying of Votes.

3.11.1: In each category, tallying shall be as described in Section 6.4. “No Award” shall be treated as a ~~nominee~~-[finalist](#). If all remaining ~~nominees~~-[finalists](#) are tied, no tie-breaking shall be done and the ~~nominees~~-[finalists](#) excluding “No Award” shall be declared joint winners.

3.11.2: “No Award” shall be given whenever the total number of valid ballots cast for a specific category (excluding those cast for “No Award” in first place) is less than twenty-five percent (25%) of the total number of final Award ballots received.

3.11.3: “No Award” shall be the run-off candidate for the purposes of Section 6.5.

3.11.4: The complete numerical vote totals, including all preliminary tallies for first, second, . . . places, shall be made public by the Worldcon Committee within ninety (90) days after the Worldcon. During the same period the nomination voting totals shall also be published, including in each category the vote counts for at least the fifteen highest vote-getters and any other nominee receiving a number of votes equal to at least five percent (5%) of the nomination ballots cast in that category, but not including any nominee receiving fewer than five votes.

Debate time was set at 2 minutes. [Please click here to jump to Saturday’s discussion.](#)

A.4 Short Title: WSFS Membership Types and Rates

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution by inserting a new section between sections 1.5.7 and 1.5.8:

1.5.X: No convention committee shall sell a membership that includes any WSFS voting rights for less than the cost of the Supporting Membership required by Article 4 in the selection of that convention.

Debate time was set at 4 minutes. [Please click here to jump to Saturday’s discussion.](#)

B. NEW BUSINESS

B.1 Constitutional Amendments

Items under this heading have not yet received first passage and will become part of the constitution only if passed at Sasquan and ratified at MidAmeriCon II. The Preliminary Business Meeting may amend items under this heading, set debate time limits, refer them to committee, and take other action as permitted under the Standing Rules.

The order of agenda items was changed by the business meeting staff into more logical order. Ben Yalow, however, moved to use the original agenda order seeing as the meeting would always have the right to postpone items until later. The motion was seconded. A debate limit of 8 minutes was set. Mr. Yalow felt this should be the decision of the assembly, not the Chairman or the podium staff. Bill Taylor asked if the agenda was published in advance and approved by the meeting. The Chair responded that that is not typically done and that it was the job of the Preliminary Business Meeting to set the agenda. Mr. Taylor felt that if the agenda had not been approved in advance, then changing it now would be appropriate. Kate Secor spoke against reverting to the printed agenda since the proposed new agenda would ensure that all items were dealt with, not just the hot-button issues. Tim Illingworth felt the order was random no matter whether the printed order or the rearranged order, and he trusted the head table to do it right. Linda Deneroff, the Secretary of the Business Meeting, pointed out that the original order of the agenda was simply the order in which items were submitted. There was no attempt to move things around, but the head table felt the rearranged order was more logically presented.

Ari Goldstein asked for explication as to how the order was chosen, but the Chair did not feel the head table should debate the motion. Howard Rosenblatt said he felt from a practical standpoint for those trying to follow the agenda, it would be easier to follow the original printed one. The Chair pointed out that if the meeting reverted to the printed order, it would do so both for setting time limits and for actual debate.

Thomas Monahan inquired if the revised schedule would push E Pluribus Hugo into Friday's schedule. The Chair replied that it might, depending on how quickly the preliminary got through things. Mr. Yalow confirmed that the legislative intent of his motion was to have E Pluribus Hugo and 4 and 6 discussed on Friday instead of Sunday, if there were enough time to do so. Dara Korra'ti preferred the discussion take place on Sunday since there would be more time for debate. However, Keith "Kilo" Watt, the lead sponsor of the E Pluribus Hugo motion, stated that he needed to leave the meeting by one o'clock on Sunday. He didn't care which day the discussion took place as long as it was completed by 12:45 p.m. Warren Buff preferred the printed order; he felt there was no strong reason to deviate from the traditional order without having discussed it as a parliamentary body. Perianne Lurie preferred to discuss on

Sunday since we would then have data from this year's Hugo nominations, and it hard to debate this in a vacuum.

On a show of hands, the motion to revert to the original printed order failed. The meeting then proceeded, using the order proposed by the head table staff and displayed on the slides in the meeting room.

B.1.2 Short Title: The Five Percent Solution

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution to eliminate the requirement that finalists must appear on at least 5% of ballots in a category, by ~~striking out~~ words as follows:

~~3.8.5: No nominee shall appear on the final Award ballot if it received fewer nominations than five percent (5%) of the number of ballots listing one or more nominations in that category, except that the first three eligible nominees, including any ties, shall always be listed.~~

3.11.4: The complete numerical vote totals, including all preliminary tallies for first, second, ... places, shall be made public by the Worldcon Committee within ninety (90) days after the Worldcon. During the same period the nomination voting totals shall also be published, including in each category the vote counts for at least the fifteen highest vote-getters ~~and any other candidate receiving a number of votes equal to at least five percent (5%) of the nomination ballots cast in that category,~~ but not including any candidate receiving fewer than five votes.

Proposed by: Chris Gerrib, Catherine Faber and Steven desJardins

Commentary: The past few years have seen short fiction final ballots consisting of less than five nominations. This deprives members of the option of voting on a full slate. By removing the 5% rule, we ensure that a full slate is presented in every category.

Debate time was set at 6 minutes. [Please click here to jump to Saturday's discussion.](#)

B.1.5 Short Title: Multiple Nominations

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution to eliminate the possibility of a work simultaneously appearing on the final ballot in multiple categories by [adding](#) words as follows:

1: Insert the following section after existing Section 3.2.8:

[3.2.X: No work shall appear in more than one category on the final Award ballot.](#)

2: Insert the following section after existing Section 3.8.6:

3.8.Y: If a work is eligible in more than one category, and if the work receives sufficient nominations to appear in more than one category, the Worldcon Committee shall determine in which category the work shall appear, after consulting with the author of the work insofar as it is possible to do so under the provisions of Section 3.9.

Proposed by: Warren Buff, Jared Dashoff, William Lawhorn, Michael Lee, Pablo Vasquez

Commentary: The goal of this amendment is to ensure that no work appears on the final ballot in multiple categories. This means that a novel could not appear on the same ballot as a series of which it is a part. Additionally, if a YA category were to be added, a novel could not appear in both the YA and Best Novel categories. It would be the duty of the Worldcon Committee, via the Hugo Administrator and staff, in consultation with the author/creator, as possible, to determine in which category the work would appear.

Gloria Magid asked for an example of something that might be eligible in more than one category, but the Chair ruled that that was debate on the motion and not in order at that time.

Debate time set at 6 minutes. [Please click here to jump to Saturday's discussion.](#)

B.1.6 Short Title: Nominee Diversity

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution for the purpose of encouraging diversity of Hugo Award nominations by excluding more than two works within a category that are part of the same dramatic series or having a common co-author by inserting a new subsection after existing 3.8.4, adding words as follows:

3.8.X: If there are more than two works in the same category that are all episodes of the same dramatic presentation series or that are written works that have an author in common, only the two works in each category that have the most nominations shall be eligible to appear on the final ballot. For the purposes of this exclusion, works withdrawn by their author under Section 3.2.5 shall be ignored.

Proposed by: Donald E. Eastlake 3rd and Jill Eastlake

Commentary: The intent of this amendment to the WSFS Constitution is to increase the diversity of nominations appearing on the final Hugo Award ballot.

With only five nomination slots, an author or dramatic series nominated thrice or more in a Hugo category in one year is occupying 60% or more of those slots and squeezing the rest of the field down to only two or fewer. Even if the number of slots were increased to six, they would be occupying at least half of them. Situations with such three or more works in the same category have become more common recently. Based

on a quick scan, it appears this has occurred a total of ten times. But eight of these have been in the last 10 years, while there were only two in the previous 50+ years of the Hugo Award. (Nine of these ten were triples and one was a quintuplet. Eight were of dramatic series episodes and two were for written works.)

Two such works or episodes appearing on the ballot seems less problematic; such doubles have occurred more frequently (28 instances), have occurred in many different categories, and have occurred in years more uniformly spread over the history of the Hugo Award.

This amendment, to the extent possible to achieve the desired effect, strives for simplicity and tries to impose the minimum details on the Hugo administrators. It leaves questions such as who is an author of a written work or whether or not episodes are part of the same dramatic series to the discretion of those administrators.

The restrictions in this amendment apply in a different way to dramatic-presentation works and written works. In the dramatic presentation categories, no more than two works (generally episodes) of the same series would be eligible in the category. In each written category, no more than two works with the same author or co-authors would be eligible in that category. The following examples illustrate this:

Example 1: If three episodes of the television series *Science Fiction Trek* and one episode of the television series *Fantasy Wars* would otherwise qualify for the final ballot, the episode of *Science Fiction Trek* with the least nominations would be excluded. The final ballot would be the two episodes with the most nominations, plus three other works not part of that series, including the *Fantasy Wars* episode, even if, for example, all four episodes had the same Director or the like and even if all three episodes of *Science Fiction Trek* had different Directors or the like.

Example 2: Imagine that two novels authored by John Doe, a third novel co-authored by John Doe and Jane Roe, and a short story authored by John Doe would all otherwise qualify for the final ballot. Since all three novels have an author in common, only the two with the most nominations would qualify for the final ballot, with three other novels not having John Doe as an author or co-author filling out the other positions; this would exclude the novel with Jane Roe as a co-author if it had the fewest nominations. Since short story is a different Hugo category, this situation in the novel category would have no effect on the nomination of John Doe's short story.

Debate time set at 10 minutes. [Please click here to jump to Saturday's discussion.](#)

B.1.7 Two-Year Eligibility

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution to make the eligibility time window for “specific work” categories two years rather than the current one year, and to eliminate the current automatic extension of eligibility of works originally published outside the USA, by ~~striking out~~ and [adding](#) words as follows:

1. Add words to Section 3.2.1 to expand the eligibility time period for the Hugo Award:

3.2.1: Unless otherwise specified, Hugo Awards are given for work in the field of science fiction or fantasy appearing for the first time during the previous calendar year in categories presented to individual persons or serial publications, and appearing for the first time during the previous two (2) calendar years in categories presented to specific works.

2. Strike out Section 3.4.2, removing the automatic extension of eligibility to works originally published outside the USA:

~~3.4.2: Works originally published outside the United States of America and first published in the United States of America in the previous calendar year shall also be eligible for Hugo Awards.~~

Proposed by: Paul Carpentier and Julie McGalliard

Commentary: Works of science fiction and fantasy have grown in length and in numbers. With smaller and fewer works, Hugo voters could reasonably be expected to be familiar with the field as a whole. The field has blossomed, and Hugo voters can no longer be expected to have familiarity with everything available for Hugo consideration.

Note: Should a specific work receive sufficient nominations to appear on the final ballot in its first year of eligibility and should the author decline the nomination under Section 3.9, the work would not be eligible in its second year, because of the provisions of the existing Section 3.2.2 (“A work shall not be eligible if in a prior year it received sufficient nominations to appear on the final award ballot.”)

Discussion: Kate Secor moved to postpone indefinitely, and a four-minute discussion ensued. Ms. Secor felt that extending eligibility for works is harmful to the works that are published in the year. There is so much material coming out every year that it just means there is twice as much material in the second year and thereafter. The awards are for the best work in the current year; changing it to the works for this year and last year means that the field is bigger and worthy nominees are less likely to rise to the top.

Jack Foy spoke in favor of considering the motion because the breadth of the field encourages work discovered over time, especially works published toward the end of the year is a fairly short window to find material that is good.

Morris Keesan felt there were enough proposed changes to the Hugos this year that this motion, regardless of its merits, would be better discussed at another time and not this year. Andrew Adams thought would be useful to refer this motion to a committee, but to do so it needs to be considered at the main meeting in order to appoint a committee. Ben Yalow said the number of works that come out each year does not decrease if we spend two years thinking about them; it will only put people further behind in their reading. Gloria Magid said we should consider the proposal because there are a lot of works that are initially being self-published with small distribution that are being picked up by major publishers later. One example is *The Martian*. Expanding the time

frame would make allowances for cases like that. Glenn Glazer opposed consideration because nothing is sacrosanct about a committee being appointed by the business meeting, and he agreed with Mr. Keesan's reasons. Others can form committees and report back. Going through the form process is unnecessary. Hank Graham said this would be a major change, and that the transition will be painful, but he felt it was worth doing and that it is time to change how we're doing it because it will fit the current publishing situation.

With more than a two-thirds vote in the negative, the motion to postpone indefinitely passed and this proposal would not be brought up at the main meeting.

Andrew Adams asked how a motion could be reconsidered. The Chair explained that someone who voted in favor of the motion to postpone indefinitely (the side that won) could move to reconsider the vote either at the preliminary meeting or the first main (i.e., Friday's) business meeting. No one else could do so, nor could the motion be reconsidered after the first main meeting. A motion to reconsider requires a majority vote, at which point the motion to Postpone Indefinitely would be back on the floor as if the original vote on it had not taken place.

B.1.3 Short Title: Best Series

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution to change the written fiction Hugo Award categories by creating a Best Series award and correcting related references to the existing Hugo Award categories, by [adding](#) words as follows:

1: Insert words in existing Section 3.2.4 as follows:

3.2.4: Works appearing in a series are eligible as individual works, but the series as a whole is not eligible, [except under Section 3.3.X](#). However, a work appearing in a number of parts shall be eligible for the year of the final part.

2: Insert the following section before existing Section 3.3.4:

[3.3.X: Best Series. A work of science fiction or fantasy presented as a single series with a unifying plot, characters or setting, appearing in at least three \(3\) volumes consisting of a total of at least 240,000 words by the close of the previous calendar year, at least one of which was published in the previous calendar year. If such a work has previously been a finalist, it shall be eligible only if at least two \(2\) additional volumes consisting of a total of at least 240,000 words have been published since its last appearance on the final ballot by the end of the previous calendar year and provided it has not won under 3.3.X before.](#)

3: Insert the following section before existing Section 3.8.3:

[3.8.X: For nominations of works under Section 3.3.X, if a work is eligible as both an overarching series and a subset of that series, and if the both the subset and the overarching series receive sufficient nominations to appear on the final ballot, the Worldcon Committee shall determine](#)

whether the subset or the overarching series shall appear on the final ballot, after consulting with the author of the work insofar as it is possible to do so under the provisions of Section 3.9. If neither the subset of the series nor the overarching series receive sufficient nominations to appear on the final ballot, but the total ballots nominating either of them would place a work on the final ballot, the Worldcon Committee may combine the nominations and, after consulting with the author of the work insofar as it is possible to do so under the provisions of Section 3.9, determine how the work should appear on the final ballot.

Proposed by: Warren Buff, Jared Dashoff, William Lawhorn, Michael Lee, Pablo Vasquez

Commentary: The goal of this amendment is to provide Hugo categories more in line with today's science fiction and fantasy publishing norms and to further create categories that compare like items. It accomplishes this by creating an award that recognizes works that appear in multi-volume series, a large and growing segment of the publishing sector and one largely unrecognized by the Hugos to date. Furthermore, stories told in this format tend to consist mainly of books which are not ideal examples of novels, in part due to the presence of narrative arcs which remain unresolved between their covers. While this narrative sweep is not to the taste of all readers, it nonetheless represents a stylistically distinct form of storytelling, and its exemplars deserve recognition.

Today, the majority of original novels (somewhere around two thirds) in the genre being published are part of larger series, if the new releases of Tor/Forge, Baen, Pyr, and DAW are any indication. Yet for the past decade, the Best Novel category has been dominated by stand-alone works. The nominees during this time have included 20 stand-alone works, 14 first books in series, and 17 later books in series, yet the winners have been divided between eight stand-alone works, two first books, and one later book. The distribution of Best Novel winners is badly out of step with the general shape of the market, even though the nominees run close to the market trend. This could be a sign that while the Hugo nominators appreciate series work, the general voter pool prefers stand-alone novels, or at least books without significant background stories, when considering which should win Best Novel, or that comparing stand-alone works to works in a series is difficult. While series novels performed better in the past, the expansion of the voter pool has not been a kind era for them.

We have used a fairly broad definition of the category, in hopes of reflecting the breadth considered in the 1966 Best All-Time Series Hugo. That one-off award compared Tolkien's *Lord of the Rings*, Asimov's *Foundation*, Heinlein's *Future History*, Smith's *Lensmen*, and Burroughs's *Barsoom*. Structurally, these are very different works, which include a long linear story broken into separate volumes, stories on the scale of civilizations told in loosely connected works, a series of separate adventures following a cast of characters in a common setting, and a series which was later expanded by the addition of a novel to connect its plot to one of the author's earlier works. While some are composed entirely of novels, others contain a blend of

short fiction and novels. Yet the fans of the 1960s saw all of these as falling under the banner of series. We would like to preserve that diversity of storytelling and publishing methods in a modern award.

By setting the minimum for nomination at 240,000 words across multiple volumes, works are required to provide substantial material within the same series to be nominated and substantial new material to be eligible for a second nomination. The number also reflects typical book contracts for newer SF authors, which often come in around 80,000 to 100,000 words. Established authors, especially those working in high fantasy, sometimes deliver much longer works.

For reference, *The Lord of the Rings* was around 473,000 words. Volumes in Robert Jordan's *Wheel of Time* ranged between 226,000 and 393,000 words, which would have triggered new eligibility every other volume, while George R.R. Martin's *A Song of Ice and Fire* has had volumes of over 400,000 words, and would have triggered eligibility with the third and fifth volumes. Among series which placed their third or later book onto Locus's lists in 2013 and 2014, the majority had already crossed 300,000 words, while a few were close to the cut-off. The bulk of the series were in their third or fourth entry, while eight of the 31 were beyond their fifth. The lowest total, around 150,000, came from Alan Garner's *Weirdstone* sequence, consisting of two children's novels from the 1960s and an adult novella. The two middle-grade series to place a book on the list, Lois Lowry's *Giver* and Catherynne Valente's *Fairyland* series, came in below the threshold, while most of the young adult series came in above it. Young adult series varied wildly, with trilogies ranging from about 230,000 words (Holly Black's *Curse Workers*) to over 480,000 (Tamora Pierce's *Beka Cooper*). Several other series, most of which would tend to gain eligibility every two or three volumes, are documented at <http://cesspit.net/drupal/node/1869/>.

The work need not be that of a single author, and collaborative efforts that hang together well enough for the voters and authors to consider them a single work are eligible. For reference, the *Wild Cards* series has had numerous contributors over several decades, but each new novel or collection ties into all that has come before. The *Ring of Fire* series has multiple intertwining stories that are linked by a common progressive storyline.

And while the above discussion has focused on novel length works, the works need not be segmented into novel length volumes. Any work, presented in a series of multiple volumes, should be considered as eligible. For example, a series of fictional blog posts or short stories meeting the word count would qualify. Novella or even Short Story length volumes summing to the word count would also be eligible.

To eliminate the possibility of a given work, even with additional material being added, winning Best Series multiple times, a clause has been included at the end of Section 3.3.X.

To lessen issues with the triggering work being part of both the overarching series and a subseries, as in the case of Discworld, for example, a clause (Section 3.8.X) has been added to give the Worldcon Committee explicit powers, which the sponsors and others

believe the Committee already had by implicit tradition, to confer with the author as to which work – the overarching series or the subseries – would appear on the ballot. Additionally, the last sentence of Section 3.8.X allows the Committee to combine the nominations and place only the overarching series or the subseries on the final ballot, after discussion with the creator, when possible, so that a nomination for the subseries would count as a nomination for the overarching series and vice versa.

The sponsors have also separately submitted a proposal entitled “Multiple Nominations” that addresses the matter of a work being simultaneously eligible as part of a Series and in another category.

Debate time was set at 16 minutes.

Discussion: Dr. Lurie moved to postpone indefinitely since the business meeting had a full agenda. Warren Buff, the maker of the motion, felt it would bring the Hugo categories more in line with the way publishing works these days. While a lot of works in series, they don’t do very well as “Best Novel.” There’s enough interest to nominate them, but they don’t stand alone very well as novels when compared against other standalone novels or even first entries in a series.

John Lorentz, speaking as a Hugo administrator, felt it would be horrendous trying to deal with the eligibility issues and trying to figure out what fits into what category and when something is newly eligible to be considered. Thomas Monahan said the issue of when a book or series is eligible for a Hugo needs to be discussed. Why should a single book in a series get the Hugo rather than the series itself? Ignoring or postponing the discussion was not a good idea. Terry Neill didn’t think there’d been enough time to hammer out the details and that it could use another year to refine the amendment. This should be done online and not in the business meeting. Derrick Freeland felt this amendment would bring in new readers.

With a serpentine vote of 75 in favor and 125 against consideration, and a two-thirds vote against consideration being necessary to kill the motion, the motion stayed on the agenda.

[Please click here to jump to Sunday’s discussion.](#)

B.1.8 Electronic Signatures

Moved, to amend Section 4.4 of the WSFS Constitution to authorize Worldcons to accept ballots with any form of signature or authentication legal in the jurisdiction of the administering Worldcon, as follows:

Section 4.4: Ballots.

4.4.1. Site-selection ballots shall include name, signature, address, and membership-number spaces to be filled in by the voter. Each site-selection ballot shall list the options “None of the Above” and “No Preference” and provide for write-in votes, after the bidders and with equal prominence. The supporting membership rate shall be listed on all site-selection ballots.

[4.4.2. Voters may sign or authenticate their ballots using any signature method, either physical or electronic, that is legal in the jurisdiction of the current Worldcon Committee.](#)

Proposed by: Terry Neill, Janet D’Agostino-Neill

Commentary: This amendment is meant to clarify requirements and simplify submitting legal signatures, whenever the current Worldcon Committee and all the current bidders agree to electronic submission of Site Selection ballots. This year the directive was to print the ballot, sign it, scan it, then email it to Site Selection. There are many forms of legally binding electronic signatures that were not allowed. This amendment will allow any form of electronic signature legal in the jurisdiction of the seated Worldcon.

Discussion: A debate time of 12 minutes was proposed by the Chair, but before it could be voted on, Kate Secor presented an amendment by substitution to replace with language in Section 4.4.2 as follows:

[Administering Worldcons shall provide the option to receive only the Site Selection ballot and associated paraphernalia on paper, even if they have otherwise selected electronic publications.](#)

The motion was seconded.

The Chair confirmed (after Ron Oakes made a parliamentary inquiry) that a motion to amend takes precedence over a motion to postpone indefinitely, but that once the motion to amend was out of the way, it would be in order to postpone indefinitely.

The parliamentarian noted that this amendment by substitution completely changes the effect of the motion. Dr. Perianne Lurie raised a point of order: if an amendment by substitution has nothing to do with the original proposal, is it still in order? The Chair ruled that the motion was in order, even though the amendment by substitution was antithetical to the original motion it is on the same subject and therefore germane.

Dr. Lurie appealed the ruling of the Chair, which was seconded. No debate time was established for the appeal and therefore stayed within the original 12 minute time limit set by the Chair. When something is appealed, the Chair is permitted to offer both an opening and a closing opinion. The Chair felt that while it is not in order to simply invert something, having a motion that is antithetical to the original intent of a motion is in order, and thus the Chair felt the amendment by substitution was within the scope of the original amendment.

Dr. Lurie felt the amendment by substitution was not germane. The original motion dealt with electronic signatures; the substitution dealt with providing paper copies to members. Dave McCarty felt the issue was germane because the electronic issue is specifically regarding site selection and how to provide materials to the voters. Morris Keesan felt that even though the amendment and original motion are about site selection, this is no more germane than would be a motion to amend EPH by saying “Let’s have a YA Hugo.” They’re both about Hugos, but they’re unrelated. Kate Secor replied that this is actually about signature delivery mechanisms. The question is about

electronic signature delivery versus paper signature delivery, and discussing methods of signature delivery is germane one each to the other. Jack Foy felt the amendment by substitution completely overrides the intent of the original motion; and though it might stand well on its own right, it doesn't dovetail with the original motion. Ben Yalow reiterated that for the germaneness criteria to be met it is merely required that it affect the same general subject matter. Since both the amendment and the amendment by substitution refer to methods for providing signatures, it's clearly germane. Christopher Gerrib suggested that this discussion would be better suited when discussing the original amendment rather than while we're trying to set time limits on the agenda. Howard Rosenblatt stated that page 136 of *Robert's Rules of Order* confirmed this motion to be germane.

A motion was made to close debate on the appeal, but was withdrawn to allow the Chair to make a closing statement. In closing, the Chair said that inverting the intent of an original motion is not opposed by Robert's, and one of the purposes of the preliminary meeting is to not only decide how long an item will be discussed in the main meeting, but what will be discussed. The Chair therefore ruled that the amendment by substitution is germane.

There being less than a majority opposed to the Chair's ruling, the Chair's ruling was sustained and the motion was germane.

A five-minute debate on the amendment ensued. Kate Secor spoke in favor of the substituted amendment. We sign everything electronically these days, but it turns out there are technical and security concerns about how that's done. This gives us a way to let people who would otherwise be using an electronic signature system file a ballot that they can sign on paper and return on paper. This satisfies the needs of both people who want this to be easier for people who are not paper-based and people who want it to be as secure and as simple as the system we currently have. She also asked to refer it to committee to refine the wording of the substituted amendment; however a member is not actually allowed to refer a motion to committee immediately upon speaking, particularly if no one had yet spoken against the proposal. However, it would be in order for anyone to refer it to committee after there was one speech against.

Terry Neill wrote the original motion to allow paper and at least one form of electronic publication and spoke against the amendment by substitution. Her intent was to allow either paper or at least one form of electronic signature. She agreed with Ms. Secor that the business meeting needs to allow both, and that was the intention of her amendment. Therefore, she had no objection to referring the amendments to a committee for reconciliation.

However, there was an objection to referring the original motion and pending amendment to a committee. Speaking in favor, Kate Secor reiterated she and Terry Neill agreed to move this matter to a committee to report back on Friday. Rick Kovalcik spoke against referring to a committee saying the Chair had explained how important the preliminary meeting was. However, some people are very busy at the convention and do not have time to deal with committees. They made the effort to

come to the preliminary meeting and should be given a chance to explain now why they think this is a very bad idea.

A motion was made to end the debate on the motion to refer to committee, and, with more than two-thirds in favor, the motion to close debate passed. By a show of hands, the motion was referred to committee to report back on Friday. Committee members consisted of Kate Secor, Terry Neill, Don Eastlake, Tim Illingworth, Dave McCarty and Dennis Caswell. They were instructed to meet after the Preliminary Business Meeting was over and to get their motion to the secretary as soon as possible.

[Please click here to jump to Sunday's discussion.](#)

A motion was made to take the Mark Protection Committee report at this time and to take nominations for the MPC. However, the vote failed.

B.1.1 Short Title: 4 and 6

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution to reduce the number of nominations each member can make in each category, to increase the number of finalists appearing on the final ballot and to correct related references to the number of nominations per member by ~~striking out~~ and [adding](#) words as follows:

3.7.1: The Worldcon Committee shall conduct a poll to select the nominees for the final Award voting. Each member of the administering Worldcon, the immediately preceding Worldcon, or the immediately following Worldcon as of January 31 of the current calendar year shall be allowed to make up to ~~five (5)~~ [four \(4\)](#) equally weighted nominations in every category.

3.8.1: Except as provided below, the final Award ballots shall list in each category the ~~five~~ [six](#) eligible nominees receiving the most nominations. If there is a tie including ~~fifth~~ [sixth](#) place, all the tied eligible nominees shall be listed.

3.8.6: The Committee shall move a nomination from another category to the work's default category only if the member has made fewer than ~~five (5)~~ [four \(4\)](#) nominations in the default category.

3.8.7: If a work receives a nomination in its default category, and if the Committee relocates the work under its authority under subsection 3.2.9 or 3.2.10, the Committee shall count the nomination even if the member already has made ~~five (5)~~ [four \(4\)](#) nominations in the more-appropriate category.

Proposed by: Chris Gerrib, Catherine Faber and Steven desJardins

Commentary: The goal of this amendment is to provide a broader base of potential winners and to increase participation in the nominating process. It accomplishes these goals by increasing the number of finalists from five to six. By reducing the number of

nominees per member to four, we make it clear that members do not have to submit a full nominating ballot, encouraging participation in less popular categories. For more popular categories, limiting the number of nominees encourages the member to prioritize their selections. Finally, because of the 4-nominee limit, we are more likely to see a broader selection of works.

Discussion: Kent Bloom moved to postpone indefinitely, and the default time for discussion on postpone indefinitely was 4 minutes. Mr. Bloom felt it would be premature to begin debate because it was unknown whether this is a problem, or how much of a problem it is or what kind of a problem it is, or whether it's going to affect more than one year. He felt the discussion should be postponed till next year to see if it will be needed.

Perianne Lurie felt this was a big problem, and if we didn't deal with it this year, we'd have three years of this problem instead of two. We'd have to ratify it next year anyway, and we'll have even more data. She also asked if it were in order for the business meeting to ask next year's Hugo administrators to release the nomination data shortly after the close of final voting, rather than waiting until midnight, when the total votes would be released. Jack William Bell leaned against making any changes to the Hugo voting process this year. He felt the problem arose because people didn't nominate, and he urged everyone to do so next year and hold off making the proposed changes. Tim Illingworth recognized the sincerity of the people who want to postpone indefinitely, but he felt that it was important to talk about solutions and see what we might want to do. Tom Galloway felt we needed to produce something this year, but did not feel that this was a workable solution. It took him three minutes to figure out how to completely game it. Warren Buff felt this proposal addresses a psychological barrier that some people feel exists toward nominations: separating the number of names listed on a nominating ballot from the number on the final voting ballot would encourage more people to nominate.

Adrienne Foster felt the problem was not the system; it was the people "who drank X's lemonade¹." Ben Yalow raised a point of order: that Ms. Foster's speech was addressing an individual person. The Chair found the point of order was well taken and advised the members that no one should cast aspersions on individual persons.

Chris Gerrib, the maker of the motion, felt that this proposal was not a knee-jerk reaction, but a marker in the sand to discuss a clear problem. With less than two-thirds of the members opposed to consideration, the motion to postpone indefinitely failed.

