

2016 WSFS BUSINESS MEETING AGENDA
MIDAMERICON II, THE 74TH WORLD SCIENCE FICTION CONVENTION
KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI
Thursday, August 18;
Friday, August 19;
Saturday, August 20; and
Sunday, August 21, 2016

Table of Contents

PRELIMINARY BUSINESS MEETING, THURSDAY, AUGUST 18, 2016..... 6

A. BUSINESS PASSED ON 6

 A.1 Short Title: Best Fancast..... 6

 A.2 Short Title: The Five Percent Solution 6

 A.3 Short Title: Multiple Nominations..... 7

 A.4 Short Title: Nominee Diversity..... 8

 A.5 Short Title: Electronic Signature 8

 A.7 Short Title: E Pluribus Hugo (Out of the Many, a Hugo) 9

 A.6 Short Title: 4 and 6 12

B. NEW BUSINESS 14

 B.1 Resolutions..... 14

 B.2 Constitutional Amendments 14

 B.2.1 Short Title: Best Series..... 14

 B.2.2 Short Title: December Is Good Enough..... 17

 B.2.3 Short Title: Two Years Are Enough 19

 B.2.3.1 This Year’s Awards, This Year’s Nominators
 (amendment by substitution) 20

 B.2.4 Short Title: Three Stage Voting (3SV), or “The Only Winning
 Move Is Not to Play” 23

C. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MOTIONS..... 28

 C.1.1 MPC Report and Nominations 28

B. NEW BUSINESS 28

 B.2.5 Short Title: Additional Finalists 29

 B.2.6 Short Title: EPH+ 30

 B.2.7 Short Title: Defining North America 38

B.2.8	Short Title: Retrospective Improvement	38
B.2.9	Short Title: Universal Suffrage	40
B.2.10	Short Title: Non-transferability of Voting Rights	41
B.2.11	Short Title: Young Adult Award.....	43
MAIN BUSINESS MEETING, FRIDAY, AUGUST 19, 2016		46
C.	COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MOTIONS.....	46
C.1	Standing Committees of WSFS	46
C.1.1	MPC Election Results	46
C.2	Standing Committees of the Business Meeting	46
C.2.1	Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee	46
C.2.2	Worldcon Runners Guide Editorial Committee	47
C.3	Special Committees	48
C.3.1	Formalization of Long List Entries (FOLLE) Committee	48
C.3.2	YA Hugo Award Study Committee	48
C.3.3	Report of the Best Series Committee	51
D.	FINANCIAL REPORTS.....	52
D.1	Anticipation.....	52
D.2	Chicon 7	53
D.3	LoneStarCon 3	55
D.4	Loncon 3	58
D.5	Detcon1	61
D.6	Sasquan	62
D.7	MidAmeriCon II	74
D.8	Worldcon 75.....	76
A.	BUSINESS PASSED ON	77
A.1	Short Title: Best Fancast.....	77
A.2	Short Title: The Five Percent Solution	77
A.2.1	Short Title: Amendment to The Five Percent Solution.....	78
A.3	Short Title: Multiple Nominations.....	79
A.4	Short Title: Nominee Diversity.....	79
A.5	Short Title: Electronic Signature	81
B.	NEW BUSINESS	84
B.2	Constitutional Amendments	84
B.2.1	Short Title: Best Series.....	85

B.2.2	Short Title: December Is Good Enough.....	88
B.2.7	Short Title: Defining North America	89
MAIN BUSINESS MEETING, SATURDAY, AUGUST 20, 2016		91
E.	SITE SELECTION RESULTS	91
E.1	Worldcon 2018.....	91
E.2	NASFiC 2017.....	93
F	ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE REPORTS.....	94
F.1	MPC Report	94
F.2	Nitpicking and Flyspecking Committee	94
F.3	Nominee Diversity Committee	95
A.	BUSINESS PASSED ON	95
A.4	Short Title: Nominee Diversity.....	95
B.	NEW BUSINESS	99
B.2	CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS.....	99
B.2.3	Short Title: Two Years Are Enough	99
B.2.11	Short Title: Young Adult Award.....	99
B.2.4	Short Title: Three Stage Voting (3SV), or “The Only Winning Move Is Not to Play”	101
B.2.8	Short Title: Retrospective Improvement	103
B.2.9	Short Title: Universal Suffrage	106
B.2.10	Short Title: Non-transferability of Voting Rights.....	108
MAIN BUSINESS MEETING, SUNDAY, AUGUST 20, 2016.....		109
B.	NEW BUSINESS	109
B.2	CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS.....	109
B.2.4	Short Title: Three Stage Voting (3SV), or “The Only Winning Move Is Not to Play”	109
C.	COMMITTEE REPORTS.....	114
C.3	Special Committees	114
C.3.2	YA Hugo Award Study Committee	114

A.	BUSINESS PASSED ON	114
	A.7 Short Title: E Pluribus Hugo (Out of the Many, a Hugo)	114
B.	NEW BUSINESS	120
	B.1 Resolutions.....	120
	B.1.1 Short Title: Double Duty	120
A.	BUSINESS PASSED ON	121
	A.6 Short Title: 4 and 6	121
B.	NEW BUSINESS	123
	B.2 CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS.....	123
	B.2.6 Short Title: EPH+	123
	APPENDIX 1	124
	APPENDIX 2	130
	APPENDIX 3	141
	APPENDIX 4	143
	APPENDIX 5	145