Kent Bloom felt the real problem was people rather than counting or otherwise changing the Hugo rules and therefore offered an amendment by substitution:

Every Hugo nomination ballot shall prominently contain the statement:
"I am personally familiar with each of the nominations I have made and

¹ "X" was the name of a specific individual.

believe each of them to be worthy of a Hugo Award,” which must be specifically acknowledged by the nominator.

The Chair ruled that this motion not germane as it was sufficiently outside the scope of the actual 4 and 6 proposal. Mr. Bloom objected, and the objection was seconded. A default ten-minute time limit was set for discussion of the appeal.

The Chair defended his ruling because the amendment by substitution went off on a tangent, was not even directly antithetical to the original motion, and was too far out of line to be germane.

Mr. Bloom believed the amendment by substitution to be germane because it addressed the same problem in the same section of the Constitution, although it addressed the problem in advance rather than *ex post facto*. His motion would not affect the way the nominations were counted; it affected the way nominations would be made and addressed a problem that cannot be solved by legislation. The time to consider this motion would be better spent than time to consider all the nitpicking involved in counting and nominating rules. With a two-thirds show of hands in favor, debate was closed on the appeal. A majority show of hands then sustained the Chair’s ruling that the amendment was not germane.

At this time, discussion turned to scheduling a committee of the whole, which is a parliamentary device whereby the business meeting would act as if we were a committee meeting. The committee could not actually take direct action on a proposal and could only discuss what to do and make recommendations to the business meeting. With a show of hands, the committee of the whole was scheduled for Friday. The Chair explained that a committee of the whole allows for a certain level of informality in consideration of the motions. The committee of the whole would meet on Friday, and the votes would be taken on Sunday. The motion to refer the amendment 4 and 6 and the amendment E Pluribus Hugo to the committee of the whole (and record the meeting) passed by a show of hands.

A short debate on deferring the vote on the amendments to Sunday ensued. Winton Matthews asked how E Pluribus Hugo could be scheduled for Sunday if we hadn’t even discussed it. The Chair explained that if the motion was killed, it would not come up at the scheduled time. Andrew Adams felt we would not have the information we needed to debate these amendments until Sunday and was in favor of scheduling the debate for Sunday. Mr. Yalow spoke against scheduling the debate for Sunday. He said the claim had been made that the amendment would solve a general problem and not a one-year problem. He said we had six decades’ worth of data regarding Hugo nominations. One extra year’s worth of data would not add much to the discussion if this is a general problem. Jameson Quinn, coauthor of E Pluribus Hugo, spoke in favor of scheduling on Sunday. He counter-argued the claim about how much data was available, saying that the only full data available was from 1984. There was no data for when a problem came up; and if it came up once, it can come up again and it felt the data from this year’s nominations would be helpful for demonstration purposes. Priscilla Olson said

she was tired of extending everything. She pointed out that some members of the business meeting had other obligations at the convention and that pushing things into an extra day was upsetting. Additionally, she didn't know how one year's worth of data, even in this extraordinary year, would be helpful in deciding anything. With more than two-thirds of the members voting in favor, debate was closed.

On the question of scheduling both the amendment 4 and 6 and the amendment E Pluribus Hugo on Sunday, the majority of the members voted in favor, and they would come up after anything that hasn't yet been resolved before them.²

Debate then resumed on setting the time limit for Item B.1.1.

Debate time set at 12 minutes. [Please click here to jump to Sunday's discussion.](#)

B.1.4 Short Title: E Pluribus Hugo (Out of the Many, a Hugo)

Moved, to amend Section 3.8 (Tallying of Nominations), Section 3.9 (Notification and Acceptance), and Section 3.11 (Tallying of Votes) as follows:

Section 3.8: Tallying of Nominations.

3.8.1: Except as provided below, the final Award ballots shall list in each category the five eligible nominees ~~receiving the most nominations. If there is a tie including fifth place, all the tied eligible nominees shall be listed.~~ [determined by the process described in section 3.A.](#)

Insert new section 3.A after Section 3.8 as follows:

Section 3.A: Finalist Selection Process

3.A.1: For each category, the finalist selection process shall be conducted as elimination rounds consisting of three phases:

(1) Calculation Phase: First, the total number of nominations (the number of ballots on which each nominee appears) from all eligible ballots shall be tallied for each remaining nominee. Next, a single "point" shall be assigned to each nomination ballot. That point shall be divided equally among all remaining nominees on that ballot. Finally, all points from all nomination ballots shall be totaled for each nominee in that category. These two numbers, point total and number of nominations, shall be used in the Selection and Elimination Phases.

(2) Selection Phase: The two nominees with the lowest point totals shall be selected for comparison in the Elimination Phase. (See 3.A.3 for ties.)

(3) Elimination Phase: Nominees chosen in the Selection Phase shall be compared, and the nominee with the fewest number of nominations shall

² This made these two proposals "general orders," although it wasn't explicitly mentioned at the time.

be eliminated and removed from all ballots for the Calculation Phase of all subsequent rounds. (See 3.A.3 for ties.)

3.A.2: The phases described in 3.A.1 are repeated in order for each category until the number of finalists specified in 3.8.1 remain. If elimination would reduce the number of finalists to fewer than the number specified in section 3.8.1, then instead no nominees will be eliminated during that round, and all remaining nominees shall appear on the final ballot, extending it if necessary.

3.A.3: Ties shall be handled as described below:

(1) During the Selection Phase, if two or more nominees are tied for the lowest point total, all such nominees shall be selected for the Elimination Phase.

(2) During the Selection Phase, if one nominee has the lowest point total and two or more nominees are tied for the second-lowest point total, then all such nominees shall be selected for the Elimination Phase.

(3) During the Elimination Phase, if two or more nominees are tied for the fewest number of nominations, the nominee with the lowest point total at that round shall be eliminated.

(4) During the Elimination Phase, if two or more nominees are tied for both fewest number of nominations and lowest point total, then all such nominees tied at that round shall be eliminated.

3.A.4: After the initial Award ballot is generated, if any finalist(s) are removed for any reason, the finalist selection process shall be rerun as though the removed finalist(s) had never been nominee(s). None of the remaining original finalists who have been notified shall be removed as a result of this rerun. The new finalist(s) shall be merged with the original finalists, extending the final ballot if necessary.

Section 3.9: Notification and Acceptance.

3.9.1 Worldcon Committees shall use reasonable efforts to notify the ~~nominees~~ finalists, or in the case of deceased or incapacitated persons, their heirs, assigns, or legal guardians, in each category prior to the release of such information. Each ~~nominee~~ person notified shall be asked at that time to either accept or decline the nomination. If the ~~nominee~~ person notified declines the nomination, that ~~nominee~~ finalist(s) shall not appear on the final ballot. The procedure for replacement of such finalist(s) is described in subsection 3.A.4.

Section 3.11: Tallying of Votes.

3.11.4: The complete numerical vote totals, including all preliminary tallies for first, second, . . . places, shall be made public by the Worldcon Committee within ninety (90) days after the Worldcon. ~~During the same-~~

~~period the nomination voting totals shall also be published, including in each category the vote counts for at least the fifteen highest vote getters and any other candidate receiving a number of votes equal to at least five percent (5%) of the nomination ballots cast in that category, but not including any candidate receiving fewer than five votes. During the same period, the results of the last ten rounds of the finalist selection process for each category (or all the rounds if there are fewer than ten) shall also be published.~~

Submitted by: Keith “Kilo” Watt, Jameson Quinn, Tammy Coxen, Yoana Yotova, Joshua Kronengold, Christopher Battey, David Gallaher, Adam Tilghman, David Wallace, Sara Watt, CJ Cabourne, Steven Halter, P J Evans, David Goldfarb, Seth Gordon, Ginger Tansey, Steve Wright, Catherine Faber, Andy Holloway, Duncan J. Macdonald, Claudia Beach, Derry Earnshaw, Jason Skiles, Soon Lee, David Harmon, Lydia Nickerson, Abigail Sutherland, Lee Billings, Oskari Rantala, Seth Breidbart, Chris Suslowicz, Fragano Ledgister, Lori Coulson, Jeffry Herman, Mark Shier, Buddha Buck, Lenore Jean Jones, David Langford, Christopher Hatton, Rogers Cadenhead

Commentary: “E Pluribus Hugo” – the name of this proposal is also its goal: recognizing the many opinions within fandom as to what nominees might be worthy of the Hugo. It is to be emphasized that this proposal does not change the nominating process from the perspective of Worldcon members: They still list the nominees, unranked, they feel are Hugo-worthy (up to the maximum permitted) in any categories they choose, just as they have in the past. In the past, we have counted the number of nominations each nominee received, and the top five nominees were put on the final ballot. However, because SF fandom typically nominates a variety of different nominees, it was easy for an organized slate to make it so that no other nominees made the final ballot.

Using this system, fandom isn’t penalized for nominating a wide variety of nominees. If you nominate something that ends up not having a chance to make the final ballot, then your remaining choices automatically get more of your support instead of just being wasted. In other words, you can safely nominate *anything* you feel is Hugo-worthy. If enough people agree with you, it will make the final ballot. If they don’t, that’s okay – when that nominee is eliminated, your other choices will have a greater chance of making the final ballot. In this way, by eliminating the least popular candidates each round, fandom slowly converges to a consensus as to which finalists should be voted on to be the Hugo winner.

It is also an explicit goal of this proposal not to disenfranchise anyone. Rather, this proposal seeks to ensure that no group of members – of any sort, minority or majority – can disproportionately dominate an entire category. This system allows the broadest range of nominees that are popular with fandom-at-large to be considered for the Hugo Awards.

FAQs:

1. Can you explain the system in plain language?

First, and most importantly, E Pluribus Hugo makes absolutely no changes in how members nominate (no ranking or complex strategies are required). The new system changes only the way nominations are tallied in order to create a more robust measure of which nominees have the broadest and deepest support among WSFS members. The final Hugo voting system, which actually chooses the winner, is unchanged.

The new system narrows down Worldcon members' nominations by knocking out the least supported works in repeated elimination rounds until only five (under current rules) finalists remain. Here are the basic steps, as applied to one category:

(a) All the nominations for each nominee (that is, the number of ballots on which each nominee appears) are added up, just like in the current system. This number, called "number of nominations" in the proposal, is one of the criteria used to determine the final nominees with the broadest support.

(b) Next, one point is divided equally among all the nominees in a category on each member's ballot. If there are two nominees on a ballot in a category, each gets 1/2 point; if there are three nominees, each gets 1/3 point, and so on.

(c) All the points for each nominee from all nomination ballots are then added together. This number, called "point total" in the proposal, is the second of the two criteria used to determine the final nominees with the broadest support.

(d) The nominees with the lowest point totals are compared to each other. The nominee with the fewest number of nominations is eliminated, because it is the nominee with the least support.

(e) After a nominee is eliminated, it is removed from the ballots that it appeared on, each of which gets its point redistributed among its remaining nominees. For example, if a ballot had four nominees with 1/4 point each, it now has three nominees with 1/3 point each, and so on.

Over successive rounds, a surviving nominee's point total can't decrease, but it can increase as the nominees it shares a ballot with are eliminated. Eventually, the finalists will have all the points from all remaining ballots. This process is repeated until the designated number of finalists (five in the current version of the constitution) remains.

2. I'm a visual person. Is there a graphical way to see how the system works?

Yes. We have created a PowerPoint http://sasquan.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/E_PLURIBUS_HUGO1.pptx (and also in PDF http://sasquan.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/E_PLURIBUS_HUGO1.pdf) form that can be viewed in a browser, but you lose the animations) that explains the system and

shows how it limits the effect of slates. In this graphical form, you can watch the eventual finalists' bar graphs of their point totals get longer and longer as other nominees are eliminated. You can also see how slate nominees tend to compete with and eliminate each other, since they tend to have virtually the same number of both points and nominations.

3. E Pluribus Hugo?

The designers felt this name accurately reflects what the Hugo nomination system should be trying to achieve. Fandom is the Many. Members of fandom have a wide range of interests, tastes, and desires in what they appreciate in science fiction and fantasy. This is a defining characteristic of fandom, and this system embraces it. Out of all of these many tastes in nominees, this system allows a single set of nominations to slowly emerge as the most popular candidates for the Hugo Awards: "Out of the Many, a Hugo."

4. But surely that's not what the system is formally called?

Okay, sure. Formally, in the context of election theory, this system would be called "single divisible vote with least popular elimination" or SDV-LPE for short. E Pluribus Hugo is both cooler and geekier, as everything is better with a little Latin.

5. Why are there Selection and Elimination Phases? Couldn't you simplify the system by doing it all in one step per elimination?

The Selection Phase looks for nominees with the lowest point total, and the Elimination Phase eliminates the one with the fewest number of nominations. Looking at the two different measures of popularity adds robustness to the system. There are strategies to manipulate each of these two measurements, but it is very difficult to manipulate both in the same direction. A strategy that focuses on number of nominations for the Elimination Phase (such as bloc voting) will be stymied by the Selection Phase; a strategy that focuses on points for the Selection Phase (such as nominating only one nominee) will turn out to be counterproductive in the Elimination Phase. While no voting system can be completely strategy-proof, this two-step approach makes this system as close to that as possible.

6. Why re-run the system if someone declines a nomination? Why not just take the nominee that was eliminated in the next to last round?

We considered that as an option, including analyzing and simulating the effects on the vote either way. We discovered only one major difference in the results: If the declined nomination is from a slate, then when taking the "6th place" nominee, the declined nomination will tend to be replaced by a non-slate nominee. With our system of re-running the vote, if a slate nominee makes the final ballot and its nomination is declined, that nomination will tend to be replaced by another nominee from the slate. Either way works, but as noted above, our goal is to avoid shutting out any section of

fandom from the final ballot. The results of re-running the calculation seem more in line with that philosophy.

7. Shouldn't I just nominate one work if I want to give it the best chance to win?

The system was crafted specifically to make most strategies irrelevant. For example, if you wanted to support a single nominee you feel strongly about, and there isn't anything else you feel is Hugo-worthy, you can do that. On the other hand, if you nominate four other things that you feel might be Hugo-worthy, you aren't hurting your favorite. This is because if your other nominees get eliminated, then your full support will go to the remaining nominee, just as if you had never nominated the others. If enough people agree with your other four, some of them might make it, too. If enough people don't agree with your favorite, there's nothing you can do to get it on the final ballot, because you will never have more than one point and one nomination for it.

The bottom line is that a low point total isn't what causes a nominee to be eliminated. Not having enough nominations is what eliminates a nominee – exactly as it is under the current system. There is no way that you (alone) can increase the number of nominations your favorite nominee gets – not even by only listing that one nominee. If you only list one nominee (“bullet voting”), you can give it at most an extra 4/5 of a point (but more reasonably only around 1/3 of a point, because you weren't likely to pick all five finalists in any event). Listing only one nominee would have to give your favorite enough points to put it all the way into fourth place, so that its nominations are never compared for elimination. Because finalists may have well over 100 points, the odds of making much of a difference with this strategy are very, very small – and the price you pay is that you don't get to nominate any of your other favorites.

In general, the best strategy is simple: nominate as many nominees as you feel are worthy.

8. Isn't it true that any voting system can be gamed (or strategized, etc.)?

Yes, there is a theorem which proves that all voting systems must have inherent flaws – that is, it's impossible to create a voting system in which strategy never makes a difference. The objective therefore is to choose a system whose flaws are not an issue to the election at hand. In this system, “strategic voting” is technically possible, but extremely risky: There's no good way to know ahead of time whether a given strategy will help, or backfire. Here's a specific example:

In theory: Suppose that you and your friends wanted to see both the novels *Rocket* and *Castle* on the final ballot, and you really don't want to see *Tentacles*. Suppose that you knew that without your nominations, *Rocket* would be a shoo-in, *Tentacles* would just barely make it to fifth place, and *Castle* would just barely miss. In that case, you all could submit nomination ballots that only have *Castle* in the Best Novel category, leaving off *Rocket*. By doing that, and giving your undivided points to *Castle*, you increase its points and maybe help it to avoid having its number of nominations

compared in the Elimination Phase. (You have no way to increase the number of nominations that Castle receives.) If you push it up to 5th place, it can still be eliminated by Tentacles, if Castle has fewer nominations. If you could somehow push it all the way up to 4th place, it would safely make the final ballot.

In practice: You won't actually know the preferences of all the other Hugo voters so precisely before the election. Maybe Rocket isn't so popular after all, and it needs your nominations to get over the top. Maybe too many people will assume Rocket is safe, and it loses because they left it off their ballots. Maybe Tentacles has a broad enough base of support that your nominations for Castle aren't enough to eliminate it. Maybe Castle is so unpopular outside your own circle of friends that it never had a chance. Maybe you're the only Castle fan who also likes Rocket, so your strategy won't change Castle's score by enough to put it in 4th place. Half a point isn't likely to make enough of a difference to give it that much of a boost (and the cost is that you are giving up nominating any of your other favorites). There are many ways for your strategy to fail, or even backfire, and only one, highly-specific way for it to work.

Nominating what you think is Hugo-worthy really is your best strategy.

9. What are E Pluribus Hugo's flaws?

In rare cases, it is possible that eliminating both members of a tie could change the final ballot slightly from what it would be if the tie were broken. The change is usually in the least popular of the finalists, and requires the two nominees in question to be very close in popularity. Hundreds of simulations were run using real and created data sets to help decide which tie-breaking methods would maintain our goal of supporting the wide range of opinions within fandom. It turned out that all the simulations showed that there was almost no difference in outcomes, no matter how we broke ties. We have chosen, therefore, to break ties in a manner consistent with section 6.4 of the Worldcon constitution. There are a number of additional tie breakers that could be used if it were deemed necessary in the future; however, simulations that have been run by the designers of this system show that it really shouldn't be required.

10 What are E Pluribus Hugo's benefits?

Simply put, it reduces the power of bloc voting without eliminating the chance that nominees that do appear on slates will make it to the final ballot. Conversely, it makes it very difficult for slates to prevent non-slate nominees from appearing on the ballot.

11. How does this system eliminate slate or bloc voting?

It doesn't, exactly, nor should a nominee be automatically eliminated just because it appears on a slate. On the other hand, any slate which nominates a full set of five nominees will find that each of its nominations only count 1/5 as much. With "non-slate" nominating, some of your nominees will be slowly eliminated, so your remaining nominees get more and more of your support. Since slate nominees tend to live or die

together, they tend to eliminate each other until, in general, only one slate nominee remains. With a large enough support behind the slate (five times as much), the slate may still sweep a category; however, if that many voters support the slate, they arguably deserve to win, and no fair and unbiased system of nomination will prevent that. The answer in that case is, simply, to increase the general pool of voters. Regardless, with E Pluribus Hugo, slates will never receive a disproportionate share of the final ballot, as occurred in the 2015 Hugos.

12 Couldn't supporters of slates just recommend a single nominee for a candidate, and it will automatically appear on the final ballot?

Yes, if a slate has enough supporters, that is certainly a viable possibility – it's also completely fair. It does not force all other nominees off of the final ballot, and the final Hugo winner is determined by the same voting process we have always had. Just appearing on the final ballot isn't a guarantee of winning a Hugo. However, if any large section of fandom strongly believes that a nominee deserves a Hugo nomination, then it should, in fact, appear on the final ballot.

13. What if there are multiple slates (slate wars, "parties", etc.)?

As with a single slate, the nominees on each slate will tend to eliminate each other until only the most popular one remains. The end result is that even multiple slates are unable to sweep the nominations.

14. What happens if a broadly popular nominee is nominated by a group of unrelated people?

If it is broadly popular, the system will still select that nominee for the final ballot.

15. What happens if a broadly popular nominee also appears on a slate?

If the nominee garners support from individuals, then the system will select that nominee for the final ballot, even if it is on a slate. In general, slates neither help nor hurt any given nominee.

16. What happens when there are a lot of nominees with no obvious favorites and nomination slates are introduced?

Simulations of this scenario showed that slate nominees did receive a larger proportion of nomination slots than they did otherwise. This is a fair and valid result: If there were no overall favorite, then members really had no collective preference. Even in this scenario, simulations showed that non-slate nominees were not completely shut out of the final ballot.

17. How do the results of this system compare to the results under the current nomination system?

Statistical tests showed that this system duplicates historical results under the present system in about (conservatively) 4.5 out of 5 candidates. In the absence of slates, it generally gives identical results to the current nomination system.

18. I think we should just increase the number of nomination slots on the final ballot to a larger number (for example, 6), and decrease the number of slots a member can nominate to a smaller number (for example, 4). Wouldn't that be simpler and easier?

Unfortunately, this simply means that the slate with the largest number of supporters will receive four of the nominations and the slate with the next largest number of supporters will receive the remaining two. It doesn't solve the problem of slates depriving non-slate nominees of the opportunity to compete in the final Award vote. In general, we want fandom to nominate as many nominees as they feel are Hugo-worthy, since under E Pluribus Hugo there is no strategic reason not to do so. For this reason, most of the designers of this system would prefer that members not be limited to nominating only four nominees. Keep in mind, however, that E Pluribus Hugo will work with this (or most any other) change as well, so one does not preclude the other.

19. I think we should set up a committee to handle these situations as they occur. The committee would be empowered to add nomination slots or throw out slate-influenced ballots as required.

In spite of some claims on the Internet, there has never been a small group of people serving as actual gatekeepers to the Hugo Awards. Establishing such a review committee would validate those claims. The fairness of a committee's decisions would be subject to constant questions, and the prestige of the Hugo Awards would be tarnished.

20. I think we should use [insert other mathematical voting system].

We considered essentially every applicable type of voting system currently in the literature, guided by two experts in the field. It should be kept in mind, however, that the goals and requirements for choosing a set of representatives in a political situation are different from those for choosing a set of Hugo finalists. Some of these systems do, in fact, have positive properties that speak for them. None of them were as simple or as intuitive as E Pluribus Hugo, yet E Pluribus Hugo meets all of the stated goals for a Hugo nomination system.

21. This system looks really complicated. Won't E Pluribus Hugo be difficult to code and implement?

We should keep in mind that EPH is actually not any more complicated than the Instant Runoff Voting system we currently use for the Hugo finals. We use a computer program to handle the nomination system currently; changing to a different computer program isn't a big deal. From the standpoint of the voters, nothing at all changes – they can continue to nominate just as they always have. One of our non-experts coded the full algorithm for the system in a matter of days. If the current nomination-gathering code can be modified to output a comma-delimited text file, we can use the existing EPH code as-is, so no new code would need to be developed.

22. Isn't this change just designed to keep certain people out of the Hugo nomination process?

No. E Pluribus Hugo is designed to fix a flaw in the current Hugo nominating process, which was highlighted by the Sad and Rabid Puppies slates in 2015. This flaw allowed a small percentage of nominators to dominate the final ballot, shutting out all others from entire categories. This is a major flaw that must be fixed if the integrity of the Hugo Awards is to be maintained. E Pluribus Hugo dilutes the effect of slate or bloc nominating, and works against any group trying to control the nominations. If some hypothetical cabal were trying to maintain its dominance, they would not propose this system, as E Pluribus Hugo works against that purpose.

Although it is true that the discussions for this system were hosted at the “Making Light” blog, owned by Teresa and Patrick Nielsen Hayden, the discussions were conducted openly and inclusively. Those of us who worked on the system were very clear that our goals were to create a system that resists bloc or slate nominating, treats all individual nominators equally, and allows a consensus final ballot to emerge from all the nominations submitted. E Pluribus Hugo accomplishes those goals.

Discussion: Kent Bloom made a motion to postpone indefinitely. He felt this amendment was excessively premature to have any discussion. The data necessary to discuss this would not be available this year and might not be available next year until after the Hugo Awards are handed out, if it's done in the traditional way. We have only one data point that is not in a series; and if you have one anomaly, it is simply not statistically or otherwise valid to consider that as a motivation for action until you have verified that there is actually a problem and not a measurement or, in this case, a social issue.

Quinn Jameson, one of the makers of the original motion and a voting systems expert, said the requirement for the additional data on Sunday wasn't necessary but would be an extra demonstration of the effectiveness of the method. He felt there was sufficient theoretical grounds to debate the method and sufficient simulation evidence in order to debate this method with or without any data that might be gained on Sunday.

John Lorentz spoke against consideration. He said theory was fine but facts are a different matter; real world experience is a different matter. He administered the Hugo Awards in 1998, 2002, 2006 and 2015, and he felt this proposal was extremely complicated on many levels: it adds a lot of work to the Hugo administrators; it adds work to the programming needed; it is complicated to explain to the voters, and he did not feel it was practical.

The lead maker of the motion, Keith “Kilo” Watt, said that E Pluribus Hugo (“EPH”) would not change anything in how people vote. The instructions to the nominators would be exactly the same. A key objective was “Do no harm.” If there were no slates, EPH would change nothing in the results. It’s designed so that only if you were getting this representation coming in would there be an effect. It’s already coded and ready to go. It only requires a comma-delimited text file. He also volunteered to work with the Hugo Administrators. He also believed that there was time to tweak the program after the results of the 2015 awards are released, and the thing to be decided was whether there was enough of a problem from what we’ve seen this year that we need to do something. If the answer is yes, we need to discuss the options.

A two-thirds vote against consideration was necessary to kill this proposed amendment. There being less than two-thirds vote in the negative, the motion was not postponed and was scheduled for referral to committee of the whole on Friday and considered for a vote on Sunday.

Before the debate time could be set, however, Ben Yalow asked to substitute a motion for the original constitutional amendment that would create a Hugo Study Committee to consider the matter and report back next year. Perianne Lurie asked to amend Mr. Yalow’s suggestion with a secondary amendment to have a committee continue studying the motion, even after the vote was taken on Sunday. However, the Chair ruled that that secondary amendment was not in order. Dr. Lurie then spoke against creating the committee. She felt that the people who caused this issue in the first place were not going to go away, and she believed we needed to start taking action now so that we can refine it next year, and that we could not survive three years of this problem.

After a point of inquiry, the Chair clarified that the motion to create the committee would have to be discussed on Sunday because that was the substitute motion. But that would only occur if the substitute motion passed.

Jack Foy pointed out that the origin of this motion had already been discussed extensively within a written documented process on a particular blog and was refined well enough to consider as is.

On the question of substituting a new proposal to create a study committee for the entire matter, a majority being necessary, the negative had it, and the motion to amend by substitution failed.

Debate time was set at 36 minutes. [Please click here to jump to Sunday’s discussion.](#)

B.2 Resolutions

B.2.1 Short Title: I Remember the Future

Moved, to extend the Hugo eligibility for the movie *I Remember the Future* due to extremely limited distribution, as provided for in Section 3.4.3 of the WSFS Constitution.

Proposed by: Chris Barkley, Michael A. Burstein, and Nomi S. Burstein;
Along with Lou Antonelli, Ari Baronofsky, Steve Davidson, Tom Doyle, Harold Feld, Lisa Feld, Tom Galloway, Christopher J. Garcia, Crystal Huff, Justin Husted, Daniel M. Kimmel, Michael Kingsley, Larry Lennhoff, Tasha Turner Lennhoff, Ann Margaret Lewis, Jennifer Francis Murphy, Steven H Silver, Janna Silverstein, Amy Sisson, Sarah Stegall, Leslie Turek, France Andrews Zeve, Alvaro Zinos-Amaro

Commentary: The film *I Remember the Future* (KAS Creations) is a short student film that was directed by Klayton Stainer, an Australian filmmaker. It premiered at the 2014 Worldfest-Houston on April 6, 2014, and in the rest of the calendar year it was screened at only two other venues: the San Jose Short Film Festival (October 12, 2014) and a special meeting of the Baltimore Science Fiction Society (November 15, 2014). Because of its limited release, very few members of Sasquan were actually able to screen the film before the deadline for nominating in the 2015 Hugo Awards. The film won a Grand Remi Award at Worldfest-Houston and has received other accolades since, which serve as testimony to the idea that the film would actually be worthy to be considered for a Hugo nomination.

In 2015, the film was screened at three science-fiction conventions (Arisia, Boskone, and Minicon) and more film festivals, thus giving it more exposure. Furthermore, as of this writing the film has been submitted to Sasquan for the media program. We would like to give this film the chance it deserves to be considered by the members of MidAmeriCon II for the Hugo in Best Dramatic Presentation, Short Form.

Disclosure: One proponent of this motion is the writer whose Nebula-nominated short story served as the basis for this film.

[Please click here to jump to Friday's discussion.](#)

B.2.2 Short Title: Hugo Eligibility Extension for Predestination

Moved, to extend for one year the eligibility of the movie *Predestination*, based on limited availability, as authorized by Section 3.4.3 of the WSFS Constitution.

Proposed by: Michael Kingsley, Mark Bernstein, Emily Stewart, and Aaron Vander Giessen

Commentary: The Australian film *Predestination* has its global premiere at the SXSW Film Festival in Austin, Texas on March 8, 2014. The film then was part of the Melbourne International Film Festival in July, 2014. There were theatrical screenings

in a limited number of large cities in the United States in January 2015, and *Predestination* was not released on DVD until February 10, 2015. Due to its limited release in 2014 and early 2015, very few members of Sasquan had the opportunity to view the film before the deadline for nominating the 2015 Hugo Awards. *Predestination* is a film adaptation of the classic Robert Heinlein short story, “All You Zombies,” which appeared in the March 1959 issue of *The Magazine of Fantasy and Science Fiction*, and the film has been receiving several favorable reviews. It currently scores 84% with film critics on the Rotten Tomatoes aggregator website.

[Please click here to jump to Friday’s discussion.](#)

B.2.3 Short Title: Hugo Nominating Data Request

Moved, that the WSFS Business Meeting requests that the Administrators of the 2015 Hugo Awards make publicly available anonymized raw nominating data from the 2015 Hugo Awards, including the works nominated on each ballot in each category, but not including any information that could be used to relate ballots to the members who cast them; and

Resolved, that it is the opinion of the WSFS Business Meeting that releasing such anonymized raw nominating data after the announcement of the results of the 2015 Hugo Awards is not a violation of the privacy of members’ ballots.

Proposed by: Keith “Kilo” Watt, Jameson Quinn, David Harmon, Duncan J. Macdonald, Catherine Faber, David Goldfarb, Soon Lee, David Wallace

Commentary: While there will always be speculation and “what if?” scenarios, discussions will be more productive if they are based on reality. Particularly in an election, transparency (so long as voter privacy isn’t violated) is always a good and necessary aspect. Releasing the anonymized ballots will also put to rest any insinuations about impropriety in handling what has been an extraordinarily contentious Hugo season. Perhaps more importantly, the nomination ballot data have significant historical value and should be preserved in any event. This request does not compromise anonymity, any more than manually recounting ballots would in any election.

Testing and development of voting systems are greatly enhanced by using real-world data. During the creation of the E Pluribus Hugo methodology, several statistically-generated nomination datasets were used for testing purposes. It would be beneficial to use an actual nomination dataset for verification of EPH methodology and results, as well as for any other nomination system which may be proposed.

[Please click here to jump to Friday’s discussion.](#)

B.2.4 Short Title: Open Source Software

Resolved, That the WSFS Business Meeting recommends that software (including but not necessarily limited to, custom-written applications,

spreadsheets, and databases, but not including the hardware, operating systems, or commercial applications upon which such software is dependent) used by a seated Worldcon committee to carry out any function mandated by the Constitution (including, but not necessarily limited to, administration of the Hugo Awards and of Future Worldcon Selection), shall be made available to any member upon request or as an open-source project;

That if a Committee makes such information available upon request, it must make readily available contact information for feedback including bug reports;

That no Worldcon shall be obligated to use any patch or upgrade suggested during its seating period; and

That such patches or upgrades be considered for inclusion if the software is to be reused by Worldcons seated after the submission is made.

Proposed by: Kate Secor, Ben Wolfe

Commentary: As software becomes more sophisticated, and various proposals for counting nominations and votes follow to take advantage of new capabilities, it is inevitable that we will reach a point where nominations and votes can no longer be verified by hand. This requires a measure of trust in the software that is used to tabulate results.

The Worldcon community (and that of SF/F fandom at large) contains many people who are aware of the risks of using untested and unverified software. This measure is introduced to encourage Worldcons to allow independent review of the software they use to promote faith in the results of its use.

The intention is not to put a burden on Worldcons to supply anything other than the source code of the software they are using, since that would represent an unreasonable drain on their resources. It is also not intended to require any Worldcon to make changes to their software during their seating periods.

The hope is that this will encourage the creation and reuse of robust, flexible software with community oversight and input, to encourage greater understanding of how WSFS-mandated voting operations are carried out.

[Please click here to jump to Friday's discussion.](#)

B.2.5 Short Title: MPC Funding

Resolved, that the Business Meeting recommends that all future Worldcons and NASFiCs grant US\$1 per voting member to the WSFS Mark Protection Committee to fund the MPC's operations.

Moved by: The WSFS Mark Protection Committee

Commentary: The operations of the WSFS MPC have been funded by a voluntary donation from Worldcon (and sometimes NASFiC) committees of \$0.50 per site selection voter. This amount was established in the early 1980s when the MPC's

predecessor was established, and has never been adjusted. Since then, the number of things the MPC has been expected to do has increased, the number of places the MPC has been tasked to register the WSFS service marks has grown, and the MPC has also had to deal with a number of infringements upon the MPC marks, some very serious and expensive. The MPC proposes that broadening the contribution of WSFS convention committees to \$1 per voting member (that is, member with applicable WSFS voting rights such as site selection, Hugo Awards, including all Attending and Supporting members) would catch up on thirty years of inflation, fund all current projects, and allow the MPC to build up a reserve against emergencies requiring substantial legal expenses, such as the Fancaster affair(!) last year.

The MPC typically does not ask committees to make their traditional donations until after their convention is over, and does not attempt to collect donations from committees that are otherwise insolvent.

By defining the contribution in terms of “voting members,” any non-voting members (such as press passes, vendors, children-in-tow, and any other class of member that does not have voting rights) would not be assessed a contribution. NASFiC committees typically do not have “voting members” in this sense, except in the rare case when a NASFiC selects the site of a future NASFiC; however, the MPC suggests that future NASFiC committees follow the example of Detcon 1 and contribute similar amount based on their supporting and attending membership counts.

[Please click here to jump to Friday's discussion.](#)

C. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MOTIONS

Committee reports may include motions. Motions made by committees consisting of more than one person need not be seconded.

C.1 Standing Committees of WSFS

C.1.1 Mark Protection Committee (Including Nominations for MPC)

The annual report of the Mark Protection Committee (“MPC”) is attached to this agenda as [APPENDIX 1](#).

The MPC met on August 19, in Room 304 of the Spokane Convention Center in Spokane, Washington, at Sasquan.

Nominations for the WSFS Mark Protection Committee are in order at the Preliminary Business Meeting. Nominees must accept nomination within one hour of the end of the Preliminary Business Meeting. Current MPC members are:

- **Elected 2012, term ending in 2015:** Stephen Boucher, Scott Dennis and Donald Eastlake III;

- **Elected 2013, term ending in 2016:** Tim Illingworth, Kevin Standlee, and Ben Yalow;
- **Elected 2014, term ending in 2017:** John Coxon, Linda Deneroff, and Dave McCarty; and
- **Worldcon Representatives:**
 LoneStarCon 3 – Randall Shepherd (until 2015)
 Loncon 3 – Paul Dormer (until 2016)
 Detcon 1 – Deb Geisler (until 2016)
 Sasquan – Glenn Glazer (until 2017)
 MidAmericon II – Mark Olson (until 2018).
- **Officers of the Mark Protection Committee**
 Chair: Kevin Standlee
 Secretary: Linda Deneroff
 Treasurer: Scott Dennis
 Agent for Canada: Adrienne Seel

The members whose terms of office expired at this Worldcon were: Stephen Boucher; Scott Dennis and Donald Eastlake III. We elect no more than three people each year to the Committee. Write-in votes are allowed, but write-in candidates must also submit their consent to election by the close of balloting. Nomination acceptance forms were available at the head table staff. Mr. Olson nominated the three current members to continue, and they accepted their individual nominations. Glenn Glazer nominated Bruce Farr, who also accepted the nomination.

[Please jump here to jump to the Mark Protection Committee election results.](#)

The Hugo Awards Marketing Committee (HAMC) members are Dave McCarty (Chair), Cheryl Morgan, Kevin Standlee, Craig Miller and Mark Olson. This is a subcommittee of the Mark Protection Committee, and their report is made to the MPC and follows the MPC financial report.

The Worldcon Website Working Group (WWWG) is chaired by Mike Scott and has a variable membership. This is a subcommittee of the Mark Protection Committee. The Worldcon Website Working Group submitted no report to the MPC. George Mitchell, who hosts the Worldcon.org and WSFS.org web sites, will make a report directly to the Business Meeting regarding the web site hosting.

Kevin Standlee recused himself from presiding at the Business Meeting, and Jared Dashoff assumed the Chair. Mr. Standlee, Chairman of the Mark Protection Committee, presented the MPC's report.

Verbal Report: Mr. Standlee reported that this was an extraordinarily useful and productive year for the committee. It fought off a serious and expensive challenge to one of our service marks through a potential suit that was not followed up at last year's

Worldcon. It cost us a lot of money, and a lot of groups, including last year's Worldcon and several other committees donated toward it.

The MPC implemented the proposal from last year's business meeting to form an entity to pursue registration of marks outside the United States. It turned out that trusts are not the right kind of legal form. But thanks to the cooperation of an existing nonprofit that was in the process of suspending operations, the MPC was able to form a 501(c)(3) tax exempt California nonprofit corporation by taking over their charter and changing its name to Worldcon Intellectual Property ("WIP"). It is completely controlled by the members of the Mark Protection Committee, which has now begun the process of registering our service marks in the EU, which was our next highest priority.

In addition, the MPC did a budget analysis and worked out a resolution that will be considered later in the agenda to recommend a change in the way this committee is funded. The funding mechanism for the Mark Protection Committee has not changed or been adjusted since 1984, and it has thoroughly gotten out of whack with inflation and increasing amount of demands on our time.

The MPC also thanked those organizations and individuals who donated money to the EU mark registration cost: LoneStarCon 3, which made a special contribution; Anticipation (through CanSMOF); and Dave Lally, who personally contributed a quarter of the cost, for which the MPC is grateful.

George Mitchell, who has been the web host of the Worldcon websites for many years, was then granted the floor.

Mr. Mitchell said it had been his honor and his pleasure to host WSFS.org and Worldcon.org since they were first registered, over 20 years ago and that it had been fun, except for email registration, which was less fun every year. That the business meeting had never heard of him was the best indication that the current arrangement has been successful. However, he felt the time had come when the society needed something more professional and permanent. He was willing to aid, assist and advise in whatever way the society wished. Mr. Mitchell concluded by giving his heartfelt thanks for having had the pleasure of providing the hosting all this time.

Kevin Standlee then asked if there were any objection to the meeting suspending the rules and adopting a resolution that thanked Mr. Mitchell for his many years of service to WSFS.

Resolved, that the WSFS Business Meeting offers its thanks to George Mitchell for his many years of service to the World Science Fiction Society as the host of the Society's Worldcon.org, NASFIC.org, and WSFS.org web sites.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

With that, Mr. Standlee resumed chairing the Business Meeting. He recognized Lisa Hayes, who thanked the meeting for allowing her the privilege of recording the meeting. She announced that the first segment of the recording had already had 85

views on You Tube, and she was happy to have been able to bring the meeting to the entire world.

Without objection, Preliminary Business Meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m. on Thursday.

BUSINESS MEETING, FRIDAY, AUGUST 21, 2015

The meeting was called to order at 10:10 a.m. The business meeting staff consisted of Kevin Standlee, Presiding Officer; Jared Dashoff, Deputy Presiding Officer; Donald E. Eastlake III, Parliamentarian; Linda Deneroff, Secretary; Jesi Pershing, Timekeeper; Lisa Hayes, Videographer; and Joyce Reynolds-Ward, Sergeant-at-Arms.

The Business Meeting was conducted in an order different from that shown in the printed agenda. These minutes follow that new order, but follow the numbering in the printed agenda.

The Chair announced the order of the rest of the meeting's proceedings. The meeting would resume where it left off at the end of the Preliminary Meeting. That meeting accomplished everything it was required to do; however, a number of items that would ordinarily have been taken up at the Preliminary Meeting still remained. Therefore the Friday meeting would start with the election of members to the Mark Protection Committee. It would then proceed to committee reports. Some committees, however, had very minimal reports and asked that the written reports be accepted without additional discussion. Resolutions would come next, and then the Business Meeting would commence a Committee of the Whole to discuss the Hugo-related items concerning nominating procedures. Following that would be ratification of the business passed on from Loncon 3, and, finally, the new constitutional amendments would be voted on. Anything not concluded on Friday would come up at Saturday's meeting. Anything remaining after Saturday's meeting would come up on Sunday before the items already set to be discussed on Sunday.

C. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MOTIONS (continued)

C.1 Standing Committees of WSFS

C.1.1 Mark Protection Committee

[Please click here to jump to the verbal Mark Protection Committee report.](#)

[Please click here to jump to APPENDIX 1 for the written Mark Protection Committee report.](#)

The Mark Protection Committee report was given on Thursday and nominations were taken for the committee. At the beginning of Friday's session, ballots were distributed for voting. Tim Illingworth and Todd Dashoff (Mr. Dashoff the Elder) were the tellers.

[Please click here to jump to the Mark Protection Committee election results.](#)

C.2 Standing Committees of the Business Meeting

Standing committees of the Business Meeting are created by Standing Rule.

C.2.1 Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

The Nitpicking and Flyspecking Committee members for 2014-2015 are Donald Eastlake (Chair), Jared Dashoff, Linda Deneroff, Tim Illingworth, Jesi Pershing, and Kevin Standlee. The authority of this committee stems from:

Standing Rule 7.7: Nitpicking and Flyspecking Committee

The Business Meeting shall appoint a Nitpicking and Flyspecking Committee. The Committee shall:

- (1) Maintain the list of Rulings and Resolutions of Continuing Effect;
- (2) Codify the Customs and Usages of WSFS and of the Business Meeting.

Actions: The Resolutions & Rulings of Continuing Effect is up to date at <http://www.wsfs.org/bm/rules.html>.

The NP&FSC notices that the new rule allowing Postpone Indefinitely inadvertently conflicts with an existing provision in Rule 1.2, and that it is unclear whether Postpone Indefinitely can apply to a constitutional amendment pending ratification. It was obviously the legislative intent that Postpone Indefinitely could apply to any item of new business (including new constitutional amendments), but not to constitutional amendments awaiting ratification, because Postpone Indefinitely is intended to be a somewhat gentler way of achieving what Objection to Consideration does without the abrupt parliamentary force that OTC applies. Therefore, the Committee moves the adoption of the following change to Standing Rule 1.2, and furthermore moves to Suspend the Rules and allow this change to take effect immediately.

In addition, the Committee has noticed a number of minor inconsistencies and infelicitous wordings and anticipates proposing some minor technical amendments in 2016.

The Chair reiterated that the resolution put forth by the Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee (agenda item B.2.6 PI Scope) was discussed and adopted at the top of the Preliminary Business Meeting. The committee will have more to do next year.

The Business Meeting Chair reappointed the members of the committee as currently constituted and with the discretion of its chair to appoint new members.

C.2.2 Worldcon Runners Guide Editorial Committee

The Worldcon Runners' Guide Editorial Committee members for 2014-2015 are Mike Willmoth (Chair), Bill Taylor, John Hertz, Sharon Sbarsky, Alex von Thorn and Marah Searle-Kovacevic. The authority of this committee stems from:

Standing Rule 7.8: Worldcon Runners Guide Editorial Committee

The Business Meeting shall appoint a Worldcon Runners Guide Editorial Committee. The Committee shall maintain the Worldcon Runners Guide, which shall contain a compilation of the best practices in use among those who run Worldcons.

The Worldcon Runners Guide Committee continued to make incremental improvements with the online documentation available at <http://werg.conrunner.net/wiki>.

Dicussion: Mike Wilmoth, the Chair of the committee, said not a lot of progress had been made because its members had been working on Sasquan, but there had been some incremental progress in updating the online guide.

The Business Meeting Chair reappointed the members of the committee as currently constituted and with the discretion of its chair to appoint new members.

C.3 Special Committees

Per WSFS Constitution Section 5.2, any special committee not reauthorized automatically lapses.

C.3.1 Formalization of Long List Entries (FOLLE) Committee

The Long List Committee has continued to curate the Long List of Worldcons and Long List of Hugos.

The committee is working toward moving the Long List to the WSFS site once it is established. For now, the working site is at <http://www.smofinfo.com/LL/>.

The Long List Committee for 2014-2015 consists of Mark Olson (Chair), Craig Miller, David G. Grubbs, Joe Siclari, Kent Bloom, Colin Harris, Kevin Standlee, Tim Illingworth, and Ben Yalow. Richard Lynch has left the committee, and we thank him for his many years of help.

The committee requests that the WSFS BM continue its endorsement of the committee for another year.

This report was in writing and there was no additional oral report. Their motion was discussed later and can be found [here](#).

C.3.2 YA Hugo Award Study Committee

The report of the YA Hugo Award Study Committee is attached to this agenda as [APPENDIX 2](#).

At Loncon 3, Katie Rask was appointed chair of the reconstituted committee for 2014-2015, whose members are Jodie Baker, Adam Beaton, Warren Buff, Johnny Carruthers, Aurora Celeste, Peter De Weerd, Martin Easterbrook, Chris Garcia, Helen Gbala, Tim Illingworth, Dina Krause, Laura Lamont, Farah Mendelsohn, Sue “Twilight” Mohn,

Christine Rake, Kate Secor, Marguerite Smith, Kevin Standlee, Adam Tesh, Tehani Wessely, Clark B. Wierda, and Lew Wolkoff.

Motion: The Committee requests that the Business Meeting reform the Committee for another year (with the addition of new members). The new version of the Committee will focus specifically on the issues surrounding the creation of a Campbell-like YA/teen lit award (possible topics of discussion presented in Exhibit 2), with the results presented at next year's Business Meeting. Click [here](#) for the authorization.

Discussion: Katie Rask reported that the committee was formed as a second version of the prior committee. The goal was to consider the very many issues that have been raised in business meetings in the past regarding the possibility of a YA Hugo Award. The goal wasn't necessarily to come up with a proposal but to deal with some of the issues that had not been dealt with before. She reiterated that the idea of a YA Hugo has been around for at least a quarter of a century. Their findings were (1) an award is a reasonable request. It is reasonable to have a YA or teen lit award and (2) under the existing methodology of the Hugo Awards, there is no provision for a YA award since the Hugo fiction categories are defined by word count, not by age categories.

The four exhibits to Appendix 2 further detail the issues the committee dealt with. Exhibit 1 addressed some of the common concerns that have been raised in business meetings in the past about whether an award is even necessary: Why have another award when YA books are already eligible? The committee's findings were that the Hugos have not necessarily done a good job of representing YA works in the past. Exhibit 3 compared the Hugo Awards and the Newbery awards: In the last 50 years or so, approximately five YA speculative fiction titles have been nominated for a Hugo; in that same timeframe, 35 or 36 YA speculative fiction works have been nominated for the Newberys.

The second section addressed the issue of whether YA is a subgenre; many people refer to it as a genre. And this section explained that most people do not consider it a genre. It's considered an age category, something completely different. The third issue was: will anyone at Worldcon know anything about YA? And would they be qualified to vote? Ms. Rask said the committee had some really good data. For example, there were 36 YA lit panels at Loncon 3 as well as a number of presenters.

Ms. Rask noted that YA was not defined on the list of awards in Exhibit 2. And as noted above, Exhibit 3 shows Newbery/Hugo comparison. The main gist of Exhibit 4 is that the committee believed it had not really been able to address all of the issues and believed that it needed a second year, specifically to further address the issue of a non-Hugo award. She presented the idea of something like a Campbell Award, given the problem with the present Hugo methodology. Ms. Rask then asked the membership for a second year to continue with both its current members and anyone else who wished to join.

Joshua Kronengold asked if they committee considered targeting YA with a length category using the existing Hugo methodology. Ms. Rask replied that Exhibit 4 contained a list of some of the questions that the committee would not just consider but

also research in more detail in the coming year, one of which would be word length limits. She thought probably 40,000 words would be a good place to start for a shorter novel. YA books can be very long, but they can also be shorter, and Ms. Rask felt more research was needed to find common word lengths in YA books.

Mr. Kronengold then asked whether a particular word-length category could be called YA, or if YA usually fell under a particular word-length category that, therefore, could work with the Hugo methodology.

The meeting voted to continue the committee for another year. The Business Meeting Chair reappointed the members of the committee as currently constituted with the addition of Joshua Kronengold and with the discretion of its chair to appoint new members.

C.3.3 WSFS Membership Types and Rates Committee

Mark Olson is chair of this committee that was reconstituted at Loncon 3. The members for 2014-2015 are Gary Blog, Kent Bloom, Warren Buff, Martin Easterbrook, Donald Eastlake 3rd, Kevin Hewett, Colin Harris, Tim Illingworth, Kevin J. Maroney, Priscilla Olson, Ron Oakes, Perky Raj (“PRK”) Khangure, Howard Rosenblatt, Ian Stockdale, Kevin Standlee, Don A. Timm, Leslie Turek, and Mike Willmoth.

In view of recent events, the committee recommends that “A.4 Short Title: WSFS Membership Types and Rates” be ratified, and another committee be appointed once we have a chance to see the outcome of that amendment.

The WSFS Membership Types and Rates Committee submitted a written report and had no oral report.

At this point the polls closed for the Mark Protection Committee election.

B. NEW BUSINESS

B.2 Resolutions

The first order of business as each item came up was to set time limits on these resolutions, since none had been set at the Preliminary Business Meeting.

B.2.1 Short Title: I Remember the Future

[Please click here to jump to the text of the motion.](#)

This motion extends eligibility for the Hugo Awards under Section 3.4.3; it required a two-thirds vote. Debate time was set at 4 minutes.

Discussion: Chris Barkley noted that this film received limited distribution and he, as well as Michael A. Burstein, and Nomi S. Burstein, wanted this particular and

remarkable film to be considered in next year's Hugos. He also threw their support in favor of extended eligibility for the film, *Predestination*.

Without any further debate and with a two-thirds vote in favor of adopting this resolution, the resolution was adopted, and the eligibility of I Remember the Future was extended.

B.2.2 Short Title: Hugo Eligibility Extension for Predestination

[Please click here to jump to the text of the motion.](#)

This motion extends eligibility for the Hugo Awards under Section 3.4.3; it required a two-thirds vote. Without objection, debate time was set at 4 minutes.

Michael Kingsley believed this film is definitely worthy of a Hugo. It is an Australian film that was first presented to the public at South by Southwest in 2014. It was then presented to the public at the Sydney Film Festival later that year and perhaps some other small venues. But it wasn't generally available until 2015, when it was released on DVD, On Demand, and perhaps one other venue.

Without any further debate and with a two-thirds vote in favor, this resolution was adopted, and the eligibility of *Predestination* was extended.

B.2.3 Short Title: Hugo Nominating Data Request

[Please click here to jump to the text of the motion.](#) Debate time set at 6 minutes.

Discussion: Before debate commenced, the Chair observed that this was merely a request. The administrators of the Hugo awards had complete and total authority under the WSFS Constitution to do as they would with the request. They did not have to release the information or they could release it at their discretion.

Mr. Keith "Kilo" Watt believed this was a fairly low-pressure request. As his group was developing E Pluribus Hugo ("EPH"), they realized it was handy to have actual data that they could use for developing the scenario. But it didn't just apply to that group. It applied to anybody, for transparency. The group actually had the 1984 actual ballots that they used for testing. They also took the 2013 nomination data and did a statistical sampling that matched that, but they had a lot more confidence in the 1984 data because it was the real thing. He did not feel that the group violated any privacy issues. Additionally, it is useful information as well as historical information. The Hugo vote this year, for better or worse, is going to be an historical item, and he felt we should have this data for historical purposes.

John Lorentz raised a point of order: he felt that this resolution was out of order because it violated Section 3.11.4 of the Constitution, about releasing the voting totals. It includes the statement that during the same period, the nomination vote total shall also be published, including in each category the vote counts for at least the top 15 vote-getters and any other nominee receiving a number of votes equal to at least five

percent of the nomination ballots cast in the category, but not including any nominee receiving fewer than five votes.

The Chair ruled that the point of order was not well taken and said the Constitution is a minimum, not a maximum and that it is permissible for the administrators to release more information than required. Mr. Lorentz appealed the chair's ruling.

The Chair defended his ruling, reiterating that that the wording in Section 3.11.4 of the Constitution represents the minimum requirement, not a maximum, and that administrators are allowed, but not required, to release more information than is provided.

Mr. Lorentz, speaking against the Chair's ruling, said that the wording says specifically "the nomination voting totals shall be published" and it also includes that "not including any nominee receiving fewer than 5 votes." Therefore Mr. Lorentz believed that it specifically says we shall release these numbers, but not release anything receiving less than 5 votes. Words matter, he added.

Carl Fink made a parliamentary inquiry, requesting that the exact wording in the Constitution be put up on the screen.

Leslie Turek spoke in favor of the Chair's ruling, because it seemed clear to her that the phrase was put there to reduce the burden on the Hugo Committee so that they wouldn't have to list every single thing that got nominated, which could number a few hundred items. It wasn't meant to preclude anything, but you don't have to do it.

Ben Yalow said historically nothing was released initially. There was then an extensive discussion, and a compromise was reached between those who wanted everything released and those who wanted nothing released. This compromise resulted in the current wording of this Constitutional article to split the difference. Nothing more was intended.

Mike Stern believed the defining word was "at least," which means you can do more. The Chair used his right to speak last and reiterated that it seemed obvious to him that this is a minimum requirement and not a maximum and that whatever the vote, it will set a precedent and go into the Rulings of Continuing Effect. The question of whether the Chair's ruling that wording in Section 3.11.4 is a minimum, not a maximum was sustained by a majority in the affirmative and, thus, the resolution was in order.

Glenn Glazer moved that debate be extended by 6 minutes. However, with less than a two-thirds vote in the affirmative, debate was not extended. Joshua Kronengold then proposed an amendment the resolution to include the phrase "but not including candidates receiving fewer than five nominations" at the end of the first clause, following the words where it says, "but not including any information that could be used to relate ballots to members who cast them". This was an undebatable motion because debate time had expired. There being less than a majority in favor, the question to add the rider to the last sentence of the first clause of the resolution did not pass.

Perianne Lurie made an amendment to the resolution to include the year 2016 everywhere the year 2015 appears so that we will have information next year when we

might be ratifying something we voted on this year. This amendment adopted by a show of hands. A move to end debate and the making of any subsidiary motions was made and passed by a show of hands. The final resolution was now:

Moved, that the WSFS Business Meeting requests that the Administrators of the 2015 and 2016 Hugo Awards make publicly available anonymized raw nominating data from the 2015 and 2016 Hugo Awards, including the works nominated on each ballot in each category, but not including any information that could be used to relate ballots to the members who cast them; and

Resolved, that it is the opinion of the WSFS Business Meeting that releasing such anonymized raw nominating data after the announcement of the results of the 2015 or 2016 Hugo Awards is not a violation of the privacy of members' ballots.

With a majority vote needed to pass this resolution, it passed by a show of hands.

Glenn Glazer, in his capacity as vice chair of business and finance for Sasquan, announced that while the Hugo Administrators had grave reservations about this resolution, Sasquan would comply with the resolution. Ron Oakes, the current developer of the Hugo web application and the keeper of the database, said he had the technical capability of delivering the anonymized data and could possibly make the information available as early as the Sunday business meeting. Mr. Glazer said he knew of one request for this information, and it would be delivered on a thumb drive. However, Sasquan would not post the information on its website, but others could request the information by emailing hugoadmin@sasquan.org.

B.2.7. FOLLE Committee

[Please click here to see the 2016 committee list.](#)

B.2.8. YA Award Committee

[Please click here to see the 2016 committee list.](#)

B.2.9. Membership Rates & Types Committee

[Please click here to see the 2016 committee list.](#)

Each of the three above committees moved its own continuation in the reports (they are motions, even if not in the form of resolutions). The Chair asked if there was any objection to simply continuing the FOLLE Committee, the YA Committee, and Membership Rates and Types Committees as currently constituted. With no objection, the rules were suspended, resolutions B.2.7, B.2.8, and B.2.9 were immediately adopted, and the Chair appointed their existing committees as currently constituted, but with the addition of Mr. Kronengold to the YA Committee. Additionally, each committee may continue to supplement its members at the discretion of the individual committee chairs.

Kent Bloom then pointed out that the Membership Rates & Types Committee requested that it be on hiatus for at least a year, but the chair of that committee felt it was okay to let the motion stand and the committee could simply not meet.

At this point, with the Business Meeting convened a Committee of the Whole, with Jared Dashoff presiding, to discuss items B.1.1 and B.1.4 for 36 minutes. There was no objection to this order of business, nor was there any objection to instructing the Committee of the Whole to record its proceedings and to include them with the recordings of the Business Meeting.

The main business meeting returned to order at 11:49 a.m., and Kevin Standlee resumed chairing the meeting. The committee of the whole made its report: the business meeting should take up the matter of the 4 and 6 proposal in the matter of fill-in-the-blank.

However, before returning to the agenda, the tellers were called upon to the results of the Mark Protection Committee election.

C.1 Standing Committees of WSFS

C.1.1 Mark Protection Committee (Election Results)

[Please click here to see the Mark Protection Committee Verbal Report.](#)

Tim Illingworth and Todd Dashoff reported that there were 128 ballots expressing a preference which meant 64³ were needed to elect. On the first round no one had a majority. The tellers eliminated the lowest total, recounted, and Donald Eastlake was elected. They then proceeded to a second round, which elected Steven Boucher. Bruce Farr was elected in the third round.

Seat 1	First Round	Second Round	Third Round	
Stephen Boucher	28	38	—	
Scott Dennis	21	—	—	
Don Eastlake	46	51	81	Winner
Bruce Farr	33	39	47	
Spoiled	2	—	—	

³ When the results were announced, the majority needed was initially read as 64, but a close reading of the results shows that it was actually 66, dropping to 65 and 64 in subsequent rounds as ballots were eliminated with no further preferences. Although blank ballots do not count toward the total, invalid votes (votes with preferences the tellers could not determine) do count toward the total initially. This slight inaccuracy did not affect the results of the election.

Seat 1	First Round	Second Round	Third Round	
Total with Preference	130	128	128	
Needed to Elect (Majority)	66	65	65	
Blank/No Further Preference	1	3	3	
Total Ballots	131	131	131	

In subsequent rounds, the spoiled ballots from Seat 1 were assumed eliminated as No (Further) Preference.

Seat 2	First Round	Second Round	
Stephen Boucher	46	75	Winner
Scott Dennis	32	—	
Bruce Farr	49	52	
Total with Preference	127	127	
Needed to Elect (Majority)	64	64	
Blank/No Further Preference	4	4	
Total Ballots	131	131	

Seat 3	First Round	
Scott Dennis	61	
Bruce Farr	66	Winner
Total with Preference	127	
Needed to Elect (Majority)	64	
Blank/No Further Preference	4	
Total Ballots	131	

The Chair then asked if there were any objections to commending the tellers and instructing that the ballots be destroyed. Hearing no objection, he thanked the tellers for their work and instructed them to destroy the ballots. The results of the election were now official.

The meeting would have picked up with a discussion of Item B.2.4, but Glenn Glazer made a motion to lay it on the table, because Ron Oakes, a Sasquan's committee member, wished to speak on the matter but had to attend to some convention duties. He requested that the discussion on this matter resume once Mr. Oakes returned. With a two-thirds vote in the affirmative, Item B.2.4 was laid on the table, to be picked up later.

B. NEW BUSINESS

B.2 Resolutions

B.2.5 Short Title: MPC Funding

Kevin Standlee, the Chair of the business meeting recused himself, and deputy chair, Jared Dashoff, once again presided.

[Please click here to jump to the text of the motion.](#) Debate time was set at 8 minutes.

Discussion: Kevin Standlee, as the chair of the Mark Protection Committee, asked, in light of the crowded agenda and since this year's Worldcon (Sasquan) had already pledged \$1 per attending/supporting member (for a total of \$10,500), unanimous consent to withdraw the motion, and without objection, it was withdrawn.

Mr. Standlee then resumed chairing the meeting.

C. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MOTIONS

Adam Tesh asked anyone who was interested in participating in the YA committee to go to the back of the room to give put their names and email addresses on a sign up sheet to be added to the committee.

The Chair could not recall if other committee appointments had been made for the two committees in the Standing Rules. Therefore, at this time the Nitpicking Flyspecking Committee and the Worldcon Runners Editorial Guide Committee were reappointed as currently constituted, with authority to augment their members at their discretion.

D. WORLDCON REPORTS

Due to time constraints, the Chair announced that while there was one financial report he wanted to hear a verbal report on, there was no time to hear the other financial reports. Therefore there is no commentary on these reports, except for D.1.1.

D.1 Past Worldcons & NASFiC

D.1.1 Millennium Philcon (2001)

Final Financial Report as of August 8, 2014

The surplus of the Millennium Philcon has been distributed and this is its final report.

Surplus Balance July 31, 2014	\$45,216.36
Distributions:	
73rd World Science Fiction Society (Sasquan)	\$23,000.00
74th World Science Fiction Society (MidAmericon II)	<u>23,000.00</u>
Balance	\$ 0.00

Certified and presented by: Todd Dashoff, Vice President

Convention: The Millennium Philcon

Address: P.O. Box 425, Huntingdon Valley, PA 19006

Contact Email: Todd Dashoff <todd.dashoff@gmail.com>

Website: <http://2001.worldcon.org>

Current tax status: Not tax-exempt; a Pennsylvania Not-for-Profit Corporation

Officers:

Mark Trebing – President

pTodd Dashoff – Vice President

Margaret Trebing – Secretary

Rich Ferree – Treasurer

Discussion: Todd Dashoff, the chair of the 2001 Worldcon, apologized for the time it had taken, but he was able to report that all surplus reportable funds from Millennium Philcon had been distributed. He added the money was split between Sasquan and MidAmeriCon II, and that Sasquan had agreed that if they ended up not needing the money, they would distribute it to the 75th Worldcon, to the Mark Protection Committee, and to the Worldcon Historic Committee.

John Pomeranz confirmed that the Millennium Philcon had fulfilled its obligations to the World Science Fiction Society without outside pressure. He moved that the Business Meeting thank Millennium Philcon for resolving this difficult matter, and was seconded. Without objection the motion was adopted by acclamation. Glenn Glazer then confirmed that a check for the 2017 winner would be delivered at the Site Selection Business Meeting. With that, the Chair discharged the Millennium Philcon from any further reporting.

A. BUSINESS PASSED ON FROM LONCON 3

The Business Meeting next took up ratification of the Constitutional Amendments approved at Loncon 3 and passed on to Sasquan for ratification. If ratified, they will become part of the Constitution at the conclusion of Sasquan.

A.1 Short Title: Popular Ratification (“2 plus 1”)

[Please click here to jump to the text of the motion.](#) Debate time was set at 10 minutes.

Discussion: For the penultimate time, Kevin Standlee, the Chair of the business meeting, recused himself, and deputy chair, Jared Dashoff, once again presided.

Mr. Standlee explicated that, currently, the Constitution is amended by passing an amendment at one Worldcon, ratifying it at the next (at which time it becomes part of the Constitution), and having it take effect the following year. This amendment would require a third stage: a vote of the membership to ratify an amendment. Anyone eligible to vote site selection would be eligible to vote yes or no on any amendment. If there were more yes than no votes, regardless of the total votes cast, the matter would be ratified and take effect at the end of the third year. Mr. Standlee made it clear that if this amendment were ratified, it would not affect anything passed by Sasquan first and subject to ratification in Kansas City. It would affect only those items first passed by MidAmeriCon II. We had a very large attendance at this year's business meeting, but there were over 11,000 members overall. He said he received complaints all the time, even from attending members who couldn't attend the meeting because of other duties. Right now any member, attending or otherwise, could propose new business, but if we call our attendees "members," we should give them more membership rights, including a voice in our rulemaking process. This would increase the credibility of our governance process. He also pointed out that this amendment contained a sunset clause and would need to be re-ratified in five years (2020), so even if we had challenges with it, we would have one more chance to pull it back, if necessary.

Kate Secor raised a point of order. The Constitution prohibits remote participation in the Business Meeting, and she asked to what extent this could be considered participating in the Business Meeting and was impermissible. The parliamentarian said that this ratification vote was no more a vote at the Business Meeting than site selection is a vote at the Business Meeting. It's a separate process that occurs outside the Business Meeting and would be in order if this constitutional amendment were ratified. Therefore, the motion was in order.

Chris Gerrib said people who care about what the Worldcon does make the time to be here; people who don't care, don't come and should not vote because they haven't studied the issues.

Tim Miller agreed that a lot of people do not come or do not nominate or do not vote site selection. Ratifying this amendment is not going to require everyone to vote. But it would allow more people—those who can't make it, those who have supporting memberships or who may attend the Business Meeting every year but can't make it to a particular Worldcon—to vote and still be involved in the process.

Kate Secor argued against the motion. She is from California, where there is popular ratification of laws that she felt did not work well. She was concerned that those outside the Business Meeting would not understand the technical legal language we use for motions. She was concerned that amendments would be rejected because the electorate lacked the knowledge of what we might be trying to do, and nothing would get done. Additionally, there is nothing in this motion that would require what even the

California voter guide does, i.e., a nonpartisan explanation of what a motion is attempting to do.

Ben Yalow agreed with Ms. Secor that it was completely likely that this system has the failure modes she described, but he felt it was worth giving it a try since it contained a mandatory sunset clause. If we didn't like the results, we could fix them in five years. This was his 45th business meeting; he could not imagine anything that absolutely had to be fixed now.

Gary Blog agreed with Ms. Secor. Can you imagine what the membership would think of E Pluribus Hugo and understanding one word of what they're trying to do, he asked.

Leigh Ann Hildebrand, an elections inspector in the state of California and someone who recognized the very privilege involved in being able to afford to attend a Business Meeting, whether in Spokane or in Helsinki, said it was important to enfranchise the larger voting population. If we trust people enough to vote for Hugos and site selection, we should trust them on this.

Howard Rosenblatt said that at the Business Meeting we discuss, we debate, and we clarify. There was no requirement in this amendment to watch these proceeds on YouTube in order to be well informed before voting. He believed that if the voters can't attend the Business Meeting, there may be other ways to inform them, but sending out a ballot was not sufficient.

Kevin Standlee made a motion to extend debate for two minutes to allow the second maker of the motion to speak. This motion passed with a majority vote. Warren Buff said that the supporting material presented at Loncon 3 addressed this issue. If the amendment were ratified this year, the makers of the amendment would submit a standing rule proposal to clarify how information would be disseminated. He added that we keep talking about the problem of supporting members who don't act like members, and that we should give them the chance.

Lisa Hayes opposed this amendment because in this day and age the voting would be entirely or substantially electronic. She did not want the vote coming down to whoever posted to YouTube or to Facebook first, hitting their link and getting 11,000 people to jump over and blindly vote one direction or the other.

Rachael Acks said that if we want to keep the world in Worldcon, we have to make accessible to international members, which means allowing remote voting.

David Wallace said that a year ago he might have supported this amendment, but that the events of the past few months convinced him that this was a bad idea. One problem is that this amendment extended ratification by an extra year, and he felt three years was too long, that sometimes we need to be able to act more quickly than that. Additionally, in the events of the last few months, there was an appeal by one of the slate sponsors to go get a whole bunch of outsiders to come and get supporting memberships in order to vote for the slate. He believed that this proposal would encourage more such actions. It's fine to say we want to extend the franchise to the rest of the Worldcon, but he felt this proposal would just encourage more slate voting.

A motion to call the question to close debate passed with a show of hands. Then, with a serpentine vote of 69 in favor and 99 against ratification, the amendment was not ratified and was not made part of the Worldcon Constitution.

Kevin Standlee once more resumed presiding over the Business Meeting.

Glenn Glazer said that Ron Oakes had returned to the meeting and thus made a motion to bring back Item B.2.4, Open Source Software, from the table. The motion passed by a show of hands, and the item was taken from the table and placed before the meeting once again.

B. NEW BUSINESS

B.2 Resolutions

B.2.4 Short Title: Open Source Software

[Please click here to jump to the text of the motion.](#) Debate time was set at 10 minutes.

Discussion: Kate Secor said she proposed this resolution because there has been a certain loss of trust among the membership around what's going on with Hugo voting and Hugo nominations. It would say to people that we're using really complicated software that will make hand recounts super hard, but if you know the software you can go look at it and see what it is doing. The amendment does not mandate that people be forced to open source their software, and there is a lot of opposition to doing that. It's not asking that people be forced to change the software that they're using in any given year, although she suggested that if there were a legitimate bug report then changing the software should be considered. She said all this motion asked is that the Business Meeting endorse the idea that the software used to inform the functions that are required by the Constitution be available for people to review if that's what they want to do. And if or when bugs are found in the software, they be able to report them, whether the seated Worldcons or committees choose to act on that or not.

Ron Oakes spoke in opposition, as the author or coder of the current website code used for the Hugo nomination process, and the main author involved in the voting process. All the software he wrote, with a small exception of the stuff that was written for Chicon 7 originally, is copyrighted, but its rights are assigned exclusively to WSFS. That does not preclude reasonable requests to examine the software, but it does preclude it getting out into the open by unwarranted sharing of its code. This code was written specifically for this body for this purpose, but he did not want to deal with open source. He added that a small portion of the Hugo voting code was based on code originally written by Steve Stanton for LoneStarCon 3 and is GPL. But the remainder of the code, including that used to cross-check the counts of the Hugo voting, is available for reasonable requests because it is licensed to this body. But it is not open source, and

he was against what he saw as something to force him to deal with open source licensing. As a professional software developer, as long as he was assigning the code to a body, he said he believed himself safe from any employment issues. But making it open source could cause issues that might be harmful to his employment in the future.

Donald Eastlake moved an amendment to the resolution that would to simplify it by striking its second, third and fourth clauses. The motion was seconded. Mr. Eastlake said that while he was generally in favor of a recommendation, not a requirement, in favor of open source, the rest of the proposal about being required to give a contact and bug reports, etc., just muddied the issue. He felt a statement in favor of open source was fine if the Business Meeting wanted to do that.

Jack Foy spoke against striking these clauses. He said this resolution was made to build trust between the community and the organizers of this process. Part of that trust is being able to trust the infrastructure that we use in order to execute our business as the Worldcon. The way to build trust and an extremely common process is to ask others to review software and reporting problems. He felt it was an added bonus that the software could be studied and help everyone understand what's going on. But the major reason to pass this resolution was for us to be able to identify and rectify problems with any software we're using.

Rick Kovalcik spoke in favor of Mr. Eastlake's motion. He believed that the amendment accomplished the openness and allowed review of the software without most of the onerous side effects that worried Mr. Oakes. If the amendment passed, the Business Meeting could then try to fix any other bad side effects.

Joshua Kronengold then proposed an amendment by substitution, but was overruled because there was already a pending amendment on the floor, and a secondary amendment is not in order unless the primary amendment is a motion to amend by substitution.⁴ A motion was then made to close debate, and without objection debate was closed on the amendment to the resolution. The vote on the amendment to strike the last three clauses then passed by a show of hands. The resolution now consisted of only the following:

Resolved, That the WSFS Business Meeting recommends that software (including but not necessarily limited to, custom-written applications, spreadsheets, and databases, but not including the hardware, operating systems, or commercial applications upon which such software is dependent) used by a seated Worldcon committee to carry out any function mandated by the Constitution (including, but not necessarily limited to, administration of the Hugo Awards and of Future Worldcon Selection), shall be made available to any member upon request or as an open-source project.

⁴ That is, a secondary amendment cannot be an amendment by substitution for the primary amendment

Dennis Caswell then made a motion to strike the last six words of the resolution: “or as an open-source project.” Without objection, the question was called, the motion passed, and the phrase was deleted from the resolution. The motion now read:

Resolved, That the WSFS Business Meeting recommends that software (including but not necessarily limited to, custom-written applications, spreadsheets, and databases, but not including the hardware, operating systems, or commercial applications upon which such software is dependent) used by a seated Worldcon committee to carry out any function mandated by the Constitution (including, but not necessarily limited to, administration of the Hugo Awards and of Future Worldcon Selection), shall be made available to any member upon request.

Andrew Adams spoke in favor of the amended resolution. He believed that making the source code of the software we use available to any member did not pose any professional risks to those who developed it, unless they would be were incompetent. Making the software available to our members was the point of this motion, particularly as amended, which was the crux of this motion.

Colin Harris spoke against the amended resolution, not least because the definition of the software in scope, which is anything needed to support the Constitution, implicitly includes our membership administration software and the way we sell memberships online and other things that typically are redeveloped every year. He felt that a lot of people put goodwill into this work and might think twice if they had to expose their work in this way, and said we should not enshrine this as a resolution.

A motion to close debate was seconded, and debate was closed by a two-thirds vote. By a show of hands, the amended resolution failed. A motion was made for a serpentine vote, but that, too, failed.⁵

Without objection, Friday Business Meeting adjourned at 12:47 p.m.

⁵ A request for a counted vote requires at least 20% of the attendees to support it.

BUSINESS MEETING, SATURDAY, AUGUST 22, 2015

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. The business meeting staff consisted of Kevin Standlee, Presiding Officer; Jared Dashoff, Deputy Presiding Officer; Donald E. Eastlake III, Parliamentarian; Linda Deneroff, Secretary; Jesi Pershing, Timekeeper; Lisa Hayes, Videographer; and Joyce Reynolds-Ward, Sergeant-at-Arms.

This was the site selection business meeting. The special order of business at this meeting was the presentation of the site selection results for 2017, followed by question time for next year's Worldcon, MidAmeriCon II, as provided in the Standing Rules. The 2018 bidders (San Jose and New Orleans) agreed to dispense with their presentations if there was no objection to them doing so. There was no objection. The Chair explained that presentations are privileges of those bids, and they could dispense with them at their discretion.

E. SITE SELECTION BUSINESS

E.2 Question time for the Seated Worldcons

E.2.1 MidAmeriCon II (Worldcon in 2016)

Question Time is guaranteed by the rules and requires suspension of the rules to dispense with it. MidAmeriCon II agreed (prior to the meeting) to move to suspend the rules and dispense with Question Time for the 2016 Worldcon. By a show of hands with two-thirds voting in the affirmative, Question Time for the 2016 Worldcon was dispensed with.

Both Kevin Standlee and Jared Dashoff recused themselves from the Site Selection announcement because the former was a director of the Montreal Worldcon bid as well as of the San Jose 2018 Worldcon, and the latter was an officer of the DC in 2017 Worldcon bid. Therefore the parliamentarian, Don Eastlake, presided over this portion of the meeting.

E.1 Report of the 2017 Worldcon Site Selection and Presentation by Winners

Don Eastlake recognized Joni Dashoff, the Site Selection administrator, to make her report. She introduced her deputy, Judy Bemis, and then dealt with some housekeeping issues. Knowing in advance that Mr. Dashoff and Mr. Standlee would recuse themselves, Ms. Dashoff directed any parliamentary questions to Mr. Eastlake.

The Constitution says "mail" and doesn't specify "postal" versus "electronic," maybe because there's never been a need to do that. This year, knowing that three of the bidders were from outside the U.S., she specifically asked the parliamentarian and the division heads, all the way up to the Chair, to ensure everyone's concurrence to allow electronic delivery of ballots. It was not restricted to outside the U.S., and it was not

used solely outside the U.S. Nor was the postal service delivery used only within the U.S. Electronic signatures were a separate issue.

The Site Selection results as follows: There were 2625 valid ballots, of which 19 indicated no preference, leaving 2604 with preferences. Thus, 1303 votes were required to win the election. Ms. Dashoff explained that the one invalid ballot was 1, but that was only the one submitted as valid by payment. There were others that were invalid by duplicate payment for site selection on one membership. There were many that were invalidated because while being members of Sasquan they did not pay the 2017 voting/membership fee. There were still others who paid the 75th Worldcon membership fee but were not members of Sasquan. Ms. Dashoff did not have a count of those numbers. There were others who did not sign their ballots, and those votes were counted as no preference, and Ms. Dashoff apologized to those people whom she was not able to contact in time to get a signature for those ballots.

Helsinki won in the first ballot, so there was no need for any redistribution of votes.

FIRST BALLOT	Mail-in	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	TOTAL	
Helsinki in 2017	538	279	229	316	1363	WINNER
Montreal in 2017	51	25	73	79	228	
Nippon (Japan) in 2017	18	16	33	53	120	
DC17 (Washington, DC)	288	156	222	212	878	
None of the Above	0	0	0	0	0	
Invalid ballots	0	1	0	0	1	
All of the Above	0	3	2	0	5	
Nightvale	1	0	2	0	3	
Minneapolis in '73	1	1	0	0	2	
Gallifrey (Cheron)	0	1	0	0	1	
Gndevaz, Armenia	0	1	0	0	1	
Happiness, Fulfillment Corporation	0	0	0	1	1	
Mariehamn	0	0	0	1	1	
Marseille, France	0	0	0	1	1	
Boston in '89	1	0	0	0	0	
Total with Preference	898	483	561	664	2606	
Needed to Win					1304	
No Preference	11	6	0	2	19	
Total valid votes	909	489	561	666	2625	

Ms. Dashoff thanked all the bidders, voters and staff, and congratulated Helsinki, Finland.

Mr. Eastlake called for a motion to thank the tellers, accept the results, and call for the ballots to be destroyed. Without objection, the tellers were thanked, the results accepted and the ballots ordered destroyed. The selection of the 2017 winner was final.

Mr. Standlee then resumed chairing the meeting and recognized Glenn Glazer, who, on behalf of the Millennium Philcon, presented Eemeli Aro, the Chair of the 2017 bid, a check for US\$23,000 in pass-along funds.

E.2 Question time for the Seated Worldcons (continued)

E.2.2 Worldcon 75 (Worldcon in 2017)

Helsinki gave a five-minute presentation followed by five minutes for questions. Eemeli Aro announced Worldcon 75, to be held 9-13 August 2016, and introduced Jukka Halme, Saija Aro and Crystal Huff as its chairs. The website is www.worldcon.fi. The GOHs will be John-Henri Holmberg, Nalo Hopkinson, Johanna Sinisalo, Claire Wending and Walter Jon Williams. Progress Report 0 was handed out, and the three chairs thanked the other bidders. By unanimous consent, Question Time for the 2017 Worldcon was dispensed with.

A. BUSINESS PASSED ON FROM LONCON 3 (continued)

A.2 Short Title: A Story by Any Other Name

[Please click here to jump to the text of the motion.](#) Debate time was set at 6 minutes.

Discussion: Tim Illingworth asked if the listing of categories in Section 3.2 was correct. Were they 3.3.1-3.3.5, or were they 3.3.1-3.3.4 and 3.3.6? The Chair consulted with the original maker of the motion (Colin Harris). The original intent of the second clause was to include Novel, Novella, Novelette, Short Story and Graphic Story. Therefore, the numbering in the second clause was meant to be 3.3.1-3.3.4 and 3.3.6. An objection was made to simply making this correction, but the Chair pointed out that that would mean the amendment would only run from Best Novel through Best Related Work and would not include Best Graphic Story. The secretary added that this was an error on her part; she recalled making the correction somewhere but it simply didn't make it into the agenda. This needed to be resolved before the amendment could be voted upon. The Chair ruled that based on what the maker of the motion reported, the amendment was meant to cover Best Novel, Best Novella, Best Novelette, Best Short Story and 3.3.6, Best Graphic Story. The Chair also pointed out that the version on Loncon 3's website and on page 143 of the souvenir book correctly lists "3.3.1-3.3.4 and 3.3.6". Thus the Chair ruled that the version in the souvenir book was definitive and the text to be voted on should read:

Section 3.2.5: In the ~~story written fiction~~ categories ([3.3.1 – 3.3.4](#) and [3.3.6](#)), an author may withdraw a version of a work from consideration if the author feels that the version is not representative of what that author wrote.

Ben Yalow appealed the ruling of the Chair solely for the purpose of getting into the record the minutes as produced by Loncon 3's secretary said explicitly that what was passed was 1 through 5. He wanted a definitive ruling as to how these conflicts were dealt with and, therefore, appealed the ruling of the Chair with full force so that there would be a ruling going forward.

The appeal was seconded, and the Chair asked unanimous consent for up to five minutes of debate time. There was no objection.

Kevin Standlee, as presiding officer, defended his ruling by noting that while the minutes are produced by the head table staff, the definitive document of Business Passed On is itself certified by the Chairman and secretary of the business meeting, and that it is that document upon which we depend. Thus, the document certified by the Chair and secretary as the business passed on, even if it varies from the minutes of the meeting as issued by those same people, is the definitive document.

Mr. Yalow felt that, given the importance of this particular decision, he felt it vital that the issue be voted upon in order to get a definitive ruling into the record and future rules. Linda Deneroff, the secretary at the Loncon 3 business meeting, supported the Chair's ruling, stating it was merely a typographical error.

Rick Kovalcik felt the question was relevant.

Dr. Perianne Lurie spoke against the ruling. She said 3.2.6 made no reference to Graphic Story. If it were the intent to include Graphic Story, it would need to be added to the changed section 3.2.6. She said the short title read, "By inserting a new section after existing 3.2.5," which would be 3.2.6, and then enumerates the categories, Best Novel, Novella, Novelette and Short Story, but makes no reference to the graphic stories.

Don Eastlake felt the ruling of the Chair was actually unnecessary in some sense. The text says "in the story categories," and 3.3.5 isn't a story category, and 3.3.6 is a story category. So it was inconsistent. Therefore, there must be a typographical error of some sort, and the resolution in favor of the Business Passed On seemed to him the right way to do it.

A motion to close debate on the appeal was moved and seconded. The ruling of the Chair, that the version of the amendment printed in the program book as certified by the head table staff of last year was definitive and took precedence over any printed minutes or other documentation, was sustained.

Mr. Standlee then reread the amendment as printed in the Souvenir Book:

Moved, to amend Article 3 of the WSFS Constitution to clarify that eligibility for the fiction categories should be based on content rather than the format of delivery, by amending as follows:

By inserting a new section after existing 3.2.5:

Section 3.2.6: the categories of Best Novel, Novella, Novelette, and Short Story shall be open to works in which the text is the primary form of communication, regardless of the publication medium, including but not limited to physical print, audiobook, and ebook.

And amending section 3.2.5:

Section 3.2.5: In the ~~story written-fiction~~ categories ([3.3.1 – 3.3.4](#) and [3.3.6](#)), an author may withdraw a version of a work from consideration if the author feels that the version is not representative of what that author wrote.

Without objection, the debate time was reset to six minutes.

Dr. Perianne Lurie moved to amend Section 3.2.6 the changing the first sentence to add “Graphic Story” in the list of “categories of Best Novel, Novella, Novelette, Short Story and Graphic Story”. The motion was seconded.

Section 3.2.6: the categories of Best Novel, Novella, Novelette, Short Story and Graphic Story shall be open to works in which the text is the primary form of communication, regardless of the publication medium, including but not limited to physical print, audiobook, and ebook.

The Chair was in doubt as to whether this was a lesser change and submitted the question to the members. By a show of hands, the meeting voted that this was a greater change. This motion would thus require an additional year for ratification if the amendment to the pending Constitutional amendment passed.

Dr. Lurie, speaking in favor of her amendment, said that since the story category now included Graphic Story, it only made sense that to be consistent within the two parts of this proposed constitutional amendment.

Jared Dashoff recused himself from the remainder of debate on the subject and, yielding to the makers of the original motion, said that the two clauses were separate in their purpose and therefore Graphic Story did not need to be added to Section 3.2.6.

Todd Dashoff believed that when Mr. Standlee read the motion, the word “fiction” was prominent in the beginning of the motion, and he felt that automatically included Graphic Story.

Colin Harris, the maker of the motion, spoke against the amendment, saying that it contained only two changes. One was to the four fiction categories, where “written fiction” was changed to “story” because in the past people assumed “written” did not include things like “audio book” and a more neutral wording was needed. Graphic Story, however, is not something by definition in which text is the primary form of communication.

Section 3.2.5 also changed “written fiction” to “story” to convey a more neutral tone, and it was explicit in last year’s commentary that Section 3.25 would extend the clause to cover Best Graphic Story just to avoid the word “written”. In response to the amendment, he felt text was not the primary form of communication in Graphic Story, as it is not in Best Dramatic Presentation, and the written categories were what the amendment was trying to separate for introducing the idea of audio book as a legitimate form. Therefore he felt it unnecessary to add “Graphic Story” in Section 3.2.6.

A motion to close debate on Dr. Lurie’s amendment was made, seconded, and, with more than two-thirds in favor, passed. With a show of hands, the amendment failed to achieve a majority.

A motion to close debate on the motion to ratify the amendment as printed on page 143 of the souvenir book was made and passed. By a show of hands, A.2, A Story by Any Other Name, was ratified and became part of the Constitution. It would take effect at the end of Sasquan.

A.3 Short Title: Hugo Finalists

[Please click here to jump to the text of the motion.](#) Debate time was set at 4 minutes.

Discussion: Without discussion and by unanimous consent, the motion to ratify A.3, Hugo Finalists, was ratified and became part of the Constitution. It would take effect at the end of Sasquan.

A.4 Short Title: WSFS Membership Types and Rates

[Please click here to jump to the text of the motion.](#) Debate time was set at 4 minutes.

Discussion: Without discussion and by unanimous consent, the motion to ratify A.4, WSFS Membership Types and Rates, was ratified and became part of the Constitution. It would take effect at the end of Sasquan.

Jeff Thorpe asked if the motion just passed had any affect regarding the ruling of the Chair in 1990 when a member aged 11 was allowed to propose a motion to the Business Meeting. Don Eastlake III clarified that the member in question was Donald E. Eastlake IV who held a full attending membership of the convention, and he seconded a motion. A point of order was raised at the time that he was under age, but the Chair of that year’s meeting ruled that it was legal for him to participate. This ruling is in the Rules of Continuing Effect.

The just passed rule about membership types and rates had no effect on that earlier ruling. This year’s Worldcon had an attending membership and two discounted membership rates, for military and young adult members, which two classes are just attending memberships by a different name. They also had a child membership, which

did not have voting rights. If someone had a child membership, they were not a member of this assembly. But someone who was one day old and had a full attending membership would still be a member of this organization since there are no age restrictions on WSFS memberships.

B. NEW BUSINESS

B.1 Constitutional Amendments

B.1.2 Short Title: The Five Percent Solution

[Please click here to jump to the text of the motion.](#) Debate time was set at 6 minutes.

Discussion: Steven desJardins said the intent was to stop works with negligible support from getting on the ballot at a time when there were very few works with substantial support. However, since there has been a renaissance of short fiction, there are literally dozens of Hugo worthy works being published in many different venues, and it is becoming harder to cross the 5% threshold, and Hugo voters, in general, have a lot of reluctance to coordinate their nominations. So there's a paradoxical system that responds to the increase in Hugo-worthy works by reducing the number of slots they get on the final ballot. The 5% rule was well intentioned; it had a good run. We've seen how it works, and we found it makes more problems than it solved. Therefore, he said, it was time to abolish it.

Ben Yalow offered a small correction regarding the intent of the 5% rule. The intent of the rule was not because there wasn't a great deal of worthy work; the feeling was that if you couldn't make 5% of the ballots, you were looking at noise, not signal. The stories are all effectively getting the same number of votes and just creating a long tail. That may no longer be meaningful, but the purpose of the 5% rule was not to eliminate works; it was to separate signal from noise.

Joshua Kronengold sang his speech in favor of the motion: "Before I was a neo, the year I shan't debate; we made a rule for our premier award. Even if it made the cut, a nomination met its fate if 1 in 20 didn't think it scored. At first it seemed a good rule, avoided the long tails, But later, when the field ballooned in size, if the population fails to all read the same tales; where the ballot's concerned, there's too much for the prize. Then, yes, the genre was small; now, though, you can't read it all. Then, tastes were more concentrated; the best stories rated for the Hugos were slated. We must this rule amend; at this point it's hard to defend. I think that it makes no sense to drop works that lack 5%." (The Chair classified singing your speech as a "funny, once.")

Dr. Perianne Lurie proposed an amendment to strike out "but not including any candidate receiving fewer than five votes" at the end of the proposed revision to Section 3.11.4, so the text would read:

3.11.4: The complete numerical vote totals, including all preliminary tallies for first, second, ... places, shall be made public by the Worldcon Committee within ninety (90) days after the Worldcon. During the same period the nomination voting totals shall also be published, including in each category the vote counts for at least the fifteen highest vote-getters ~~and any other candidate receiving a number of votes equal to at least five percent (5%) of the nomination ballots cast in that category, but not including any candidate receiving fewer than five votes.~~

However, the Chair ruled this revision to not be germane because it exceeded the scope of the original amendment. Mr. desJardins appealed the Chair's ruling. The Chair defended his ruling because the phrase that the amendment proposed to modify was primarily in there to show the context and was not affected by the original constitutional amendment. A change has to be relevant to what the original amendment speaks to, which in this case was the 5% rule. Dr. Lurie, while agreeing somewhat, said that if the 5% rule were eliminated, there was likely to be many more candidates receiving fewer than five votes in the top 15 nominees. Mr. Yalow spoke in favor of the Chair's ruling because in any question of germaneness, it has to be germane to what the initial motion is doing. The initial motion is only touching the 5% percent rule; anything outside that rule would not be germane. Mr. desJardines said that the phrase "but not including any candidate receiving fewer than five votes" was not intended to be a restriction. This was a minimum that they were required to publish, not a maximum, and he was afraid that by deleting the text, it would change the interpretation, which was not the intent of the original amendment. The Chair gave the final argument, that the question of germaneness was a matter of scope, it would be no more in scope than changing the word "ninety" to "eighty". With less than a majority in the negative, the Chair's ruling that Dr. Lurie's amendment was out of order was sustained. At this point all debate time was expired.

Joshua Kronengold then moved to amend Section 3.11.4 by inserting the phrase "non-finalist" so the section would then read:

3.11.4: The complete numerical vote totals, including all preliminary tallies for first, second, ... places, shall be made public by the Worldcon Committee within ninety (90) days after the Worldcon. During the same period the nomination voting totals shall also be published, including in each category the vote counts for at least the fifteen highest vote-getters ~~and any other candidate receiving a number of votes equal to at least five percent (5%) of the nomination ballots cast in that category,~~ but not including any non-finalist candidate receiving fewer than five votes.

Again the Chair ruled that the amendment was not germane. This ruling was appealed, but the appeal was undebatable because all debate time on the underlying proposal had expired, and again the vote sustained the Chair's ruling. Glenn Glazer then made a motion to extend debate by two minutes, but by a show of hands that extension failed as well.

The question on the adoption of B.1.2 as originally submitted required a majority to pass. By a show of hands, the motion was adopted and was sent on to MidAmeriCon II for ratification.

B.1.5 Short Title: Multiple Nominations

[Please click here to jump to the text of the motion.](#) Debate time was set at 6 minutes.

Discussion: As one of the makers of this motion, Jared Dashoff recused himself from the head table to defend the motion. This motion came out of the Best Series motion because it had applicability elsewhere, and it was mostly concerned with making sure that if there were a Best Series Hugo, that a book that was eligible in both Series and Novel would be in both categories. Thus it would also apply to any potential Young Adult Hugo, should one come into existence. He noted that this is done elsewhere, where the Hugo administrator moves things based on the creator of the work.

Kate Secor asked if a work of original fiction were published on a podcast and that podcast were then nominated for Best Fancast, would that prevent the story from appearing in the story categories as a subset of the podcast that was nominated. Mr. Dashoff the Younger said he could not speak to that question since he was not a Hugo administrator, but his gut reaction would be “no,” but that that is a question best left to a future administrator. John Lorentz reiterated that much of this is already part of the function of the Hugo administrator. If something were eligible in two categories, the usual practice is to place it in the category that received the most nominations. His problem with the amendment concerned the phrase “after consulting with the author of the work insofar as it is possible to do so.” This year the administrators had three weeks to determine the finalists and the ballot wasn’t finalized until two days before it was announced. If the Hugo Administrator has to wait to hear back from an author, it could delay the list of finalists and puts a time crunch on the Hugo Administration, which is already time crunched. Terry Neill spoke in favor of the proposal, pointing out that the language says “insofar as it is possible to do.”

Dave McCarty moved to amend the current proposal to drop contacting the author and replacing it by moving the work into the category in which it gets the most nominations, which would support the will of the voters. The motion would read:

[3.8.Y: If a work is eligible in more than one category, and if the work receives sufficient nominations to appear in more than one category, the Worldcon Committee shall determine in which category the work shall appear, based on the category in which it receives the most nominations.](#)

After the motion was seconded, Helen Montgomery wanted to know, since the Hugo Administrators have to contact potential nominees anyway in order to get their acceptance, why this would make it any difference. Mr. McCarty replied that the administrators could not move on and contact the next nominee until the first nominee responded, which can take up to the day before we have to finalize the ballot. Perianne Lurie asked if an author were nominated in two categories, say YA and Best Novel, and they got more nominations in YA, would the Hugo Administrator notify them that

them they were also eligible in Best Novel so they could withdraw the YA nomination, or would they not know that they could have been in the other category. Mr. McCarty responded that that would be up to that year's Hugo Administrator. He then reiterated that it's difficult to contact everyone in a timely manner and get the final ballot nailed down. The Hugo Administrator is limited by the number of hours in which to do this, and it's a lot more difficult than people realize. Having to wait on an answer back from somebody before knowing what to do with the next nomination would cause significant problems. Giving the administrator definitive direction in the manner that we actually do it anyway would be a good thing.

Kate Secor continued to have a concern regarding the superset/subset issue. If we don't contact the author, he or she doesn't get a choice. If we're not contacting the creators of the work to tell them that there's a problem, this is just going to make it worse, because now there's someone who could have been a nominee; and somebody else, who created the work that their work appeared in, has decided that they don't get to.

LeAnn Hildebrand's concern regarded absolute vote totals. She could see a situation where something is liked by a greater percentage of people within a category with fewer overall nominators than in a second category with a larger number of nominators.

With debate closed, by a show of hands, the proposal was amended.

Andrew Adams then proposed an amendment to strike out "the Worldcon Committee" and insert "Hugo Subcommittee." It was seconded, but the Chair ruled the motion out of order because while the Worldcon Committee is the entity with the authority to do this, it also has the authority then to irrevocably delegate it to a Hugo Subcommittee. However, it does not have to create a Hugo Subcommittee and has not always done so. The Chair then read Section B.1.5, with the above amended section.

By a show of hands, the amended motion passed and was sent on to MidAmeriCon II for ratification.

[Please click here to jump to a reconsideration of this motion on Sunday.](#)

B.1.6 Short Title: Nominee Diversity

[Please click here to jump to the text of the motion.](#) *Debate time was set at 6 minutes.*

Lisa Padol moved to postpone consideration of B.1.6, Nominee Diversity, until after consideration of E Pluribus Hugo, and it was seconded. With a show of hands, the majority affirmed the motion, and the discussion was postponed.

[Please click here to jump to Sunday's discussion.](#)

Thomas Monahan moved to adjourn the business meeting *sine die*. He felt we had covered everything we needed, and he felt some of the remaining motions were rushed and unorganized.

Before debate on the motion could proceed, the Parliamentarian pointed out that a motion to adjourn *sine die* was not in order at this time because some items had been specifically scheduled during the Preliminary Business Meeting as general orders.⁶ The Business Meeting had to discharge all general orders before it could adjourn, and therefore adjourning *sine die* was not actually in order at this time. The Chair ruled the Parliamentarian's point well taken and so ruled.

Lisa Hayes moved to simply adjourn for the day and resume on Sunday. This motion was seconded. The Chair asked the members to momentarily set that motion aside and asked unanimous consent that when the meeting did adjourn *sine die* on Sunday, it do so in memory of Bobbie DuFault and Peggy Rae Sapienza. There was no objection to that motion. He also expressed his great appreciation to the interpreters, both the sign language and CART, for the very hard job they did. The Chair then brought Ms. Hayes' motion to adjourn back up and it was adopted.

The Saturday Business Meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

⁶ Although they weren't referred to as such at the time, the motion to postpone for a finite time creates them as general orders, per the parliamentary authority.

BUSINESS MEETING, SUNDAY, AUGUST 23, 2015

The meeting was called to order at approximately 10:10 a.m. The business meeting staff consisted of Kevin Standlee, Presiding Officer; Jared Dashoff, Deputy Presiding Officer; Donald E. Eastlake III, Parliamentarian; Linda Deneroff, Secretary; Jesi Pershing, Timekeeper; Lisa Hayes, Videographer; and Joyce Reynolds-Ward, Sergeant-at-Arms.

The Business Meeting was conducted in an order different from that shown in the printed agenda. These minutes follow that new order, but follow the numbering in the printed agenda.

B. NEW BUSINESS

B.1 Constitutional Amendments

B.1.5 Short Title: Multiple Nominations

[Please click here to jump to the original text of the motion.](#)

[Please click here for Saturday's discussion on the motion.](#)

Leslie Turek submitted a proposed rewording of the multiple nominations item that passed on Saturday. This was a motion to reconsider the previously adopted motion and adopt as a substitute a revised wording that was somewhat clearer:

[3.8.Y: If a work is eligible in more than one category, and if the work receives sufficient nominations to appear in more than one category, the work shall appear in the category in which it received the greatest number of nominations.](#)

What this would do is change the motion from a judgment decision of the administrator to a ministerial function, just like the counting of votes. The administrators would simply choose the one with the most nominations.

Without objection, the original proposal was reconsidered, replaced with the above text, and re-adopted.

There was a motion to suspend the rules [maker unknown] and take up item B.1.4, E Pluribus Hugo, at this time. By a show of hands with two-thirds in favor, this motion passed and the rules were suspended to allow this motion to come up ahead of its earlier-scheduled order. The Chair then observed that the motion on Nominee Diversity was scheduled relative to E Pluribus Hugo and would be the next item after it in the agenda.

B.1.4 Short Title: E Pluribus Hugo (Out of the Many, a Hugo)

[Please click here to jump to the text of the motion.](#) Debate time was set at 36 minutes.

Discussion: Keith “Kilo” Watt began the discussion by defining the issue. Slates gave us this year’s Hugo Award results. Fandom nominates an immense diversity of works, and this is something we want to preserve. But it’s very easy for a dedicated disciplined group to sweep the entire slate. It turned out that it less than 10 to 15% of the nominators in 2015 were able to control, in some categories, 100% of the finalists. That was fundamentally the problem. Once they realized what the problem was, Mr. Watt’s group looked for a system to solve it. What they want to do was redirect support from those works that didn’t have a chance to get nominated. As it is now, those votes are just wasted. E Pluribus Hugo would make a person’s vote count toward the rest of the works that are on that person’s ballot. This mechanism uses “points” to do that. At this point Mr. Watt briefly summarized the issue and performed a simulation of the process.

[Please click here for the discussion as a Committee of the Whole.](#)

We can always vote “No Award” on the final ballot, but this hole is well known, and EPH fixes it. How many more years of No Award do we want? Mr. Watt is a strong proponent of increasing the number of voters and making people aware of the Hugos because it’s good for fandom. However, even if you increase the number of voters, slates will still dominate when you need only 15% of nominators to take over an entire category. EPH would give us the safety net to be able to make solutions happen, and he was confident we could get it implemented within a year. But if we can’t, then when time comes up for ratification, we could either amend it or kill it and have another amendment ready to propose.

Mr. Watt said he already had a commitment from the 2016 Hugo Administrator to work with Mr. Watt’s group to get the process going. We would lose nothing by going ahead and passing it this year. It’s up to us to take back the awards for everybody so that we really have an award that represents fandom.

Speaking against the proposal, John Lorentz said no one was more disappointed that he with the way the nominations went this year. He could see the way the trend was going and that there was a problem. But as a Hugo Administrator, he felt there were problems with EPH. He couldn’t address any problems with making sure that the programming was right and integrated into the current system because he wasn’t involved with the programming this year, but he felt it would make it more complicated to explain to the nominators because, despite what was said, it changes what happens with the votes because right now each vote counts 1-to-1 against the other votes. But his real problem was that as a four-time Hugo Administrator (1998, 2002, 2006 and 2015), his biggest issue was that there was no manual backup. We would at best have to rely on two different computer systems working against each other. The current system can be double-checked manually, if need be. In addition, EPH would add about 50 hours of work for the Hugo Administrator, between the end of nominations and the finalization

of the ballot. This is getting more complicated each year. The problem is there is a broad variety of things being nominated, and fans don't spell the same things consistently. In order for a computer system to match nominees against nominees, the titles have to be exact. He gave an example, using one of this year's nominee's, explaining how it was variously titled and spelled. Before the Hugo Administrator can start to use EPH, these spellings would have to be cleaned up. Currently the administrator only has to do this for, approximately, the top ten nominees, but EPH would require more time to clean up the data. The data that was used for the simulation were far less than the data in the past few years. Mr. Lorentz said he spent roughly 100 hours between cleaning up the data to get to what we had this year and estimated EPH would add another 50 hours of work. He added that the data that was used for the EPH test was from more than 30 years ago, with a much smaller number of nominations. Even as recently as 2006, the numbers were one-quarter of the nominations received this year and were from less of a variety of sources. In sum, he reiterated that EPH would make it much more complicated and would mean a shorter span of time for voters to consider the final ballot because it would move out the announcement of the final nominees.

Michael Lee moved that a sunset clause be added to the proposed constitutional amendment:

Moved, that unless this amendment is re-ratified by the 2022 Business Meeting, Section 3.A shall be repealed, and

Provided that the question of re-ratification shall be automatically be placed on the agenda of the 2022 Business Meeting with any constitutional amendments awaiting ratification.

Mr. Lee understood that there were a lot of complexities with EPH and since he felt there was some urgency to get something in place and try something. If it didn't work, then we'll be able to have it scheduled again to try something else.

The Chair asked if there were an objection to closing debate on the amendment. Hearing none, debate was closed. He asked if there were an objection to amending the motion by adding the sunset clause. Again there was no objection, and the motion was amended to add the sunset clause.

Jack Foy remarked that Mr. Lorentz outlined a very clear need on the part of the Hugo Administrators for better tool support and the amount of manual labor that would be required to implement EPH. However, fandom has resources to improve their experience, and we should do so. His second point was that despite the complexity to explain how EPH works, it was not that hard to actually code, and Mr. Foy said he did it in an hour.

Thomas Monahan said that if the objective is to get people to vote and have everyone understand the system, it should be simple – one ballot and one nominee per category – and then everyone's vote would be equal, slate or not. He said this was just a different way to manipulate votes, and it was difficult to explain and would not bring new voters to the Hugos.

Ramez Naam felt that at some point in the future the current system would again be gamed. He pointed out that while no award was handed out at the 2015 ceremony, and while no members of the slate succeeded, there were roughly 20 slots that would have gone to new authors this year had they been on the ballot, and he offered some examples. They, and fandom, he said, deserved a better system.

Warren Buff elaborated on what Mr. Monahan said: that EPH would be a problem for new voters. Regardless of whether it actually does, it has the appearance of benefitting “bullet” voting, he said. Thus, a partially informed voter could nominate in bullet fashion, and if this appears to be encouraged by the system but in fact were less effective, then voters who are fooled in this manner have been disenfranchised. This, he added, was a serious flaw in the system.

Wendy Delamater spoke in favor of the motion. If EPH had been in place this year, she said, the Hugos would not have been hijacked.

Lisa Hayes spoke against the motion. She said one of the repeated statements was to stop the slates. But she wanted to make it clear that this body might be a slate itself, and we wouldn't want to find that authors A, B, C that they really want to have on the ballot and she would not want to see them be taken off the ballot because we all happen to like them.

Jo Rhett said that people claimed they wouldn't understand EPH. He and two others undertook some tests to determine if this was true. In every case it took longer to explain instant runoff voting (“IRV”) – the system we use site selection – than it did to explain EPH, and you have to understand IRV to understand EPH. He added that most people don't understand IRV, but they still vote and use it. Manual verification is always slow, but it is absolutely possible. This process could be done manually. Therefore, he did not feel either of these points was a real concern. Once IRV was explained, he said, no one took more than three minutes to understand how EPH would work.

Todd Dashoff moved to call the question⁷, but this failed to pass with the required two-thirds vote.

Glenn Glazer spoke against the motion. While he found the argument that people were too stupid to understand EPH repugnant, he wanted to know what problem we were trying to solve. There have been six decades of Hugo Awards, and it's been gamed only once. He said that in statistics and mathematics, as well as in formal logic, this is called hasty generalization, where a single data point is taken and then assumed that all things will happen from it; that it will continue to happen time and time again. There was no evidence, he said, to support that notion. Additionally, there was no way to prove or test that any given implementation of EPH met the specification, because the specification is written in common English. There could be multiple versions of a

⁷ End the debate on the constitutional amendment.

program that agree, but that doesn't mean they're correct. Two separate systems can still be wrong in the same way. He added that faith in the Hugos was currently low, and that there were a lot of people who didn't believe in the system. If we made a mistake and did this wrong, we would kill the Hugos more thoroughly than anyone else out there who has tried.

Dave O'Neill said that this exploitation of the system was done once. If we believed this would not happen again, we would be deluding ourselves badly. There were 500 people who voted strictly slate, and they will be eligible to nominate again next year. He did not believe it will not happen again. If we didn't pass something this year – which we don't have to ratify – we would again be voting “no award” next year, and he did not want to see that happen.

Mike Johns submitted an amendment to Section 3.A.3, Part 4, to delete “then all such nominees tied at that round shall be eliminated,” and replace it with “that a nominee selected at random from the tied nominees shall be eliminated. The same random data set shall be used every time the nominee list is compiled in a particular year,” so that that section of the amendment would read:

(4) During the Elimination Phase, if two or more nominees are tied for both fewest number of nominations and lowest point total, then a nominee selected at random from the tied nominees shall be eliminated. The same random data set shall be used every time the nominee list is compiled in a particular year.

Lisa Hayes asked if any part of the vote for this amendment would affect next year's Hugo Awards. The Chair explained that the answer was no since it could not take effect until ratified next year; and if ratified next year, it would first take effect in the 2017 Hugo Awards.

John Pomeranz noted that fandom has always been ahead of the rest of the world using the preferential ballot system, and as a purely theoretical matter, he acknowledged that those who drafted EPH developed a more perfect voting system. But our current but not perfect system seems to be working, and he became more certain of that once the 2015 results were announced. Fandom will not accept slate voting and will insist that the best works of science fiction rise and fall on their individual merits. The biggest concern he had about adopting EPH now was that if we took action now to change the system, we would run the risk that those who were dissatisfied by this year's Hugo Awards results would charge us with gaming the system to exclude them. We do not want to give them the opportunity to perpetuate a campaign of misinformation. So, while he thanked the creators of EPH for their excellent proposal, he urged its defeat.

Dara Korra'ti spoke in favor of the motion. The 2015 Hugo Awards results was least available disaster of the possible disasters. She said that this year's slate was fueled fundamentally by resentment in the form of political resentment. Resentment is a term used to describe a typically populist feeling that what you deserve has been stolen from you, that is rightfully yours, that it belongs to you and that any victory is a cheat.

Thomas Monahan raised a point of order: he felt that what Ms. Korra'ti was saying was slander. The Chair ruled that the point of order was not well taken since the speaker did not address her statement against any individual person.

Ms. Korra'ti's point was that the defeat of the slate in 2015 was not a discouragement to those motivated by that type of political action. In fact, it was an encouragement. Mr. Pomeranz spoke to the idea that adopting this amendment would produce charges of gaming the system and modifying the system specifically to defeat them. But, she said, that charge had already been out there and was only fueled by the results. Additionally, once an exploit is known and successful, it will happen again until it is faced. There will also be opposition slates. The "rabid puppy" leadership had already announced its intention to flood every category in 2016. What will our reaction be then?

Joni Dashoff asked if the EPH creators could tell us who would have been nominated this year if their system had been used. Mike Stern asked if the anonymized data had yet been released and was told to write to hugoadmin@sasquan.org.

Mark Olson said he wanted to believe in this proposal; it sounded good, but he was not yet convinced. He had a mathematical background, and consequently he didn't believe anyone unless he could look at it himself. Complexity, he said, is the enemy of legitimacy, and his biggest fear was that we would de-legitimize the Hugo Awards further. He asked two questions: (1) Do you believe right now you could go out and explain to a random fan who was not a rules geek how EPH worked? Do you understand the effect of the rule well enough to be sure it would work in reality as well as you hope it will work? He wanted it tested with real data and thoroughly understood before we passed it. If it passed those rules, we could come back next year and pass it.

Richard Lynch agreed with Mr. Pomeranz. He felt that EPH was gaming the system against the previous gaming of the system, and two wrong did not make a right. The current system has been in place for half a century and worked perfectly well. Until this year, "No award" had not been announced since 1977, so what we had was an aberration, and we should wait and see what happens before we overreact.

Rick Kovalcik also agreed with Mr. Pomeranz and Mr. Lorentz because he felt the problem was with nominations, not with votes. He said the report that there were 500 bloc nominations was incorrect; his look at the data put the number closer to 200 to 300. He felt there were better and simpler solutions to the problem. If you wanted to avoid blocs, he said, we should go with 3 and 1, or something like that.

Mr. "Big Heart" Ben Yalow believed what Mr. Pomeranz said was key to the issue: we must fix the problem in a way that is clear and visible that this was not an attempt by a group of 100 people at a business meeting to change the rules so as to prevent an outcome they didn't like from 200 people gaming a Hugo Award that 3,000 people voted in. We need to be perceived to be as fair. The current system is perceivable as fair because it can be easily and quickly explained: Nominate everything you like, and we will add up the thing that has the most votes, and it gets nominated. That's easy. He defined anyone to explain EPH as easily.

John O'Halloran said that by the current system, a slate can dominate the nominations as we've seen. We've also seen that the voters will respond to the slates and defeat them.

Jameson Quinn moved to extend debate by two minutes; however, it was defeated by a show of hands since there was less than a two-thirds vote in favor of the motion.

By a serpentine vote of 186 in favor and 62 opposed, E Pluribus Hugo was adopted and passed on to MidAmeriCon II for ratification.

The agenda was to continue with B.1.6, Nominee Diversity, but Eric Schulman moved to suspend the rules and to consider 4 and 6 (Item B.1.1) next. With two-thirds of the members voting in the affirmative, the rules were suspended, and the 4 and 6 proposal was taken up next.

B.1.1 Short Title: 4 and 6

[Please click here to jump to the text of the motion.](#) Debate time was set at 12 minutes.

[Please click here for the discussion as a Committee of the Whole.](#)

Discussion: The Committee of the Whole considered this motion and made a recommendation that the Business Meeting consider various other possible combinations of number of nominee positions and number of finalist slots by filling blanks. Since the numbers were intertwined, it was not possible to treat them as separate entities, and the Chair, in consultation with other members of the head table, proposed taking the ratio between the two numbers in decreasing order (e.g., the largest ratio downward). Each of the possibilities would be answered yes or no.

Before debate could begin, there were a number of parliamentary inquiries.

Eric Schulman moved to take the ratio in ascending order (smallest ratio first), but this failed on a vote by a show of hands.

Todd Dashoff made a parliamentary inquiry, asking for a clarification. If two sets of numbers had the same ratio, which would be considered first? The Chair replied that the number of the finalist position (the second digit) would be the tiebreaker. Mr. Dashoff the Elder said if we take them by the ratios and then by the "B" digit within the ratios, we might not get to a particular combination with a low ratio than the membership might prefer. He made a motion to consider picking one from each ratio and then reconsider, but there was no second to this motion.

Jamison Quinn made a motion that, once we had all the possible nominations, the meeting reserve two minutes of debate time for members to discuss the general subject before voting on any of the values. By a show of hands, more than two-thirds of the meeting agreed with this motion.

The parliamentarian, Don Eastlake, addressed the question of how it would be in order to amend the ratio next year and what would constitute a lesser change. It would be in order to amend either of the two numbers to be closer to the current value of 5 as an integer number. For example: if 4 or 6 were adopted, either one could be changed back to five next year, and ratification would still be effective because the Constitution provides that things are adopted to the extent that they are ratified.

Priscilla Olson asked what the ratio would be. The Chair explained that even though the title put the number of nominators before the denominator, the actual ratio would be considered by denominator over nominator; that is the number of ballot slots to nominations. So, though the short title is 4 and 6, the ratio was actually six ballot slots to four nominations. The more ballot slots to the fewer number of nominations defined the higher ratio, and the vote would be in descending order; e.g., the largest ratio would be considered first.

Steven desJardins asked if the fill-in-the-blanks procedure would change the title of the amendment as well. The Chair explained that the title of a motion is not a substantive part of a motion, and the title would be changed if different numbers were assigned. Speaking as the Chair of the 2016 Business Meeting, Jared Dashoff confirmed that the amendment would be called whatever was agreed upon once the slots were filled.

Lincoln Kliman made a motion to lay the constitutional amendment on the table. Before the vote could be taken, however, Kate Secor made a parliamentary inquiry. Since it was established at the Saturday meeting that we could not adjourn *sine die* until we had addressed this issue, if it were laid on the table, would the debate that just ensured count as substantive enough that we could adjourn without picking it back up off the table? The Chair responded that addressing the question meant the question came before the assembly, but the assembly did not have to actually vote on it. If the motion was laid upon the table and the meeting adjourned *sine die*, the motion (i.e., the constitutional amendment) would die.

With less than two-thirds of the assembly voting in the affirmative to lay the motion on the table, the motion was still before the assembly, with the blanks remaining to be filled in.

Finally, the Chair set the rules for filling in the blanks. Only positive integers would be considered. A two-thirds vote would be necessary to close nominations.

The following ratios were proposed: 3 and 5, 5 and 8, 6 and 9, 2 and 5, 1 and 5, 3 and 7, 3 and 6, 5 and 10, 3 and 10, 4 and 8, 6 and 7.

The two minutes of debate time set aside for discussing the possibilities now ensued and votes were taken on several alternatives to fill in the blank.

The two minutes of debate time set aside for discussing the possibilities now ensued.

Eric Schulman defended 1 in 5 if this method were chosen over EPH next year since it was effectively the same as EPH, except the members can only nominate one work per category. He said that if EPH was too complicated for next year's meeting, then 1 and 5 would do the same thing for minimizing slates.

The next speaker, Joan van Akrin, was one of the ASL interpreters. She contradicted Mr. Schulman and said that this motion is not the same as EPH, and in fact, if both EPH and 4 and 6 passed, they would actually be a little bit stronger and better at demagnifying the power of the slates.

Milt Stevens was against lowering the number of nominees, because less than five would make the voters feel deprived. In fact, he believed that adding more nominations would give voters a greater choice and would increase the chances of getting an individual's nominees onto the ballot. It would also increase egoboo, with no downside to doing that.

Jamison Quinn said this motion was generally compatible with EPH, but the strongest resistance to a slate comes with the highest number of nominations.

A motion to extend debate on the blanks for two minutes was made and seconded, but failed to carry a two-thirds vote.

Each choice of a blank was a separate yes or no question. The vote was taken by ratio. If the ratio was the same, then the tiebreaker was the number of ballot slots.

Learned Foot raised a point of order, asking what would happen if none of the blanks obtained a majority. The Chair responded that if none of them received a majority, we would be left with the blank have to start over filling in the blanks – unless the members voted to leave it alone and try to pass it with the blanks, in which case they'd have to fill the blanks after passing the amendment.

The votes were as follows:

- 1 and 5 failed.
- 3 and 10 failed.
- 2 and 5 failed.
- 3 and 7 failed.
- 5 and 10 failed.
- 4 and 8 failed.
- 3 and 6 failed.
- 3 and 5 failed.
- 5 and 8 failed.
- 6 and 9 failed.
- 4 and 6 passed.

In the end, the blank in the motion 4 and 6 was filled with 4 and 6.

The Chair asked if there was any objection to ignoring the time spent filling the blank and not holding it against the total debate time. Hearing no objection, the debate time was reset to 10 minutes.

Steven desJardins said the point of 4 and 6 was to hinder the ability of organized slates to dominate a category. Though this motion wouldn't prevent it completely, any slate would need 50% more nominators to do the same amount of damage, assuming EPH was not ratified next year. A slate might be able to get some nominees, some finalists, on the ballot, but those finalists would be up against more genuine competition. And the cost of doing it was not that great.

Rick Kovalcik spoke against the motion. He would have been in favor of it if the ratio had been different, but he felt if a slate told people whose last names were between A and L to vote one set and from M to Z to vote another set, the system could still be gamed.

Chris Gerrib agreed that the nominations could still be gamed, but that the point was to make it more difficult to game the system, not to eliminate it. So, he encouraged members who didn't like E Pluribus Hugo to support his motion because if we didn't do something this year, the problem will still exist for the Helsinki Worldcon.

Dara Korra'ti said that in any open and fair system, one party defeats no parties in all cases. That's why political parties arise. What this initiative ignored, she felt, was that one slate will be followed by the creation of additional slates, and the short list of the Hugos will become a political football, to be tossed back and forth and reduced in value each time as a token of political strength. This system does not discourage slates; it mandates them.

Ben "Big Heart" Yalow opposed EPH, but it was clear to him that the assembly felt something needed to be done to affect slates. He hoped that we would pass this so that that people would realize how bad EPH is and feel that we have a backup mechanism if they wished to address the slate issue.

John Seghers felt that the Hugos have a history of openness in nominations and also of providing a good number of choices to select from. We have other ways to address this, including EPH, but he felt that 4 and 6 was an ill-considered measure that doesn't really address the issue.

Lisa Hayes felt that 4 and 6 was an absolutely simple way to reduce the power of slates. A second and important consideration of this system would allow fewer blanks for people to fill in so the nomination ballot wouldn't be so intimidating. Therefore, we would get a broad number of choices from a number of different people without any one group dominating that list, making it simple and straightforward and an improvement over our current system.

Joshua Kronengold said the analysis showed that this proposal encouraged parties, and therefore would not work in the long term. Changing the number of nominations would make it harder to reach convergence; and lowering the number of nominations would hurt things, particularly in conjunction with EPH, where every nomination one lists would give support for something to get on the ballot and defeat slates. He also felt five finalists were sufficient; he didn't want more things to read.

Rich Horton felt differently: having more good works to read was a feature. He felt that the field is too big, and none of us can really cover the entire field. We have to do the best with what we have and accept that there will be a broader range of nominees to bring in a more diverse and wider set of potential winners.

Jared Dashoff moved to end debate, and by a vote of more than two-thirds of the members, debate was closed. There was a motion to reconsider closing debate, but it failed. Jamison Quinn then moved to suspend the rules and allow a single amendment, but this also failed. Then, by a serpentine vote of 86 in the affirmative to 82 in the negative, the motion passed and was passed on to MidAmeriCon II for ratification.

B.1.3 Short Title: Best Series

[Please click here to jump to the text of the motion.](#) Debate time was set at 16 minutes.

Discussion: Warren Buff made a motion to suspend the rules and take up the Best Series proposal, create a committee consisting of the makers of the motion and such other persons as they might wish to add to that committee and refer the motion to that committee with instructions report to next year's WSFS Business Meeting. The motion passed by a show of hands with two-thirds in the affirmative. Thus, the motion was referred to a committee consisting of Warren Buff and Jared Dashoff. Those who wished to be added to the committee were advised to meet with Messrs. Buff and Dashoff, who would then provide members' names to the Business Meeting secretary.

B.1.6 Short Title: Nominee Diversity

[Please click here to jump to the text of the motion.](#) Debate time was set at 10 minutes.

[Please click here to jump to Saturday's discussion.](#)

Discussion: Donald Eastlake was concerned about a recent increase in the number of dramatic presentations and written works where three or more episodes of a single dramatic series were nominated or three or more works by the same author or coauthors were crowding out nominations in those categories. He also made a distinction between this motion and EPH. EPH tries to avoid a small minority, less than a third, from controlling the nominations. This motion would control a majority; even if 80% of the people wanted every nomination in Dramatic Series Short Form to be a *Mighty Mouse* episode, only the two with the most nominations would be eligible and some other series or other kinds of short dramatic presentations would still make it on to the final ballot for the voters to think about.

Gary Blog raised a question regarding dramatic presentations: how would this restriction affect someone who wrote episodes for different series? Mr. Eastlake responded that in the case of dramatic presentations only the series is considered, and the personnel are ignored; e.g., if someone were the same director or executive

producer, etc. in episodes from different dramatic series, then all those episodes could appear on the final ballot.

Joshua Kronengold spoke against this motion. He felt that the EPH motion already handled this issue. If EPH works, he said, why do we need this? Additionally, he believed the motion to be inherently undemocratic and ignored the will of the nominators in favor of an arbitrary criterion.

Dara Korra'ti made a parliamentary inquiry: since the Business Meeting previously adopted language changing this amendment uses the term "written works" would it need to address this motion to reflect the new usage in the rest of the Constitution? The Chair ruled that since the intent of the motion was clear, the secretary, working potentially with the Nitpicking and Flyspecking Committee, could adjust the wording to make it internally consistent with the rest of the Constitution.

Kate Secor made an amendment from changing the phrase "an author in common" to "an author for single -author works, or two or more authors for coauthored works, in common." The amendment would now read:

[3.8.X: If there are more than two works in the same category that are all episodes of the same dramatic presentation series or that are written works that have an author for single-author works, or two or more authors for coauthored works in common, only the two works in each category that have the most nominations shall be eligible to appear on the final ballot. For the purposes of this exclusion, works withdrawn by their author or authors under Section 3.2.5 shall be ignored.](#)

Joshua Kronengold made a parliamentary inquiry: if this amendment were to pass, how would conflicts be handled between a single-authored work and a coauthored work that had one author in common with the single-authored work? The Chair ruled that there would be one criterion for single-authored work and a different criterion for multi-authored works, and the actual implementation of it would be left up to the administrators.

Kate Secor said she was proposing the amendment because in the Dramatic Presentation section of this amendment we are treating creative teams working on TV shows as fundamentally a single unit, even if their members are switched out or they work on multiple shows. She believed that an author versus a coauthoring team versus a different coauthoring team are three separate creative units and should be treated as creative teams for the purposes of this amendment of exclusion. She conceded that this would mean that there could be someone who writes with a lot of different coauthors and that that person and all his or her different coauthors might appear on the ballot multiple times, but since those groupings represented different creative teams, she did not feel it inimical to the spirit of this amendment.

Paula Lieberman spoke against the proposed change. She considered Dramatic Presentation series as an integral type of entity, but authors write individual stories, and usually the individual stories do not relate to one another. They are separate

thematically, organically, et cetera. Therefore, she felt, the categories were not commensurate.

Mark Olson moved to close debate on both the amendment to the proposal and to the proposal itself. By a show of hands, the motion to end debate passed with two-thirds in the affirmative. Again by a show of hands, the amendment was adopted by majority vote. Finally, by a serpentine vote of 71 in the affirmative and 60 in the negative, the proposal (as amended) passed and will be sent on to MidAmeriCon II for ratification.

At this point Mark Olson made a motion to adjourn *sine die* in memory of Bobbie DuFault and Peggy Rae Sapienza. Rik Kovalcik spoke against the motion. The Business Meeting had created a committee to report on Electronic Signatures, and he wanted to at least hear the report and perhaps extend the committee for another year before adjourning. Terry Neill, a member of the committee, felt that they had arrived at a reasonable compromise and did not think it would take up very much time to conclude this piece of business. On a show of hands, the motion to adjourn *sine die* failed.

B.1.8 Electronic Signatures

[Please click here to jump to the text of the motion.](#) Debate time was set at 12 minutes.

This proposal and an amendment to it were referred to a committee reported back the recommended substitute below.

[4.4.X Worldcons may, with the agreement of all active bids, choose to offer any electronic signature means legal in the seated Worldcon's home jurisdiction.](#)

[4.4.Y Worldcons must offer the option to receive a paper site selection ballot regardless of that member's selection for other publications. Should they choose to include other material \(such as an addressed envelope and stamp or International Reply Coupon\), they may charge a reasonable fee for such materials.](#)

There was an objection to adopting the amendment by substitution. There was five minutes debate time on this amendment.

Kate Secor, the Chair of the committee, reported that the committee included the maker of the original electronic signature motion as well as several others who had been involved in bids, either current or past. They felt that this motion, while not speaking to any technical needs, provided an open door for electronic signatures, if the people most closely involved believe that the technology that will be used is worthwhile and provides the same benefits as paper. The motion also provided for a third publications option for those who want a paper site selection ballot but otherwise want electronic publications. This addressed specific concerns from members who said they didn't vote site selection because they couldn't figure out how to get a ballot. There were people,

she said, who would pay \$5 to get a site selection ballot and a self-addressed stamped envelope in the mail and not have to deal with electronic ballots. Ms. Secor felt this was a reasonable compromise between supporters of electronic signatures and the desires of the bidders to preserve the current privacy and security of the system that we have in place. It would still be up to each Worldcon to decide what they want to do.

Judith Bemis, the deputy site selection administrator for Sasquan, spoke against this amendment. She believed this may have been the first year that a Worldcon has accepted electronic delivery of site selection ballots to the site selection committee. Because of that, there were many issues and that this amendment allows Worldcons to work out the details since it says “may”, not “shall”. But she felt we needed more data before as we go forward. Therefore, she believed it would be better to send this amendment back to committee to make sure that all the issues that come up in administering site selection were addressed in this amendment.

Terry Neill authored the original proposal and spoke in favor of the substitute amendment. This amendment requires the agreement of all bids as well as the seated Worldcon. It is not a mandate on the seated Worldcon; it is more of a suggestion from the Business Meeting that this is something we think is good if everyone agrees. More people are voting from all over the world. There were concerns and problems this year with printing the ballot, signing it, scanning it in, and e-mailing it, which is a little complicated and weird in the 21st century. She felt the substitute amendment was a good compromise and she encouraged everyone to vote for it.

Jared Dashoff felt the current system for agreeing to electronic voting in site selection requires the agreement of all the bids, so this really didn't change anything other than Ms. Secor's amended section. Therefore he felt that the Business Meeting should debate the amended section by itself and move forward from there.

Rick Kovalcik felt that requiring paper publications be free was much simpler to deal with. Additionally he believed that the more questions we ask people, the more chance data is going to get lost. He thought it was an added complication to offer people a chance to just get site selection material by paper and therefore a bad idea.

There was a motion that the parliamentarian be instructed to put the original amendment and the substituted amendment on the screen, but by a show of hands, the motion failed.

With no debate time remaining to debate the substituted amendment, the motion to make the substitution passed by a show of hands. The substitute version was now on the floor as the main proposal.

Joshua Kronengold pointed out that the first clause, 4.4.X, of the current constitutional amendment was redundant and in compliance with current procedures. Therefore, he moved to strike that clause and keep only 4.4.Y.

Terry Neill spoke against this amendment. She said that past business meetings have adopted motions that advise Worldcon committees, instead of mandating things to them, to show that the membership was in favor of something if it was convenient for

the Worldcon, and that was what 4.4.X does. Therefore, if this Business Meeting felt that an electronic signature process was something that we wanted to let the Worldcon and the bidders know that the Business Meeting favored, she recommended voting against this amendment.

Mr. Kronengold said we shouldn't complicate the Constitution.

Dave McCarty called the previous question to end debate on all pending motions. This was seconded and passed with a two-thirds vote in the affirmative by a show of hands.

By a show of hands, the amendment to strike out 4.4.X was not adopted. Therefore the complete substituted amendment (consisting of both 4.4.X and 4.4.Y) was still on the floor. By a show of hands the amended substitute proposal regarding electronic signatures passed and was sent on to MidAmeriCon II for ratification.

E. ADJOURNMENT

E.1 Adjournment Sine Die

Todd Dashoff moved to commend Kevin Standlee for his service to this business meeting. This motion was adopted by acclamation.

The Business Meeting for Sasquan adjourned *sine die* in memory of Bobbie DuFault and Peggy Rae Sapienza at 1:33 p.m.

D. WORLDCON REPORTS

The following reports were submitted to, but not discussed at, the Business Meeting.

D.1.2 Anticipation (2009)

Anticipation has not yet disposed of its surplus, and therefore this is not its final report.

**Financial Report
Cansmof, Inc.
For the period August 1, 2014 to July 31, 2015**

Opening Balance	\$53,824.33
Administrative Fees	\$876.92
Grants:	
Detcon	\$1,400.00
Fancaster Legal Fees	\$5,000.00
CSFFA (Aurora Awards)	\$200.00
Smofcon Travel Grant	\$500.00
Smofcon Travel Grant	\$500.00
Smofcon	\$1,228.24
WSFS Service Marks	\$2,100.00
Total Expenses	\$11,705.16
Balance on July 31, 2015	\$42,119.17

Note: All amounts in Canadian dollars

Prepared by: René Walling

Convention: Anticipation

Parent Corporation: Cansmof

Address: 975 Melrose, #6, Montréal, QC H4A 2R3 Canada

Contact Email: cansmof@gmail.com

Current tax status: a federally incorporated Canadian not for profit corporation

Officers and Board Members (in alphabetical order):

Robbie Bourget

Terry Fong (Treasurer)

Eugene Heller (Vice President)

Diane Lacey

Dawn McKechnie

Linda Ross-Mansfield

Jannie Shea

Kevin Standlee

René Walling (President)

D.1.3 Chicon 7



Chicon 7

Financial Statement

August 1, 2014 through July 31, 2015

	Beginning Balance:	\$50,222.09
Income		
	Total Income	\$0.00
Expenditures		
Chairman's Division		
Post Con		(\$138.93)
<i>Chairman's Expense</i>	(\$138.93)	
Grants		(\$30,000.00)
<i>NIU Foundation</i>	(\$25,000.00)	
<i>Science Fiction Outreach Program</i>	(\$5,000.00)	
Corporation Costs		(\$140.00)
Other Bank Fees		(\$281.10)
Office Expenses / P.O. Box Rental		(\$128.00)
	Total Expense:	(\$30,688.03)
	Remaining Surplus:	\$19,534.06

Prepared by: Joyce Lloyd (Convention Treasurer) <treasurer@chicon.org>

Verified by Dave McCarty (Convention Chairman)

Convention: Chicon 7

Parent Corporation: Chicon 7 Worldcon Bid Corporation

Current tax status: an Illinois corporation that is not tax-exempt

Address: P.O. Box 13, Skokie, IL 60076

Website: www.chicon.org

Corporate Website: <http://www.chicon.org/corp-info.php>

Contact Email: chair@chicon.org

Current Members: (all can be reached at chair@chicon.org)

Dave McCarty

Helen Montgomery

Steven Silver

Tom Veal

Lane Verhulst

D.1.4 LoneStarCon 3



Profit & Loss
All Dates
Prepared on July31, 2015

	<u>Total</u>
Income	
410000 MEMBERSHIPS	
410100 Voting Fees (from Renovation)	\$45,150.00
Total 410200 Renovation - JUN 2012	\$99,277.13
Total 410300 1 May 2012 to 30 Sept 2012	\$340.00
Total 410400 1 OCT 2012 to DEC 2012	\$129,182.03
Total 410500 JAN 2013 - APR 2013	\$339,231.54
410600 1 Aug 2013 to End of Pre-Reg	\$48,994.85
410700 Walk-Ins At-Con	\$79,950.00
<hr/>	
Total 410000 MEMBERSHIPS	\$742,125.55
Total 420000 CHAIR'S OFFICE / FINANCE	\$23,560.30
Total 430000 DEALERS/ART SHOW	\$49,007.55
430600 ASFA contrib. to Suite / Chesley	\$4,270.36
Total 440000 SERVICES/FINANCE	\$11,980.00
Total 450000 FACILITIES	\$25,633.75
Total 460000 ADVERTISING	\$6,535.00
Total 470000 GRANTS, LOANS AND TIED SPONSORS	\$78,853.75
<hr/>	
Total Income	\$941,966.26
<hr/>	
Gross Profit	\$941,966.26

Expenses

610000 CHAIR'S OFFICE	
Total 610100 GENERAL EXPENSES	\$14,266.14
610105 Advertising/Promotional	\$68.00
Total 610200 PRE-CON	\$10,395.56
Total 610300 AT-CON	\$7,877.79
Total 610400 POST-CON	\$175,006.49
610501 Charitable Contributions	\$9,700.00
610502 Sasquan (2015) Pass Along Funds	\$20,000.00
610503 Loncon (2014) Pass Along Funds	\$20,000.00
610504 2016 Kansas City (2016) Pass Along Funds	\$20,000.00
610505 Alamo Contribution	\$60,000.00
Total 610000 CHAIR'S OFFICE	\$337,313.98
Total 620000 FINANCE DIVISION	\$29,592.80
Total 630000 WSFS DIVISION	\$19,143.10
640000 FACILITIES DIVISION	\$863.60
Total 640100 CONVENTION CENTER – HIRE	\$47,100.00
Total 640200 CONVENTION CENTER - CORE SERVICES	\$233.90
Total 640300 CONVENTION CENTER – LOGISTICS	\$3,420.00
Total 640500 FACILITIES – Rivercenter	\$28,472.02
Total 640700 OTHER	\$1,802.04
Total 640000 FACILITIES DIVISION	\$81,891.56
650000 EXHIBITS DIVISION	
650100 DECORATOR	\$73,187.20
650101 Exhibits Banners	\$1,378.57
650120 Paid Security	\$9,784.72
Total 650200 FIXED EXHIBITS	\$9,738.50
Total 650300 ART SHOW	\$8,924.36
Total 650400 DEALERS	\$205.41
Total 650000 EXHIBITS DIVISION	\$103,218.76
Total 660000 PROGRAM DIVISION	\$34,084.95
Total 670000 TECH DIVISION	\$131,644.31
Total 675000 EVENTS DIVISION	\$18,340.19
Total 680000 SERVICES DIVISION	\$74,517.87
Total 680200 IT SUPPORT	\$10,817.35
Total 690000 PUBLICATIONS DIVISION	\$72,699.92
Total 700000 HOSPITALITY & PROMOTIONS DIVISION	\$15,122.59
799999 UNALLOCATED EXPENSE	\$1,051.82
Total Expenses	\$929,439.20
Net Operating Income	\$12,527.06
Total Other Income	\$911.57
Net Other Income	\$911.57
Net Income	\$13,438.63

Prepared by: Bill Parker

Convention: LoneStarCon 3

Parent Organization: Alamo Literary Arts Maintenance Organization

Current Tax Status: a 501(c)(3) organization

Address: P.O. Box 27277, Austin, TX 78755-2277

Contact Email: president@alamo-sf.org

Website: <http://alamo-sf.org>

Officers:

President: Scott Zrubrek <president@alamo-sf.org>

Vice President: Randall Shepherd <vicepresident@alamo-sf.org>

Secretary: Jonathan Guthrie <secretary@alamo-sf.org>

Treasurer: Bill Parker <treasurer@alamo-sf.org>

Communications: Kurt Baty <communicatoins@alamo-sf.org>

IT: Steve Staton <it@alamo-sf.org>

Webmaster: Bill Parker & Clif Davis <webmaster@alamo-sf.org>

D.1.5 Detcon1



Income and Expenses to Date (as of August 5, 2015)

INCOME

Transfer from Bid	\$3,863.33
Voting Fees	\$15,381.83
Memberships	\$64,060.00
Dealers fees (tables & services)	\$8,220.00
Art show income (net)	\$2,094.37
Artist Alley fees	\$180.00
Merchandise sales (t-shirts, patches)	\$2,806.84
Baseball and planetarium ticket sales	\$860.00
Fees from Mobie users	\$1,050.00
Advertising sales	\$4,201.00
Chicon 7 Grant	\$6,400.00
CanSMOF Grant	\$1,400.00
LoneStarCon 3 Grant	\$2,200.00
Reception sponsorship from SFWA	\$2,000.00
FANTastic Detroit Fund donations	\$1,457.48
Misc Donations	\$466.50
INCOME TOTAL	\$125,858.35

Art show sales & fees combined:
\$11,206.50

→ Artist sales payment:
\$9,112.13

EXPENSES

Chair's Office

Committee meetings	\$331.94
Travel/expenses support	\$400.00
Mark Protection Committee dues	\$900.00
Thank You Party at ConFusion	\$519.62
Reimbursements	16,774.00

Finance

Credit card/Paypal fees/Square fees	\$2,147.81
Corporation costs	\$50.00
Other bank fees	\$141.65
Currency exchange	\$75.86
PO box rental/office expenses	\$57.17
Liability insurance	\$198.11

Member Services

Registration Materials	\$1,668.24
Consuite/hospitality	\$5,620.04
Room party prizes	\$201.92
Ribbons	\$894.02
Volunteer meals	\$366.20
Mobie hire	\$1,462.80

Facilities

Marriott (space, catering, tech & security)	\$30,179.77
Marriott (hotel room)	\$3,502.90
Attrition on Courtyard	\$3,474.68

Ops Division

Truck rental and expenses	\$2,749.72
Office supplies	\$1,131.19

Exhibits Division

Art Show expenses (setup and return mailing)	\$903.96
Fan Gallery shipping (estimated)	\$484.97
Fanzine lounge (supplies and suite rental)	\$931.55
Maker space costs	\$234.38

Program Division

Guests of Honor/Special Guests	\$7,364.76
Programming supplies	\$400.84

Events Division

Masquerade	\$66.45
YA Award ceremony	\$270.60
YA award design and fabrication	\$500.00
Dances	\$1,595.00
Tigers tickets	\$667.00
Planetarium tickets	\$145.00
Planetarium bus ride	\$327.00
ASCAP, BMI, MPLC licenses	\$250.00

Publications Division

PR1 (Dec 2013)	\$1,079.94
PR2 (April 2014)	\$1,290.02
PR3 (July 2014)	\$166.55
Souvenir Book, program guide, other at-con	\$6,121.45
Newsletter	\$948.95

Re-printing souvenir books (estimated)
Post con mailing of souvenir books (estimated)

Promotions Division

Web/IT	\$234.68
Convention activities	\$2,347.09
Promotional Materials (shirts)	\$2,505.80
Promotional Materials (other)	\$1,209.08
Outbound advertising	\$538.87

EXPENSES TOTAL **\$112,719.94**

NET INCOME **\$13,138.41**

Outstanding Liabilities

The value of uncashed reimbursement and artist payment checks is \$999.40, and these checks will be expiring within the next few months.

Grants Made

Grants to Lisa Hayes for Video Card purchase for WSFS business meeting recordings	\$400.00
--	----------

Bank Balance and Remaining Surplus

As of July 22, 2015, the bank balance and remaining surplus is \$12,738.41.

Prepared by: Don Wenzel, Detcon1 Treasurer, and Tammy Coxen, Detcon1 Chair

Convention: Detcon1

Parent Organization: Driving the Future, Inc.

Current Tax Status: a 501(c)(7) not-for-profit organization incorporated in Michigan

Registered Address: 508 Little Lake Dr., Ann Arbor, MI 48103

Contact Email: Tammy Coxen <chair@detcon1.org>

Website: <http://detcon1.org/>

Officers:

President: Tammy Coxen

Treasurer: Don Wenzel

Secretary: David Stein

D.1.6 Loncon 3



14-18 August 2014
ExCeL, London
<http://www.loncon3.org>

Financial Statement - as of 20 July 2015

HMRC Exchange Rates (i)

US dollar

\$1.5711

Euro

€1.3986

Income

Voting Fee (converted to UK£)	£23,083.78
Passalong Funds (Renovation)	£16,678.99
Passalong Funds (Chicon 7)	£18,794.14
Passalong Funds-(LoneStarCon 3)	£11,561.42
Passalong Funds-(AussieCon 4)	£3,362.20
Bid Passalong	£80,767.84
Membership Income	£627,998.67
Sponsorship	£28,364.57
Net VAT Receipts (ii)	£70,542.26
Dealers' Zone (tables)	£22,278.93
Art Show (Hanging Fees & Commission)	£7,241.41
Publication Advertising	£20,116.36
Merchandise Sales Commission	£3,429.17
Photo Competition	£150.00
Art Show Case Sales	£4,490.00
Hospitality Beer Glass Sales	£1,197.54
Infotel Commission	£4,733.95
Mobie Charge Thru and Child Care	£5,975.33
Miscellaneous	£916.43
Balancing Transfer (iii)	£37,585.82
Total income	£989,268.81

Expenditures

Chairs Discretionary	£2,529.67
Guest of Honour	£17,948.40
Hugo Losers Party	£3,696.46
Staff & Committee Weekends	£7,003.57
Hugo Awards	£6,931.79
Membership Forms & Expenses	£1,126.39
Membership Refunds	£1,525.22

Web Hosting	£865.50
Credit Card Charges	£25,836.45
Accountant Fees	£7,746.90
General Insurance	£7,830.50
Bank & Corporate Charges	£192.30
Net VAT Payments (ii)	£16,257.21
Finance Division	£2,383.69
Convention Facilities	£356,621.35
Convention Security	£40,546.90
Progress Reports	£17,739.11
Retro Hugo Booklet	£1,713.69
At Con Publications	£34,578.04
Advertising	£18,728.81
Promotions	£9,471.16
At-Con IT	£17,490.60
Mobie Hire	£2,940.00
Child Care	£7,013.40
Volunteer T-Shirts	£2,836.52
Gopher Rewards	£11,200.00
Programme	£7,681.10
Green Room	£14,682.80
Art Show	£16,847.35
Chesley Reception	£2,496.00
Exhibits Expenses	£22,130.78
Shipping & Storage	£18,088.18
Hospitality Expenses	£36,958.74
Audio/Video Tech	£33,303.86
Furnishings	£70,877.67
Performances & Events	£35,967.59
Hugo Receptions	£7,780.28
Operations & MIMO	£46,899.28
Solicitors Fees (In place MPC dues)	£8,400.00
Bid Party Expenses	£2,937.64
Balancing Transfer (iii)	£40,477.10
Total Expenditure	£988,282.00
Net (Income - Expenditure):	£986.81

Bank Accounts

	GBP	USD	EUR
Euro Account			€0.00
PayPal Accounts	£0.00	\$274.91	
UK Cheque Account	£607.11		
UK in 2014 Account	£81.47		
US Agent Account		\$0.00	
Chicon 7 Voting Account		\$0.00	
Total: Bank Accounts (Local Currency)	£688.58	\$274.91	€0.00
USD Bank Accounts (Nominal GBP)	£174.98		
Euro Bank Accounts (Nominal GBP)	£0.00		

Total Bank Accounts (Nominal GBP)	£863.56		
Unbanked Cash	£93.32	\$0.00	€0.00
Unbanked Cheques	£0.00		
Total Unbanked (Local Currency)	£93.32	\$0.00	€0.00
USD Unbanked (Nominal GDP)	£0.00		
Euro Unbanked (Nominal GDP)	£0.00		
Total Unbanked (Nominal GDP)	£93.32		
Reconciliation Balance	£29.93		
Total Reconciled Balance	£986.81		

Outstanding Income

Fox Apartments Refund & Interest	£7,420.20
Court Costs Claim on Fox	£410.00
Total Outstanding Income	£7,830.20

Outstanding Expenses

Art Showcase Mailing Expenses	£1,500.00	
Hugo Awards Expenses	£1,591.24	Nominal GBP
Tax & Court Cost Expenses	£785.00	
Final Accounts Charges	£4,500.00	Estimated
NET VAT Payment	£468.00	Estimated
Total Outstanding Expenses	£8,844.24	

Future NET Balance -£57.16

Notes:

(i) For consistency purposes the accounts are kept in three currencies and reported in GBP using HMRC publish exchange rates that we use for VAT purposes. These figures are used for all calculations.

(ii) VAT is a tax paid on most purchases made in the UK. It also must be charged by us on our memberships and other income streams (except publications). If we have paid more in a quarter than we have charged, we can reclaim the balance. If we charge more than we pay in any quarter, we pay the HMRC the balance.

(iii) Actual transfers are recorded in individual currencies. This entry relates to payments involving exchange of currency between UK and other currencies.

Prepared by: Steve Cooper (Co-Chair)

Website: www.loncon3.org

Contact E-Mail: – Steve.Cooper@ukin2014.org

Mailing Address: 378 Myrtle Road, Sheffield, S2 3HQ, UK

Officers:

Chairman: Steve Cooper
 Managing Director: Alice Lawson
 Finance Director: John Dowd

LONCON 3 is the trading name of London 2014 Ltd, a company registered in England, company number 7989510.
 Registered Office: First Floor, 176 Portland Road, Jesmond, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 1DJ.

D.2 Seated Worldcons

D.2.1 Sasquan



INCOME	ACTUALS
MEMBERSHIPS	
Voting Fees (from LSC3)	\$53,640.00
Membership and Conversions at LSC3	\$35,780.00
Membership and Conversions at LSC3	\$5,220.00
Memberships to Jan 2014 (\$ revenue all types)	\$46,650.00
Memberships (all types) through Loncon 2014	\$172,970.00
All membership types through January 2015	\$217,432.00
All membership types through 6-30-15	\$370,777.00
All memberships through 8-2-15	\$106,149.00
Total	\$1,008,618.00
CHAIR'S OFFICE / FINANCE	
Transfer from Bid	\$0.00
Bank Interest	\$167.00
Currency gain/loss	(\$2.00)
Misc Donations	\$69.00
Total	\$234.00
DEALERS/ART SHOW	
Dealers Room (PAID tables)	\$33,750.00
Dealers Room (PAID booths)	\$15,360.00
Art Show - Pre-con (hanging fees) 4X4	\$6,589.00
Art Show - Pre-con (table fees)	\$700.00
Art Show - Pre-con (shipping fees prepaid)	\$275.00
Total	\$56,674.00
SERVICES/FINANCE	
Merchandise	\$91.68
Total	\$91.68
FACILITIES	
Amazon Ballroom Rental	\$1,040.00
Total	\$1,040.00

ADVERTISING & PUBLICATIONS	
Progress Reports	\$1,000.00
Souvenir Book	\$4,450.00
Total	\$5,450.00

GRANTS, LOANS AND OTHER	
Chicago Pass-along	\$30,700.00
San Antonio Pass-along	\$20,000.00
Writers' Workshop Income	\$1,350.00
Total	\$52,050.00

TOTAL INCOME	\$1,124,157.68
---------------------	-----------------------

EXPENSES	ACTUALS
CHAIR'S OFFICE	
GENERAL EXPENSES	
Committee Meetings	\$5,776.02
Wikispaces Support	\$400.00
Mailing Lists Support	\$75.00
Chair's Fund	\$493.64
David and Vonda's Super Sekret Ribbons	\$402.00
SpoCon sponsorship	\$3,000.00
Member Souvenir Bags, Staff Flashlights	\$10,967.83
Total	\$21,114.49

EVENTS DIVISION	
Native American group	\$890.00
Streaming nomination announcement	\$499.00
Hugo Ceremony Admin	\$345.53
ASCAP	\$719.00
BMI	\$435.00
MPLC	\$800.00
First Night in the Park	\$550.00
Total	\$4,238.53

TECH DIVISION	
Tech Misc.	\$44,500.00
Total	\$44,500.00

EXHIBITS DIVISION	
Lights, panels, at-con supplies	\$490.81
Art show lighting - materials and build	\$734.18
Spokane Storage Rental & Insurance	\$1,140.00
Total	\$2,364.99

PROGRAM DIVISION	
Tom Smith travel	\$1,000.00
NASA Guest	\$871.51
Database - Grenadine & Web access/storage	\$800.00
Writers' Workshops	\$300.00
Total	\$2,971.51
FINANCE DIVISION	
Credit card fees	\$3,178.00
PayPal fees	\$14,373.00
Insurance	\$880.00
Other Bank fees	\$128.00
Office Expenses/PO Box rental	\$415.03
US Bulk Mail Imprint Fees	\$20.00
Pre-Con Treasury and Reg Office Supplies	\$330.65
Tablets for at-con square use	\$2,139.90
Registration - Badges & materials (including forms) and \$500 travel	\$9,345.40
Shipping LSC3 Treasury supplies to Spokane	\$321.37
Total	\$31,131.35
WSFS DIVISION	
Site Selection 2017 Office Supplies	\$55.35
Hugo rockets	\$3,575.97
Mini Hugo Rocket, Mailing	\$297.03
Hugo rocket base construction	\$1,750.00
Hugo Packet Hosting	\$129.38
Nominee pins	\$866.11
Total	\$6,673.84
PROMOTIONS & PUBLICITY DIVISION	
Fan Advertising	\$1,005.00
Convention Promo Parties	\$200.00
US Regionals & Other	\$1,052.98
Flyers	\$194.02
Bookmarks, posters, post cards, etc.	\$262.63
Table Kits	\$1,281.56
Internet Services (Hosting etc.)	\$576.81
Total	\$4,573.00
PUBLICATIONS DIVISION	
PR1 - Production and mailing	\$6,287.81
PR2 - Production and mailing	\$4,762.52
PR3 - Production and mailing	\$6,058.05
PR4 - Production and mailing	\$8,575.58
Special PR 4 ballot (Hugo, Site) Mailing	\$3,920.00
Souvenir Book	\$33,051.90
Membership CD	\$2,933.00
Hugo Awards Booklet	\$4,345.11
Pocket Program/Convention Guide	\$16,109.54

Restaurant guide	\$7,219.68
Total	\$93,263.19

FACILITIES CONVENTION CENTER SUB-DIVISION

Basic Hire	\$2,000.00
Convention Center Ancillaries (general)	\$88.00
Total	\$2,088.00

OPERATIONS DIVISION

Hardware (purchased)	\$99.41
Rentals for At-Con IT	\$11,194.79
Communications (phones)	\$1,214.24
MIMO/General use Carts	\$977.29
Seattle Trucks (all departments)	\$130.97
Total	\$13,616.70

HOSPITALITY DIVISION

Loncon - Hugo Losers	\$8,788.00
Loncon - Hugo Nominee Gifts	\$1,545.01
Loncon - Closing Ceremony	\$200.00
Loncon - Hugo Losers Invitations	\$184.00
Consuite Restaurant Orders	\$11,105.90
Consuite - Elec Equip	\$1,677.90
Consuite - Kitchen/Serving Equip	\$2,000.00
Consuite - Fridge Truck Rental	\$3,940.00
Consuite - Plastic Sheeting	\$589.95
Consuite - Food (Costco, CashnCarry)	\$9,000.00
Total	\$39,030.76

SERVICES DIVISION

Office Supplies	\$643.11
Ribbons and Rosettes	\$4,071.40
Kiddiecorp Payment	\$5,085.00
Staff and Volunteer T-Shirts	\$6,028.00
Signs	\$150.00
Kjell Standups (4 or so)	\$347.00
Total	\$16,324.51

TOTAL EXPENSES	\$281,890.87
-----------------------	---------------------

SUMMARY

As of August 6, 2015 Income	\$1,124,157.68
As of August 6, 2015 Expenses	-\$281,890.87
Balance	\$842,266.81

Prepared by: Bruce Farr, Sasquan Treasurer <<mailto:mbfarr2010@gmail.com>>

Convention: Sasquan

Parent Organization: SWOC (formerly Seattle Westercon Organizing Committee)

Current Tax Status: a 501(c)(3) organization incorporated in Washington State

Address: PMB #208, 15127 Main Street E, Suite 104, Sumner, WA 98390
Contact Email: info@sasquan.org
Convention Website: www.sasquan.org

Officers and Members:

President: Rhiannon "Gibbitt" Rhys-Jones
Vice President: Jason Wodicka
Secretary: Alexander von Thorn
Treasurer: Katharine Bond
Pat Porter
Ari Goldstein
Jerry Gieseke
Keet
Kristina Tracer

D.2.2 MidAmeriCon II



MidAmeriCon II
 Financial Statement
 August 1, 2014 through July 31, 2015

Income

Memberships	\$137,519.49	
Voting Fees from Loncon 3	\$24,963.12	
Transfer from Bid	\$6,267.40	
Bank Interest	\$38.23	
Total Income		\$168,788.24

Expenditures

Chairman's Division		(\$2,118.41)
Committee Meetings	(\$1,687.64)	
Misc Expense	(\$90.88)	
IT Support	(\$339.89)	
<i>Internet Service Hosting etc.</i>	<i>(\$339.89)</i>	
Finance Division		(\$4,427.39)
Fees	(\$4,123.96)	
<i>Payment Processing Fees</i>	<i>(\$3,528.12)</i>	
<i>Other Bank Fees</i>	<i>(\$595.84)</i>	
Insurance	(\$125.79)	
Office Expenses/PO Box/Misc	(\$177.64)	
Facilities Division		(\$10,000.00)
Kansas City Convention Center	(\$10,000.00)	
Design Resources		(\$5,793.62)
Progress Reports	(\$5,793.62)	
PR 0	(\$1,403.60)	
PR 1	(\$4,390.02)	
Marketing		(\$5,326.75)
Advertising (Outbound)	(\$920.00)	

Fan Advertising	(<i>\$920.00</i>)	
Convention & Open Events		(<i>\$2,266.87</i>)
Loncon	(<i>\$2,053.60</i>)	
US Regionals & Other	(<i>\$213.27</i>)	
Promotional Materials		(<i>\$2,139.88</i>)
Flyers/Brochures/Reg Forms	(<i>\$764.00</i>)	
Mailing Costs	(<i>\$28.28</i>)	
Table Swag/Promotional Items	(<i>\$1,347.60</i>)	
Total Expense:		(<i>\$27,666.17</i>)
Overall Total:		\$141,122.07

Submitted by Joyce Lloyd, Convention Finance Division Head
Verified by Diane Lacey, Jeff Orth and Ruth Lichtwardt, Convention Chairs

Convention: MidAmeriCon II

Parent Organization: MidAmerican Science Fiction and Fantasy Conventions, Inc. (MASFFC)

Current Tax Status: a 501(c)(3) organization incorporated in Missouri

Corporate Address: PO Box 41475, Kansas City, MO 64141-4175

Convention Address: P.O. Box 16, Santa Rosa, CA 95402

Convention Website: www.midamericon2.org

Officers:

President : Margene S. Bahm, President and Chairman of the Board <arya.stark4@gmail.com>

Vice President: James J. Murray <james.murray013@gmail.com>

Secretary: Ruth Lichtwardt <rlichtwardt@icloud.com>

Treasurer: Carol Doms <carol.doms@gmail.com>

Paula Helm Murray <kaylisdragon2@gmail.com>

Jeff Orth <jeff.orth@gmail.com>

John J. Platt IV <jplattiv@gmail.com>

C. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

This section consolidates the appointments made during the Business Meeting.

C.1 Standing Committees

The Chair made the following WSFS Business Committee appointments. Unless otherwise stated, the first named member is the Committee Chair. Other appointments were made after the Sunday session.

C.1.1 Mark Protection Committee

Michael Lee was appointed as the representative of the 2017 Worldcon to the Mark Protection Committee by Worldcon 75 (Helsinki). His term will expire in 2019.

C.2 Standing Committee Appointments

The Chair made the following WSFS Business Committee appointments. Unless otherwise stated, the first named member is the Committee Chair. Other appointments were made at the Sunday session.

C.2.1 Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

The appointed members for the 2015-2016 Nitpicking and Flyspecking Committee members are Donald Eastlake (Chair), Jared Dashoff, Linda Deneroff, Tim Illingworth, Jesi Pershing, and Kevin Standlee. The Chair has the power to appoint additional members.

C.2.2 Worldcon Runners' Guide Editorial Committee

The Worldcon Runners' Guide Editorial Committee was reconfirmed and will consist of Mike Willmoth (Chair), Bobbi Armbruster, Bill Taylor, John Hertz, Marah Searle-Kovacevic, Sharon Sbarsky, and Alex von Thorn. The Chair of the committee has the power to appoint additional members.

C.3 Special Committee Appointments by Resolution

The WSFS Business Committee passed the following resolutions to appoint members of the following committees. Unless otherwise stated, the first named member is the Committee Chair. [*Please click here to see the resolutions.*](#)

C.3.1 Formalization of Long List Entries (FOLLE) Committee

The members are Mark Olson, Craig Miller, David G. Grubbs, Joe Siclari, Kent Bloom, Colin Harris, Richard Lynch, Kevin Standlee, Tim Illingworth, and Ben Yalow. The Chair of the committee has the power to appoint additional members.

C.3.2 YA Hugo Study Committee

The members are Katie Rask, Jodie Baker, Adam Beaton, Warren Buff, Johnny Carruthers, Aurora Celeste, Peter De Weerd, Martin Easterbrook, Chris Garcia, Helen Gbala, Tim Illingworth, Dina Krause, Joshua Kronengold, Sue “Twilight” Mohn, Christine Rake, Kate Secor, Marguerite Smith, Kevin Standlee, Tehani Wessely, Clark B. Wierda, and Lew Wolkoff. The Chair of the committee has the power to appoint additional members.

C.3.3 WSFS Membership Types and Rates Committee

The members are Mark Olson, Gary Blog, Kent Bloom, Warren Buff, Martin Easterbrook, Donald Eastlake 3rd, Kevin Hewett, Tim Illingworth, Kevin J. Maroney, Priscilla Olson, Ron Oakes, Perky Raj (“PRK”) Khangure, Howard Rosenblatt, Ian Stockdale, Kevin Standlee, Don A. Timm, Leslie Turek, and Mike Willmoth. The Chair of the committee has the power to appoint additional members.

C.3.4 Best Series

The “Best Series” members are Warren Buff, Jared Dashoff, Todd Dashoff, Peter De Weerd, Tim Illingworth, Bill Lawhorn, Michael Lee, Simon Litten, Pablo Vasquez, and Clark Wierda. The Chair of the committee has the power to appoint additional members.

F. ANNOUNCEMENTS

F.1 Former Worldcon Chairs Photo Session

The Former Worldcon Chairs photo session will be held shortly after the adjournment of the Saturday portion of Business Meeting.

F.2 Mark Protection Committee Meeting

The WSFS MPC meeting will follow the adjournment *sine die* on Sunday.

F.3 How to Join SMOFs Email List

To join the smofs mailing list please go to:

<http://listsmgt.sflovers.org/mailman/listinfo/smofs> and fill out the form to request your subscription.

You will get an automated confirmation email, which you **must** reply to or click the link provided before anything gets sent to the list administrators.

It says on the info page: “*If you are subscribing and think that you might not be known to the list-administrators, please email smofs-owner@lists.sflovers.org and tell us who you are and some background information (including why or who told you to join the list.)*”.

Please be sure to do this as it will decrease the delay in your being added to the list. You may say you attended the WSFS Business Meeting at Sasquan as your background information if you wish.

APPENDIX 1
REPORT OF MARK PROTECTION COMMITTEE ACTIONS
September 2013 –July 2014

[Please click here to jump to the Mark Protection Committee report.](#)

Members of the Mark Protection Committee from September 2014 through August 2015 were as follows, with the expiration of membership listed in parentheses after their name: Stephen Boucher (elected until 2015), John Coxon (elected until 2017), Linda Deneroff, (elected until 2017), Scott Dennis (elected until 2015), Donald E. Eastlake III (elected until 2015), Glenn Glazer (appointed by Sasquan until 2017), Paul Dormer (appointed by Loncon 3 until 2016), Deb Geisler (appointed by Detcon 1 until 2016) Tim Illingworth (elected until 2016), Dave McCarty (elected until 2017), Mark Olson (appointed by MidAmericon II until 2018), Randall Shepherd (appointed by LoneStarCon 3 until 2015), Kevin Standlee (elected until 2016), and Ben Yalow (elected until 2016). The terms for Sandra Levy and Warren Buff expired at the conclusion of the 2014 meeting, and the MPC thanks them for their service to this committee. Kevin Standlee was re-elected Chairman; Linda Deneroff, Secretary; and Scott Dennis, Treasurer. Our Canadian agent is Adrienne Seel.

The MPC Finance Report is appended at the end of this document. A report from the Hugo Awards Marketing Committee is included as an appendix to this report. The Worldcon Website Working Group submitted no report to the MPC.

INTRODUCTION:

At Loncon 3, Fancaster had three and one-half days to ask for a cease-and-desist against announcing the Best Fancast Hugo at the Hugo awards. They did not, and the award was announced. Since then we have not heard anything from them. Fancaster (an American corporation) holds marks solely in Europe. **With several announced bids for European sites to hold Worldcon in the next several years**, Fancaster still has the potential to raise the issue again.

Because an unincorporated society cannot hold marks in Europe, our U.S. and UK legal counsels recommended that we establish a legal entity (which can be in the U.S.) under the control of the WSFS MPC, and that this entity be the legal entity that holds title to the WSFS marks. All members of the MPC would be trustees of this entity, whose sole purpose is to hold title to the WSFS marks on behalf of WSFS-sanctioned conventions (Worldcon and NASFIC). WSFS's legal counsel advised us to form a non-profit corporation for this purpose.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. **August-November 2014:** Implementing the recommendations of the 2014 WSFS Meeting, the MPC negotiated with ARESFFT (the sponsor of the SF & Fantasy Translation Awards), an existing California non-profit, tax-exempt corporation that was in the process of winding down its operations, to take over its corporate charter with the appropriate changes, effective January 1, 2015, with the understanding that the MPC would fund the cost of the changeover and

that ARESFFT would turn over operations to the MPC with zero funds. (ARESFFT returned all of its grants to the entities that had made the grants by the end of 2014.) As part of the changeover, the corporation's name was changed to WORLDCON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ("WIP"). All members of the MPC are automatically members of the Board of Directors of WIP, and no person can be a director of WIP without being a member of the MPC (with specific and low-probability exceptions dictated by California corporate law).

The MPC voted in favor of the following propositions:

- a. The MPC shall use WIP to register the WSFS service marks that it can in those places where the MPC has prioritized the protection of WSFS service marks and where such marks are currently unregistered.
 - b. As existing WSFS marks currently directly owned by the MPC within the USA come up for renewal, the MPC shall authorize that such marks be transferred to WIP.
 - c. The MPC will delegate most of its functions (as long as not prohibited by law) to WIP; however, the MPC must always maintain the ability to override the actions of WIP.
 - d. WIP will take over the MPC banking functions when it is convenient to do so.
2. **November 2014:** The MPC received a request from a descendant of Hugo Gernsback for a Hugo Award, and Glenn Glazer asked whether producing a Hugo not for a Worldcon's given ceremony is even legal under the Constitution. The consensus was that it was up to Sasquan to decide whether or not to fund building a replica trophy since it would not be a violation of Sasquan's implicit license to use the WSFS marks, but it would not have the current year's base.
 3. **December 2014:** The MPC held a meeting at SMOFcon for the specific purpose of discussing ways of funding the WSFS MPC in the future. This MPC meeting included a one-time meeting of the Board of Directors-Elect of Worldcon Intellectual Property (WIP) required as part of the transition between ARESFFT and WIP. The Board of Directors-Elect of WIP elected the existing MPC officers (Kevin Standlee, Chairman; Linda Deneroff, Secretary; and Scott Dennis, Treasurer) to be the officers of WIP effective January 1, 2015. A general discussion ensued regarding the long-term funding of the MPC's regular ongoing operating costs and how to address extraordinary costs, such as the Fancaster defense, dealing with the CIFF Hugos, and the AEE's "Worldcon." No specific actions were taken. The officers will prepare a long-term budget analysis in support of expected recommendations the MPC will propose to the 2015 WSFS Business Meeting. Also during SMOFcon, the WIP officers signed signature cards for the WIP bank account.

Also in December, Tammy Coxen contacted the MPC to say that Detcon 1 ran a surplus and wanted to make its contribution to the MPC. Detcon 1 had 1794 members and agreed to contribute 50 cents per member, rounded up to \$900.

4. **January 2015:** We received a copy of the Articles of Incorporation from the California Secretary of State, officially recognizing the change of name from ARESFFT to WIP.
5. **February 2015:** Laughing Squid, which had been hosting TheHugoAwards.org for \$8/month, informed us that we're using too many "computing cycles" (whatever that even means), and put a \$10/month surcharge on the account and also informed us that they have a maximum monthly data volume that we're approaching. Since members of the HAMC doing the web site work already had positive experience with Pair.com and their rates are reasonable, it was decided to move TheHugoAwards.org there as well.
6. **March 2015:** The U.S. Internal Revenue Service processed the name-change letter and issued a new tax-exempt determination letter in the name of WORLDCON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY. They still show a "doing business as" the SF & Fantasy Translation Awards, and but Kevin Standlee wrote to them to ask them to change that to DBA "The Hugo Awards" or remove the DBA entirely. This change means that when a bank does a crosscheck between the Taxpayer ID Number and the Name, they will match correctly. It also meant that we could change the name on the bank account from ARESFFT to WIP, order new checks and get ATM cards issued, as well as pay recurring expenses (like the domain names and web site hosting) from this account instead of having to front money and get reimbursed. (Kevin changed the name on the bank account in July.)

A group initially calling itself "Visionary World Con" set up an event for independent filmmakers. After Laurie Mann called it to our attention, we contacted them and suggested that they change their name to "Visionary World Indy Con," consistent with the description on their website, to avoid confusion with us. They made these changes.

7. **April 2015:** The announcement of the 2015 Hugo nominees saw a huge increase in the visitors to the TheHugoAwards.org. The number of visitors to the site shot up to about 27K from under 2K per day, much of which was from bots and search engines. (Likewise, there was a huge increase in traffic on the Hugo Awards Facebook page.) After declining from the initial huge spike on Finalist Announcement Day (April 4), traffic to TheHugoAwards.org continued to run at more than quadruple the pre-announcement levels. April 2015 was the busiest month in the history of the web site, exceeding the traffic from last August 18, 2014, when last year's winners were announced.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office renewed the trademark registration for the NASFIC mark. We will need to file another renewal application by May 9,

2020, in order to preserve the registration. We also renewed the nasfic.org internet domain for five years (for \$80.25).

Ben Yalow reported that WORLD SCIENCE FICTION SOCIETY INC. is still an active New York corporation. We have no idea who is keeping that entity alive. According to Ben, New York either requires the dissolution to come from the Board or a really expensive court proceeding. Theoretically, if you don't file renewal paperwork, they're supposed to dissolve the corporation—but it's not a priority for them.

Karen Junker of Cascade Writers advised us that that group planned to run a small convention they wanted to call AllWorldsCon and inquired whether we thought that would be a conflict with Worldcon. We believed it would cause confusion and asked the group to consider another name for their convention. We also thanked her for contacting us in advance of announcing their convention.

8. **May 2015:** A project called the “Long List Anthology” was brought to our attention in May (see <https://www.kickstarter.com/projects/753351971/long-list-anthology>), whose intention is to publish an anthology of the short fiction works that make the top 15 in the Hugo Awards. As long as this work doesn't actually use one of our service marks in the title or cover, and as long as it does not claim official sanction, even if it describes what the Hugo Award is, how it's selected, and how they came up with the methodology for selecting the material, we did not think it would cause confusion. Don Eastlake thought it would be nice if they included an explicit statement similar to that required by Worldcons in their publications, and Kevin provided it to them.
9. **July-August 2015:** Based on a budget analysis we conducted, the MPC considered asking Worldcons to contribute various amounts of money per member, eventually voting 10-1 (3 not voting) to ask for \$1/member, with the intention being to accumulate a reserve against unexpected expenses.

ONGOING BUSINESS:

1. With the above changes in hand, the MPC could now proceed to register its Marks in the EU. Kevin suggested approaching the three Worldcons with surplus funds that have shown a willingness to support the MPC (Anticipation, Chicon, and LoneStarCon). At the end of April, Kevin wrote to our UK attorneys to confirm that we're looking at about £4,500 (about US\$6,850 or €6,300) to register three of our service marks in the EU. For that amount, we can register WORLDCON, HUGO AWARD, and the Hugo Award Logo (without the words “Hugo Award” in it). (The long-form names WORLD SCIENCE FICTION SOCIETY and WORLD SCIENCE FICTION CONVENTION are apparently somewhat problematic, based on our previous experience of UK registration where the UK patent office rejected them for length.) Since, Dave Lally had to cut back his pledge of funds from one-half to one-third of the cost, if we split the donations four ways, they would work out to

CanSMOF/Anticipation: C\$2,100, Chicon 7: US\$1,750, LSC3: US\$1,750, and Dave Lally: €1,600.

Chicon 7 has expensed almost all its surplus and is not in a position to contribute. CanSMOF/Anticipation agreed to fund a quarter-share. LSC3 had previously made a generous donation in excess of the “traditional contribution” and also agreed to donate an additional \$1,750. The MPC (acting as WIP) instructed the UK attorneys to start the EU mark registration process, committing us to spend up to £4,500. Dave Lally sent his share directly to the law firm in GBP. CanSMOF sent its C\$2,100 share directly from Canada to the UK. The MPC will pay the balance (and collect the additional donation from LSC3.)

With our British solicitors having confirmed receipt of funding, in June 2015 Kevin authorized them to proceed with filing the applications as specified below, to be registered in the name of WORLDCON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY:

WORLDCON (word mark) in classes 16, 35 and 41
HUGO AWARD (word mark) in classes 14, 16, and 41
the Hugo Award (logo mark – without wording) in classes 14, 16 and 41.

2. We have created a ten-year expenditure cycle, which includes all the mark renewals in the U.S., EU, and anywhere else we may decide to register them (Canada and Australia being the only countries other than the U.S./EU where our current policy says we should be chasing mark registrations). We also projected how much we need to raise annually, and thus what we should be asking Worldcons to donate to us, which, based on an estimated 5,000 member convention, works out to US\$0.60 per WSFS voting member. This will allow us to accumulate surplus funds for a while (because our planned expenses come at long intervals) and thus it will allow us to meet all projected expenses, but includes no reserve against unexpected expenses.
3. Deb Geisler suggested asking the WSFS Business Meeting to have wsfs.org post the list of standing and temporary committees on its site each year, together with member names, and a single contact email address so that it will be easier for people to find out who to contact if and when issues arise, but this is difficult to achieve.

– Linda Deneroff –

Mark Protection Committee/WIP Financial Report – 1 August 2014 through 30 June 2015

	Income	Expense Paid by MPC/WIP	Paid by Other Entity	Balance
Cash on hand as of 1 August 2014				5,922.59
Paid to Loncon 3 for Fancaster expenses		220.00		5,702.59
<i>Paid by SCIFI for Fancaster legal expenses</i>			5,000.00	
<i>Paid by CanSMOF* C\$5000 for Fancaster legal expenses</i>			4,556.00	
<i>Paid by Loncon 3* 1,180 for Fancaster legal expenses</i>			1,980.00	
Reimburse Donald Eastlake III for domain renewal		68.67		5,633.92
Donation from LoneStarCon 3	3,795.00			9,428.92
Paid to Attorney Esther Horwich for trademark work		630.00		8,798.92
Additional donation from Renovation	500.00			9,298.92
Reimburse Kevin Standlee for hosting expenses		253.75		9,045.17
Paid to Attorney Esther Horwich for trademark work		30.00		9,015.17
Donation from Detcon Nasic	900.00			9,915.17
Refund fee paid to State of California	15.00			9,930.17
Paid to British solicitors for trademark work		3,141.39		6,803.78
Wire transfer fee		45.00		6,758.78
<i>Paid by Anticipation 1,077** for EU Mark Registration expenses</i>			1,750.00	
<i>Paid by Dave Lally 1,125** for EU Mark Registration expenses</i>			1,750.00	
<i>Pledged by LoneStarCon 3 for EU Mark Registration expenses</i>	1,750.00			
Balance of our cash accounts as of 30 June 2015				6,758.78
Total of expenses by payers		4,388.81	15,036.00	

Approximate total of expenses paid for Mark protection: \$19,425.00

* These original amounts were paid in non-US\$ currencies. Conversions are approximate, based on exchange rates in August 2014 and are shown for the purpose of comparability. The total bill from lawyers was 8,400, of which 1,400 was VAT that Loncon was able to claim back. The net bill of 7,000 is approximately \$11,756.

** These original amounts were paid in non-US\$ currencies. US\$ amounts reported are previously agreed-on shares of the expense. The total bill from lawyers was 4,200, approximately US\$7,048, based on exchange rates in June 2015.

Notes:

- The committee changed its reporting period to end 30 June rather than 31 July, so this report is for an eleven month fiscal period.
- The Treasurer thanks all the generous contributors to the protection of our service marks: Mr. Dave Lally, CanSMOF/Anticipation, LoneStarCon 3, SCIFI, Loncon 3, and the additional contributions from Renovation and Detcon 1.

— Scott Dennis

Hugo Award Marketing Committee Report to Mark Protection Committee September 2014 – July 2015

A result of the controversy over this year's Hugo Awards is that we think the Awards may have received more publicity this year than in any ten past years, including mentions in mainstream media outlets including:

ABC (USA)
CBC (Canada)
The Guardian (UK)
The Telegraph (UK)
The New York Times (USA)
The New Yorker (USA)
The New Statesman (UK)
Wired (USA)
The Wall Street Journal (USA)
and a large number of other venues.

While much of the coverage has focused on the controversy, it has also brought more positive attention to the Award and made many more people aware of it. High-profile members of the SF/F community, most notably George RR Martin, have made very positive statements about the Hugo Award, and those statements are among the most quoted when news coverage reported on the issue. Members of the HAMC were interviewed by the media regarding this year's Hugo Award controversies. We attempted to maintain a positive tone regarding the passion that many people bring to the Awards.

Additionally, traffic was significantly higher on the web site since the nomination announcement earlier this year. Total page views per month from April 2014 through July 2015 are listed below. (These are total page views from JetPack, the WordPress stats package. TheHugoAwards.org is a WordPress-based web site.)

Month	Views
Apr-14	114,509
May-14	73,986
Jun-14	62,580
Jul-14	69,159
Aug-14	170,178
Sep-14	55,876
Oct-14	50,750
Nov-14	53,676
Dec-14	62,765

Month	Views
Jan-15	73,845
Feb-15	62,444
Mar-15	61,505
Apr-15	229,791
May-15	89,728
Jun-15	85,520
Jul-15	90,370

Note that demand on the site after this year’s nomination announcement exceeded the demand following the announcement of last year’s final awards results by 35%. Due to the additional traffic following last year’s Awards, our previous hosting service (LaughingSquid) began imposing excess-usage surcharges, and we moved to a new hosting service (Pair.com) in March 2015. We also paid to upgrade the Hugo Awards web site hosting around the time of the nomination announcements this year, and we plan on doing the same thing during Worldcon due to anticipated very heavy traffic. (These upgrades should end up costing the MPC between \$100 and \$200 total in extra hosting fees.)

HAMC will once again provide text-based coverage of this year’s Hugo Awards ceremony via CoverItLive and the Hugo Awards web site. The cost of this coverage (about \$150) is being paid by a special grant from Sasquan.

Our contact address (info@TheHugoAwards.org) answers many queries about the Awards; however, most of them are in the form of “contact the current Worldcon.” Not surprisingly, many people assume that TheHugoAwards.org is the body that runs the Hugo Awards, and some are surprised to learn that each individual Worldcon committee independently operates each year’s Awards.

We have made minor tweaks to the web site design in response to feedback such as “where are this year’s results?” but we do not currently anticipate any major redesigns of the site.

Minority Report

This minority report does not take issue with whether the MPC needs an increase in revenue – I believe that the membership of the MPC is unanimous that it does – nor with the good sense in switching from a donation for each site selection voter to one for each WSFS member. It *does* take issue with the amount of the increase. Presently, the MPC is mandated to get \$0.50 for each *voter in Site Selection*. Over the past five years this has averaged \$856/year and over the past ten years, \$1079/year (this ignores donations from NASFiCs, which I do not have to hand, but which average \$100-\$200/year.)

The MPC's normal expenses are very lumpy. Over the past ten years they have averaged \$1455/year (there were big lumps in 2006 and 2014, while there were much smaller amounts in 2009-2013).

This past year the overwhelming bulk of the MPC's expenses were the unprecedented one-time cost of challenging the attempted registration of "fancast" in the UK by another group. The bulk of these costs (about \$12K) were covered by donations from several past Worldcons. Normal on-going expenses were around \$1200 – on the low side of normal, actually.

Over the last ten years, mandated income has been about 50% below what has been needed for normal operations – the balance has been made up from additional donations from Worldcons.

The proposed change from \$0.50/voter to \$1/member would have a huge impact on income (again, ignoring NASFiCs):

Average over past five years: from \$856/year to \$6480/year – a 7.5x increase

Average over past ten years: from \$1,079/year to \$6,382/year – a 4.9x increase

If the MPC got about a 2x increase in income, it would comfortably cover its actual average expenses, including the new EU registration. This would be a donation of about \$0.30/member. Based on past membership numbers this would give it an income of \$1945/year (based on the last five years) or \$1590/year (based on the last ten years). This would be an increase of between 50% and 100% over current levels.

Extraordinary expenses like the fancast affair are very rare (this is the first ever of this size) and entirely random and should be dealt with as they have been dealt with so far: by requesting donations from past Worldcons. This has worked and worked well and provides a very useful outside check on any MPC decision to spend seriously large amounts of money.

I believe that the proposed change is excessive and I will move to amend it to \$0.30/member.

— Mark Olson

APPENDIX 2
REPORT OF YOUNG ADULT HUGO COMMITTEE
September 2013 –July 2014

[Please click here to jump to the Young Adult Hugo Study Committee report.](#)

Committee Members: Jodie Baker, Adam Beaton, Warren Buff, Johnny Carruthers, Aurora Celeste, Peter De Weerd, Martin Easterbrook, Chris Garcia, Helen Gbala, Tim Illingworth, Dina Krause, Laura Lamont, Farah Mendelsohn, Sue “Twilight” Mohn, Christine Rake, Kate Secor, Marguerite Smith, Kevin Standlee, Adam Tesh, Tehani Wessely, Clark B. Wierda, Lew Wolkoff, and Katie Rask (Chair)

The Committee was (re)formed at Loncon 2014 in order to consider the issues surrounding a possible Young Adult Hugo. Such an award was first proposed at Chicon 1991 and in the 24 intervening years of debate, several proposals have been nixed, and discussions have at times been contentious. This Committee was therefore formed to approach and research the issue in a (somewhat) systematic manner, and to report its research to the Business Meeting.

Findings: The Committee looked into comparable awards, addressed past debates at Business Meetings, and considered the present Hugo Awards. Details of this work can be found in the Exhibits to this report, entitled ‘Common Concerns Expressed at the WSFS BM’, ‘Definitions of YA,’ and ‘The Hugo vs. The Newbery.’

- 1) The Committee finds that requests for an award recognizing teen literature (or YA) are indeed reasonable: teen lit, despite its popularity and quality, is not well represented by the current Hugos; the majority of YA awards are given by juries; the Worldcon community of teens, adults, and professionals would make the award unusual; the long-lasting demand for such an award is attested by repeated debates during almost a quarter-century of Business Meetings.
- 2) Under the existing methodology of the Hugo Awards, however, a separate category for YA fiction is not practical. That is, the Hugo fiction categories are defined by word count, not by age categories. We suggest instead the creation of a Campbell-like award, since the Campbell addresses authors and thereby functions outside the Hugo methodology.

EXHIBIT 1: COMMON CONCERNS EXPRESSED AT THE WSFS BM

1. Isn't YA already eligible?: YA works have already won Hugo Awards, so why is there a need for a separate category? The most recent win was 2001, unless you don't consider the Harry Potter books to be YA.

Most readers of YA/teen lit do not consider Harry Potter or Neil Gaiman books to be representative of the field. Harry Potter was a worldwide phenomenon well-known to the general population, while Neil Gaiman is a much-beloved member of this community who (nearly) always receives a nomination and a win for his books. In other words, HP and *The Graveyard Book*'s Hugo wins do not make a solid case for the presence of YA on the Hugo Ballot, as they are exceptional cases not representative of any field, either YA or adult.

YA/teen lit is a major component of publishing these days, and a great deal of it is speculative fiction. It is often stated at the Business Meetings that if a YA book is worthy of a Hugo nomination, it will be nominated and receive one. In the 64 years the Hugos have existed, five books that fall within YA have been nominated for Best Novel. As a comparison, if one looks to the prestigious Newbery Award from the American Library Association, a number of speculative fiction titles either won the award or were specially designated an 'Honoree.' In the time that the Hugo awards have nominated five YA works for Best Novel, thirty-five YA works have been honored with the Newbery. Nine of those works have won the Newbery Medal. Three of the five works nominated for Best Novel have won the Hugo.

First, the Newbery list shows that there are clearly quality, award-winning works of speculative fiction being written for YA audiences. Second, the Hugos, particularly when compared to the Newberys, have done a poor job of recognizing those works. (The details of this comparison, with titles, can be found in Exhibit 3).

2. The slippery slope: Hugo Award "story" categories are currently for works of science fiction and fantasy, delimited by length. A YA-work Hugo would effectively be trying to divide "science fiction and fantasy" into sub-genres. If you create a YA-work Hugo, why shouldn't we replace Best Novel with "Best Science Fiction Novel," "Best Fantasy Novel," "Best Alternative History Novel," "Best Military SF Novel," and so on.

YA and teen lit is usually not described as a 'genre' or a 'subgenre'. In fact, just as with 'adult lit', it encompasses all possible genres, including fantasy, science fiction, military SF, alternate history, paranormal romance, urban fantasy, etc. Instead, it is usually considered an age category. Academics and professionals have noted certain themes

common to YA/teen lit (e.g., the coming of age story), but those themes are by no means confined to that age category. Tracy van Straaten, VP at Scholastic, tells Wire.com, “Something people tend to forget is that YA is a category not a genre, and within it is every possible genre: fantasy, sci-fi, contemporary, non-fiction.”

A YA/teen lit award would therefore not be comparable to a Hugo award divided into ‘subgenres.’ This problem can be further avoided through the creation of a Campbell-like award.

3. Voter competency: Most of the people who cast Hugo Award ballots are likely to not be the target audience for YA works. Would this award be coached as “Best Work of YA Fiction that Adults Like”?

- There are many Worldcon members who are well-versed in YA/teen lit, a reality borne out by the growing popularity of the YA track. Several recent Worldcons have had a specifically designated paneling track on YA that appeals to teens, adult readers, and professionals. Loncon 2014 had an especially popular track, with 36 YA literature panels, two talks, and one workshop. There were 158 panel participants; teens, authors of YA/teen lit, publishers, and other professionals were well-represented. Moreover, 305 program participants expressed an interest in YA literature on their program surveys. The panels usually occurred in rooms with 100-200 person occupancies, with many of the panels standing-room-only or people turned away because of capacity issues. In other words, a large number of Worldcon attendees have knowledge of this category and fandom, although those attendees typically do not come to the Business Meeting. (Numbers provided by Loncon Programming.)
- For the 2014 Hugo Awards, 3,587 ballots were received for the final vote. The Campbell Award received 1,770 votes. The category of Best Fan Writer received 1,372 votes, while Best Fancast received 1,177 votes. (This suggests that the voting competency level required for a teen-lit related award should be reflected in at least the same number of votes as Best Fancast. In other words, a YA award needs the participation of 30% of the voting participants to be equivalent with Best Fancast, or 50% to be equivalent with the Campbell.
<http://www.thehugoawards.org/content/pdf/2014HugoStatistics.pdf>)
- Many teen-lit/YA awards are juried by adults, not voted on by teens. Such adult-juried awards include the Newbery, the YALSA awards, the Walter Dean Myers Award, the Golden Duck Awards, etc. A fan award given by Worldcon attendees would include both adults AND teens, as well as professional writers, publishers, and librarians. In this respect, such an award would represent a unique voting population.

EXHIBIT 2: HOW IS TEEN AND YA LIT USUALLY DEFINED?

Awards and Organizations:

ALSC Notable Children's Books:

“Younger Readers – Preschool-grade 2 (age 7), including easy-to-read books

Middle Readers – Grades 3-5, ages 8-10

Older Readers – Grades 6-8, ages 11-14

All Ages – Has appeal and interest for children in all of the above ages ranges”

(<http://www.ala.org/alsc/aboutalsc/alscfaqs>)

The Newbery Medal (ALSC)

“A “contribution to American literature for children” shall be a book for which children are an intended potential audience. The book displays respect for children’s understandings, abilities, and appreciations. Children are defined as persons of ages up to and including fourteen, and books for this entire age range are to be considered.”

(<http://www.ala.org/alsc/awardsgrants/bookmedia/newberymedal/newberyterms/newberysterms>)

YALSA (Young Adult Library Services Association):

Refers to books for “teens, aged 12-18” and “materials of interest to adolescents”

(<http://www.ala.org/yalsa/>)

Margaret A. Edwards Award (YALSA):

No definition of young adult literature

(<http://www.ala.org/yalsa/bookawards/booklists/members>)

The Michael L. Printz Award (YALSA):

No definition of young adult literature in award description

(<http://www.ala.org/yalsa/bookawards/booklists/members>)

“Young adult meant persons ages twelve through eighteen; and a young adult book meant a book published expressly for that readership. Thus, books published for adults – even though they might find a young adult audience – would not be eligible. The reasoning? This was to be an award for the best young adult book, not the best book for young adults.” [Cart 2010, 69-70 (see below)]

Riverby Awards (John Burroughs Association):

No apparent definition of “young readers” on site

(<http://johnburroughsassociation.org/index.php/literary-awards>)

Dolly Gray Award for Children's Literature in Developmental Disabilities

(Council for Exceptional Children):

“1. Children's books that include a main or supporting character with developmental disabilities. Developmental Disability is defined as follows: This condition occurs before a person is 22 years of age and limits him/her in at least three of seven major life

activities (e.g., receptive and expressive language, self-care, and economic self-sufficiency). . .

“2. For the picture book award, the book must be recognized as a picture book written for children in story format. . .

“3. For the chapter book award, the book must be recognized as a fictional chapter book (generally a novel divided into chapters) written for children or young adults in story format. This includes easy readers, juvenile fiction, and young adult fiction. . .”

<http://daddcec.org/ArticleDetails/tabid/76/ArticleID/512/Dolly-Gray-Award-Information-and-Procedures.aspx>

Phoenix Award (Children’s Literature Association):

No apparent definition of children’s literature on site

<http://www.childlitassn.org/phoenix-award>

Americas Award (Consortium of Latin American Studies Programs):

“The title may be for primary or secondary reading levels.”

http://claspprograms.org/uploads/Americas_Guidelines2011-1320961588.pdf

Orbis Pictus (National Council of Teachers of English):

“each nomination should be useful in classroom teaching grades K-8”

<http://www.ncte.org/awards/orbispictus>

National Book Award (National Book Foundation):

No apparent definition of “Young People’s Lit” on site

<http://www.nationalbook.org/nbaentry.html#.VCHzci5dUkg>

The Andre Norton Award (SFWA)

No apparent definition of “young adult or middle grade work”

<http://www.sfwaweb.org/awards/the-andre-norton-award/>

The Sunburst Award for Excellence in Canadian Literature of the Fantastic
(Sunburst Award Society)

No apparent definition of “young adult”

<http://www.sunburstaward.org/>

Locus Young Adult Book Award (Locus)

No apparent definition of “young adult”

<http://www.locusmag.com/News/2015/06/2015-locus-awards-winners/>

RT Young Adult Urban Fantasy/Futuristic/Paranormal (Romantic Times Reader’s Choice Awards)

No apparent definition of “young adult” on site

<http://www.rtbookreviews.com/rt-awards>

Hal Clement Award (Golden Duck Awards)

“The award is for science fiction books written for ages 12-18 that have a young adult protagonist, a teenager who must make adult decisions.”

(Helen Gbala, Golden Ducks)

Walter Dean Myers Award:

No apparent definition of “a YA work”

(<http://weneeddiversebooks.org/grants-and-awards/>)

Explanatory Rider from 2012 Proposed WSFS Amendment (Short Title: Hugo Category Young Adult Fiction):

“A young adult book is defined as one in which the author(s) and/or the publisher specifically targeted a potential nominee to this intended audience. In the event of any confusion on the issue, the Hugo Administrator may inquire with the author(s) of potential nominated work for clarification.”

Academic Definitions:

Michael M. Levy and Farah Mendlesohn (Forthcoming 2016), *Introduction to Children’s Fantasy Literature* (Cambridge University Press).

- “We have also taken decisions around the definition of children’s literature that argue for a flexible and reader-oriented understanding...children’s literature is that set of fiction read to or by children, whether or not it was originally published for children and whether or not adults have approved of children reading it... The second decision is almost more important because it explains the changing scope of the book as it proceeds to narrate three centuries of fiction for children: this book might best be understood as a history of fantasy for school-age children. It is extremely noticeable that the age at which fiction specifically for children is pitched has been gradually extended. In our earliest chapters the protagonist is rarely over eight years old; by the 1930s twelve seems to be the cut-off point, by the 1950s and into the 1980s fourteen-year-olds are regularly appearing in children’s fantasy. From the 1980s onwards a new category begins to develop – first through appropriating the work of adult writers, later as new teen lists, until it emerges as Young Adult, which features protagonists in their late teens. By the time this book concludes, there is a swathe of fiction labelled Young Adult (or more recently New Adult) which features protagonists in their early twenties and is clearly aimed at late teens and early twenties readers, readers who are in this modern world still quite likely to be in school.”

Michael Cart (UCLA): “Chapter 1. From Sue Barton to the Sixties: What’s in a Name and Other Uncertainties” in *Young Adult Literature: From Romance to Realism* (2010). [see GoogleBooks]

- Discusses history of juveniles, teen lit, YA, and changing definitions. Settles on age ranges (12-18 yrs), although in a new book (2013, p.6) he argues for ‘teen lit’ (12-18 yrs) and ‘young adult’ (19-24 yrs).

“A Young Adult Novel is a work of science fiction or fantasy which is written about teens (Age 12 to 21) in a distinctly teen voice and which explores one or more of the following issues of adolescent life: the onset of puberty, sexuality, and sexual identity; detachment from parent or parents; the emergence of more advanced reasoning abilities; the shift in interest from parental to peer relations; the training for adult work, family, and citizenry roles; and legal status as juveniles.”

- Based on Joseph Stevens, “Young Adult: A Book by Any Other Name . . . Defining the Genre,” *The Alan Review* 35 (2007).
[<http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/ALAN/v35n1/stephens.html>] and April Dawn Wells, *Themes Found in Young Adult Literature: A Comparative Study Between 1980 and 2000* (Master’s Paper: UNC, 2003)
[<http://www.ils.unc.edu/MSpapers/2861.pdf>]

Marketing Categories:

- Perhaps remove the ‘subjective’ quality by requiring that a work be published by a YA/teen imprint and creating a list of imprints which qualify?
 - Marketing categories are notoriously fluid, with imprints going in and out of business quickly, and YA books often published with an ‘adult lit’ author’s standard press
 - Marketing Categories have developed historically
 - Fantasy written for children has always been popular with and acclaimed by adults. However, if we go with the age of the protagonists as a guide, there was no real development of fantasy for teens as a group until well into the 1970s.
 - Science fiction for younger readers appeared in dime novels in the nineteenth century, then emerging as the Juvenile market in the 1930s through the 1970s.
 - The teen SF market switches to what is called the YA mode in the 1980s
 - ‘YA’ as specific Marketing Category begins in the 1980s and especially the 1990s, when the age range targeted expands as far as 11-25 yrs old

EXHIBIT 3: THE HUGO VS. THE NEWBERY

In the debate regarding creating a Hugo award for Young Adult (“YA”) speculative Fiction, it is sometimes stated that if a YA book is worthy of a Hugo nomination, it will be nominated and receive one. YA books are eligible, but they have not often won the award. In the 64 years the Hugos have existed, five books that fall within YA/teen lit have been nominated for Best Novel. These books are:

<i>Ender’s Game</i> - Orson Scott Card	(1986 Hugo winner)
<i>Harry Potter and the Prisoner Of Azkaban</i> - J. K. Rowling	(2000 Hugo nominee)
<i>Harry Potter and the Goblet Of Fire</i> - J. K. Rowling	(2001 Hugo winner)
<i>The Graveyard Book</i> - Neil Gaiman	(2009 Hugo winner)
<i>Little Brother</i> - Cory Doctorow	(2009 Hugo nominee)

As a comparison, we have likewise examined the Newbery Awards. The Newbery Award lists itself as an award given “annually by the Association for Library Service to Children (“ALS”), a division of the American Library Association, to the author of the most distinguished contribution to American literature for children.” Not all Newbery winners are given the “Newbery Medal” that is reserved for what the ALS believes to be the most distinguished contribution. However, the ALS also awards “Newbery Honoree” designations for worthy works of children’s fiction that the ALS believes deserve recognition.

The following list indicates speculative fiction titles/authors that have received Newberys since 1950:

<i>The Secret River</i> - Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings	(1956 Newbery Honoree)
<i>The Gammage Cup</i> - Carol Kendall	(1960 Newbery Honoree)
<i>A Wrinkle in Time</i> - Madeleine L’Engle	(1963 Newbery Winner)
<i>The Black Cauldron</i> - Lloyd Alexander	(1966 Newbery Honoree)
<i>The Animal Family</i> - Randall Jarrell	(1966 Newbery Honoree)
<i>The Fearsome Inn</i> - Isaac Bashevis Singer	(1968 Newbery Honoree)
<i>The High King</i> - Lloyd Alexander	(1969 Newbery Winner)
<i>Journey Outside</i> - Merry Q. Steele	(1970 Newbery Honoree)
<i>Enchantress from the Stars</i> - Sylvia Engdahl	(1971 Newbery Honoree)
<i>Mrs. Frisby and the Rats of NIMH</i> - Robert C. O’Brien	(1972 Newbery Winner)
<i>The Tombs of Atuan</i> - Ursula K. Le Guin	(1972 Newbery Honoree)
<i>The Headless Cupid</i> - Zilphia Keatley Snyder	(1972 Newbery Honoree)

<i>The Dark is Rising</i> - Susan Cooper	(1974 Newbery Honoree)
<i>The Grey King</i> - Susan Cooper	(1976 Newbery Winner)
<i>A String in the Harp</i> - Nancy Bond	(1977 Newbery Honoree)
<i>Anpao: An American Indian Odyssey</i> - Jamake Highwater	(1978 Newbery Honoree)
<i>A Ring of Endless Light</i> - Madeleine L'Engle	(1981 Newbery Honoree)
<i>The Blue Sword</i> - Robin McKinley	(1983 Newbery Honoree)
<i>Sweet Whispers, Brother Rush</i> - Virginia Hamilton	(1983 Newbery Honoree)
<i>The Wish Giver</i> - Bill Brittain	(1984 Newbery Honoree)
<i>The Hero and the Crown</i> - Robin McKinley	(1985 Newbery Winner)
<i>The Giver</i> - Lois Lowry	(1994 Newbery Winner)
<i>The Ear, the Eye, and the Arm</i> - Nancy Farmer	(1995 Newbery Honoree)
<i>The Moorchild</i> - Eloise McGraw	(1997 Newbery Honoree)
<i>The Thief</i> - Megan Whalen Turner	(1997 Newbery Honoree)
<i>Ella Enchanted</i> - Gail Carson Levine	(1997 Newbery Honoree)
<i>The House of the Scorpion</i> - Nancy Farmer	(2003 Newbery Honoree)
<i>The Tale of Despereaux</i> - Nancy Farmer	(2004 Newbery Winner)
<i>Princess Academy</i> - Shannon Hale	(2006 Newbery Honoree)
<i>The Graveyard Book</i> - Neil Gaiman	(2009 Newbery Winner)
<i>Savvy</i> - Ingrid Law	(2009 Newbery Honoree)
<i>When You Reach Me</i> - Rebecca Stead	(2010 Newbery Winner)
<i>Where the Mountain Meets the Moon</i> - Grace Lin	(2010 Newbery Honoree)
<i>Splendors and Glooms</i> - Laura Amy Shlitz	(2013 Newbery Honoree)
<i>Doll Bones</i> - Holly Black	(2014 Newbery Honoree)

In the time that the Hugo awards have nominated five YA works for Best Novel, thirty-five YA works have been honored with the Newbery. Nine of those works have won the Newbery Medal. Three of the five works nominated for Best Novel have won the Hugo.

Among the especially famous speculative fiction works missed by the Hugos are:

<i>A Wrinkle in Time</i> - Madeleine L'Engle	(1963 Newbery Winner)
<i>The High King</i> - Lloyd Alexander	(1969 Newbery Winner)

<i>The Tombs of Atuan</i> - Ursula K. Le Guin	(1972 Newbery Honoree)
<i>The Grey King</i> - Susan Cooper	(1976 Newbery Winner)
<i>The Giver</i> - Lois Lowry	(1994 Newbery Winner)

The only book that has won both the Hugo and the Newbery in 64 years is:

<i>The Graveyard Book</i> - Neil Gaiman	(2009 Newbery Winner)
---	-----------------------

EXHIBIT 4: NEXT YEAR'S YA AWARD COMMITTEE

The present Committee has touched upon some of these issues, but next year's committee would need to debate in more detail:

- Will the award be sponsored like the Campbell's?
- Will the award be named for a person?
- How will the votes be tallied?
- How will the category be defined? By age, by marketing category, or by general 'teen' designation?
- Will the award be for science fiction/fantasy or speculative fiction?
- Will the award be called 'YA', 'teen lit', or some other such thing?
- Will there be a word length limit, such as 40,000 words?
- Details of the sunset clause?
- The issue of dual eligibility?

APPENDIX 3 COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Discussion time for the Committee of the Whole was set at 36 minutes.

B.1 Constitutional Amendments

B.1.1 Short Title: 4 and 6

[Please click here to jump to the text of the motion.](#)

Discussion: The discussion opened with a short synopsis of the motion and how it works. Chris Gerrib explained that everyone would vote for the unranked list of nominees, with 4 per category. The administrators would then take the top 6, plus any ties, and put them on the final ballot. Voting on the final ballot would not change. He noted that he was not wedded to the numbers 4 or 6, and was open to suggestions, such as 3 in ten, or 5 in ten. There were two intents in offering this motion: the first was to indicate to the voters that they can list only the items they like, rather than everything they read just to fill all the spots. The second intent regards those folks who shall not be named who came up with a slate. That slate consisted of about 250 voters or about 20% of the nominators—people who voted to nominate—locked everything up. If you break up the number of nominations and make it different from the number of finalists, you force the slate to either concede part of the slate—part of the final ballot—or you split their forces in half, which dilutes their ability to do something. It would not be any more difficult to administer than the current process. It would not disenfranchise anybody. Everyone would still get to nominate and vote on the finalists. Mr. Gerrib then yielded the floor to questions.

Milt Stevens made a motion to change the number 4 to 5. However, the acting chair ruled that, being substantive debate, the motion was out of order, but could come up on Sunday when debate reopened.

Kevin Standlee raised a point of order supporting Mr. Stevens motion because he felt actually proposing that the committee of the whole adopt a recommendation in its report to the main meeting that the motion be amended by substituting 5 and 8 for 4 and 6. If the deputy chair held the point of order to be well taken, he would second Mr. Stevens motion. The point of order was sustained, and the deputy chair asked if there was any objection to reporting back to the meeting with that as a change.

Seth Breibart proposed a substitution to the Mr. Stevens amendment with a fill-in-the-blank vote. The committee of the whole would report back that the set of numbers should be set by fill in the blanks procedure at the regular business meeting and was seconded. There was no objection to the motion, and the committee of the whole agreed to report back to the business meeting that it should approach the numbers as a fill-in-the blank system.

David Clements felt that the amendment did not achieve as much as many in the meeting might have wished. It offered a list of finalists that could still be two-thirds dominated by a block. The ballot would end up with a situation analogous to the Novel

short list this year, which is still problematic even though several non-affected works are on that short list.

Mr. Gerrib, however, felt that what was important was the ratio. He felt it was important to note that this year's slate did not have complete control of the ballot. This is not a party vote, where the party can make people vote the way they want. There was a 25% runoff between the first and the fifth work in the short fiction slates, indicating the group proposing the slate had problems of their own as far as internal organization.

The deputy chair ruled that the blanks to be filled in do not need to be in the same proportion and the business meeting would not have to stick with a two-thirds ratio. He also noted that the committee was approaching the 10 minute mark on this discussion.

Rick Kovalcik felt that any set of numbers that wasn't 1 in 27 was gameable and probably half of the people in this room could figure out how a slate, even 4 and 12, could be gamed. Mr. Gerrib agreed it could be gamed, but the point was it would require a larger majority to game the system; and if it's big enough majority, they should win anyway. If 40% of people who vote want whatever work on the ballot, they should get it, whether others agreed with them or not.

Dara Korra'ti asked if the makers of the 4 and 6 amendment had considered the inevitability of multiple independent slates; i.e., not a coordinated action. Two independent slates, each running four candidates, would cover 100% of the ballot, making it a partisan ballot under any circumstances. Mr. Gerrib agreed that if there were multiple slates, there would be a partisan ballot.

At this point Kevin Standlee asked unanimous consent to move on to the second order of business. There was no objection.

[Please click here for Sunday's debate on the motion.](#)

B.1.4 Short Title: E Pluribus Hugo (Out of the Many, a Hugo)

[Please click here to jump to the text of the motion.](#)

With 19 minutes left for the committee meeting, Keith Watt began his an overview of how EPH worked: EPH is just a way of tallying nominations that minimizes slates. It doesn't change what one nominates, how one nominates or what one can nominate. The voter would not change his or her Hugo-nominating behavior. That was one of the fundamental principles behind the program.

In 2013, 15% of nominators were able to take 100% of all nomination slots, and that was similar to what we saw in 2015.

The true cause of this year's problem was that we as fans nominate a wide diversity of works. That's a feature! It's something that we want to maintain. But because we nominate all these very low numbers of votes for individual works, a slate that had good discipline could use their 200 votes to dominate the rest of us.

EPH is a mechanism that allows administrators to redirect that support from the works that didn't have a chance to begin with. The guiding principle is the Hugo Awards should be representative of all of us.

EPH works by allowing the least supported nominee to be eliminated from consideration and redirecting the support of the voters. Under the current system a vote is wasted if someone has five works on his or her ballot and it turns out an item doesn't have a chance to be nominated. Under EPH, that nomination is eliminated as though it were never put forth, and the nominator now has more support for his or her remaining nominations.

Mr. Watt then explained what was new about EPH: Points are the mechanism for redistributing that support. In each category there is one point. If you have five works on your nomination ballot, each work gets 1/5 of a point from you. All those points are added together, and that's the point total, which is a measure of popularity and support. If any of your nominees are eliminated, then the remaining nominees get the rest of your points. For example, if there were five nominations, each one got a fifth of a point. If one is eliminated, each remaining nomination gets a fourth of a point. If another work is eliminated, the remaining works get a third of a point. The key to EPH is this: Points do not eliminate anything. Points just determine who is eligible for elimination. The current system has always been the works with the most support are the ones with the most nominations, and EPH keeps that.

The number of nominations is what determines who is actually eliminated. Since works are getting more points over time, fandom is concentrating its support into the final ballot.

The EPH system does not say oh, you're a slate; you're bad, you're out. However, any set of nominees, whether they're from a slate or not, that tends to have both the same number of points and the same number of nominations will tend to compete against each other. The way the slates are controlled is they end up competing against each other, and so those five works get eliminated down to the most popular slate work.

The group behind EPH was not looking to keep slates off the ballot. The people who voted as a slate as still a part of fandom, part of us. If a slate has 20% of the electorate, they should have a slot. No fair system is going to prevent that from happening.

The important thing is that if there were no slate, EPH would get exactly the same results as the current system. It does no harm. If you are a proponent of a social solution—it's people, not the system—this gives the administrators the safety net to make those solutions work.

Mr. Watt began his slide show with a comparison of the current system and EPH. Under the current nomination system, the five nominees were the slate and swept the ballot. Under EPH, the final ballot consisted of the four most popular non-slate works plus one work from the slate.

One of the biggest misconceptions about EPH was “doesn't that mean I should only list one work.” He called that bullet voting. If you bullet vote, you give at most four-fifths

of a point to your favorite, at most. Most of the works that make the final ballot will have between 100 and 200 points. You have to get your work all the way up to fourth place so that it is never compared for nominations; otherwise it would still get eliminated because it would not have enough nominations to survive. So bullet voting doesn't do anything for you. All it would do is keep you from nominating four other works. The odds of you being able to help your work by bullet voting are essentially zero. And the price you pay for that is losing four other chances to get one of your favorites on the ballot. This is a voter education thing. We need to make sure that everybody understands why bullet voting isn't going to help.

So the best strategy is to nominate anything and everything you feel is Hugo-worthy. In conclusion, EPH is a specific fix to a specific problem. It doesn't do anything except plug the one hole that we all know is there, and it works with all the other things that we've talked about. It's politically neutral. If there is no slate, EPH won't change anything.

Tim Illingworth asked if his interpretation—the top nomination-getter can never be eliminated, even if he gets in a cage match. The second-most highest nomination can only be eliminated if he gets in a cage match with the first nomination, and so on to five—was correct.

There was some confusion with Mr. Watt's reply. He said numbers 1 through 4 are safe and would never come up for elimination because votes are tabulated from the bottom-up. It's only the fifth place that's going to be the one that's going to be eliminated. An unidentified member (Seth Breibart?) said Mr. Illingworth was referring to the number of ballots an item appeared on, not the number of points.

Mr. Illingworth clarified that he was referring to the total number of nominees. If the slate ones get in, say in second and third place, they can still get into a cage match and one will be eliminate.

Jameson Quinn clarified that that would indeed be possible if a lot of people voted for two of the top 4 that they could get into a cage match. That's exactly what happens with a slate, and that's kind of the purpose of the system. It could theoretically happen without an intentional slate but it would be very unlikely.

Mike Stern asked if there were any way to do this manually, without a computer. Is there a way to manually verify the data? Mr. Watt said there was, but that it was a tedious process. The algorithm would not be difficult to implement. Someone did it in Microsoft Excel. The current code outputs an audit file that for each round, so each round tells you what's happening with every single work, so it can be traced back by looking at the audit file. All it's doing is the same math you could do for yourself if you were distributing it. He added that it was tedious to go through, but it's there; it can be done manually.

Mr. Quinn added that the way it's already been done and the way to continue to do it is to independently program it twice in two different programming languages and not actually confirm the results until those two agree.

The deputy chair noted that currently there are two systems used that verify one another for the Hugos now.

Dave McCarty, the Hugo administrator for MidAmeriCon II in 2016, said that regardless of whether this motion pass this year, he would be working with Mr. Watt to see how the results could be checked manually, which had not been a task that they needed to do so far in their system. So before it is put into use for real, they would find a way to make sure that the results can be verified.

Dr. Andrew Adams said it had been claimed by the makers of this process that it would not substantially change any of the previous lists of finalists. But they had managed only to do a sampling on 2013 data and a run on the real data from 1984. But as had been stated, the real data is not generally available. He asked if there was anyone in the meeting who had access to past data who had run it through the proposed system and, if so, could they report on what their results were.

Mr. McCarty responded. He had completely anonymized Loncon 3's data, but he was not sure that he got things correct. His model for Loncon produced a change and he didn't know if that was a problem with his implementation or the software. He said he was willing to work with the proposers of this amendment to work through at least two sets of data and possibly three to show what we would get in a non-slate year versus a slate year. He added that he would like to do this before it is put into the constitution and hoped Mr. Watt didn't take that as a mean statement. He generally was not ready to do that for this year, but he thought that we have the ability to do with modern data what we get now, show that it doesn't affect one year when we don't believe there's a slate and what it does when we know that there is a slate. But that was not data that we would have available to us until next year's business the meeting, in practical terms.

Mr. Watt responded that there doesn't have to formally be a slate for EPH to have an effect and a classic example of that is *Doctor Who*. If you think about it, there are five good *Doctor Who* episodes and some very loyal fans. So those five episodes are going to be on the ballot. They are not intentionally a slate. But is it the best thing? Maybe you like *Orphan Black*. What EPH would do would be to essentially narrow those five nominations down to one. We'd have the very best *Doctor Who* episode going against the best *Orphan Black* episode, and we'd find out what's the best thing on television. So even if they're not a mean evil slate, it still has the advantage, based on how things work today.

Jameson Quinn also pointed out that there is a statistical procedure called bootstrapping that uses existing data to create fake extra data thousands of times. When they did that was 1984 data, they found that it got the same result about 4.5 out of 5 on average of the nominees in each slate. So it's about 90% the same. It's not that it would be 100% the same, but it would be very close to the same.

Mike Jones said he had been looking at the algorithm and it seemed to him that the tie-breaker contingency number 4 meant that a more organized cohesive a slate is, the greater the probability that the entire slate would disappear in a puff of smoke in one iteration. If you wanted to maintain slates as a fair but not over-proportioned

representation, shouldn't elimination step number four be replaced with a coin flip or some other deterministic way to remove them one at a time in each iteration.

Mr. Watt said that was called a "slate with perfect discipline" and what would be required for it to ever happen is for every single slate member to have exactly the same nomination ballots and for nobody else to vote for any of the other slate works. If any one of those things failed, then this situation could not occur. He had an amendment to change it so that if the business meeting decided that as a tie-breaker it wanted to eliminate the last one that was nominated or whatever, it could be changed. The currently proposed method was chosen this simply because it's based on what is already in the current constitution.

Glenn Glazer said that every description he'd seen of this proposal had been a description, what in computer science is called a specification. But it was not an algorithm. An algorithm is a formal statement written in a particular way that drives the way that the computer program that would do this is written. He wanted to know if there was an algorithm in the formal sense that had been published for this proposal. Mr. Watt replied that the code is freely available. However, he did not write it, and it's probably not written in the format Mr. Glazer preferred, but if someone could show him the format, he would rewrite it.

Dr. Perianne Lurie felt that the whole purpose of this amendment is to discourage slates and making them eliminate each other was a feature, not a bug.

June Young asked if this system was like a single transferable vote, which is like a method used in Ireland [not sure if Ireland is correct place].

Mr. Watt said this system is closest to the Australian ballot, for those familiar with the voting theory behind that, and it wasn't much more complicated than the instant runoff voting that we use.

Mr. Quinn added that the important difference was that the ballot stays the same, so you didn't actually have to rank the candidates. So that's different from single transferable vote, and it's a way of staying the same.

Lisa Hayes asked if this is supposed to be a system to break a slate, she wanted to make sure it was not also a system to break an unintentional slate. If we all love *Doctor Who* and didn't like any of the other programs well enough, then they deserve to get it and not be broken by a system. Mr. Jameson responded that if *Doctor Who* had 60% of the voters, they would get 3 of the five slates. That's fair.

Alex von Thorn asked if the Worldcon committee could pick software not tied to any particular code that may be hard to implement, because it's hard to find people to support this. Mr. Jameson responded that it already had been implemented in at least three different languages that he was aware of and that it was pretty easy to implement.

[Please click here for Sunday's debate on the motion.](#)

With the time having expired, Kevin Standlee moved that the committee rise and make its report. This motion was seconded, and without objection the committee of the whole concluded.