2016 WSFS BUSINESS MEETING AGENDA
MIDAMERICON II, THE 74TH WORLD SCIENCE FICTION CONVENTION
KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI
Thursday, August 18;
Friday, August 19;
Saturday, August 20; and
Sunday, August 21, 2016

All meetings were held in Room 2104AB of the Kansas City Convention Center in Kansas City, MO, with Jared Dashoff presiding over all sessions of the Business Meeting. The Officers were:

Presiding Officer:	Jared Dashoff
Deputy Presiding Officer	Tim Illingworth
Parliamentarian	Donald E. Eastlake III
Secretary:	Linda Deneroff
Timekeeper:	Lisa Hertel
Videographer:	Lisa Hayes
Asst. Videographer:	Kevin Standlee
Sergeants-at-Arms	Warren Buff, Michael “MrShirt” McConnell, Colette Fozard

The debates in these minutes will not be word for word accurate, but every attempt will be made to represent the sense of the arguments. 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 was done by an uncounted show of hands or, less commonly, by acclamation. If a voice or show of hands vote appeared close or if a counted vote was considered important, a counted “serpentine” vote was held.

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

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

PRELIMINARY BUSINESS MEETING, THURSDAY, AUGUST 18, 2016

The meeting was called to order at 10:16 a.m. The business meeting staff consists of Jared Dashoff, Presiding Officer; Tim Illingworth, Deputy Presiding Officer; Donald E. Eastlake III, Parliamentarian; Linda Deneroff, Secretary; Lisa Hertel, Timekeeper; Lisa Hayes, Videographer; Kevin Standlee, Assistant Videographer; and, Warren Buff, Michael “MrShirt” McConnell, Colette Fozard, Sergeants-at-Arms.

The Business Meeting may be conducted in an order different from that shown in the agenda. Minutes will follow any new order, but contain the numbering in the agenda.

A. BUSINESS PASSED ON

The following item was ratified at Chicago in 2012 and must be re-ratified by MidAmeriCon II in 2016 in order to remain part of the Worldcon Constitution.

A.1 Short Title: Best Fancast

[3.3.14: Best Fancast. Any generally available non-professional audio or video periodical devoted to science fiction, fantasy, or related subjects that by the close of the previous calendar year has released four \(4\) or more episodes, at least one \(1\) of which appeared in the previous calendar year, and that does not qualify as a dramatic presentation.](#)

[Provided that unless this amendment is re-ratified by the 2016 Business Meeting, Section 3.3.14 shall be repealed, and](#)

[Provided that the question of re-ratification shall be automatically be placed on the agenda of the 2016 Business Meeting with any constitutional amendments awaiting ratification.](#)

Without discussion, debate time was set at 6 minutes. [Click here for the discussion of this motion.](#)

The following items were approved at Sasquan and passed on to MidAmeriCon II for ratification. If ratified, they will become part of the Constitution at the conclusion of MidAmeriCon II.

Note: *The numbering of these items reflects items the numbering system used by Sasquan.*

A.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.

Discussion: Proposed times were 10 minutes, 6 minutes, and 4 minutes. By a show of hands, debate time was set at 6 minutes.

While it was out of order to propose a change to the amendment at this time, Kevin Standlee advised the meeting that he planned to introduce a motion to revise this amendment at the Friday meeting to strike its second half so that it would not affect the Top 15 List. [Click here for discussion of the motion.](#)

A.3 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, based on the category in which it receives the most nominations.](#)

Discussion: Proposed times were 10 minutes, 8 minutes, 6 minutes, and 4 minutes. By a show of hands, debate time was set at 8 minutes.

[Click here for discussion of the motion.](#)

A.4 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 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.](#)

Discussion: Proposed times were 10 minutes, 8 minutes, 6 minutes, and 4 minutes. By a show of hands, debate time was set at 8 minutes.

Joshua Kronengold moved to postpone discussion on this amendment until after the discussion of Item A.7, E Pluribus Hugo (“EPH”). There was no objection, and this motion passed unanimously.

[Click here for discussion of the motion.](#)

A.5 Short Title: Electronic Signature

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.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.](#)

Discussion: Proposed times were 20 minutes, 14 minutes, 12 minutes, 10 minutes, 8 minutes, 6 minutes, and 4 minutes. By a show of hands, debate time was set at 10 minutes.

[Click here for discussion of the motion.](#)

A.7 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 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.

Provided 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.

Discussion: Cliff Dunn moved to definitely postpone discussion of this amendment until after the discussion of Item A.6, 4 and 6 (“4 & 6”). He believed this to be the least destructive of the Hugo alteration amendments and therefore felt it should be discussed first. Steven DesJardins spoke against making this change to the discussion order. He felt it was impossible to discuss 4 & 6 first because its effectiveness depended on whether EPH passed. He also foreshadowed an amendment, should EPH pass, to change 4 and 6 to 5 and 6 because if EPH passed that would work better.

Jason Spitzer felt that while the order of motions is important, some of the amendments would be much more difficult to implement, and therefore it would be a waste of time to consider some of the more complicated motions if 4 & 6 were to pass.

Joshua Kronengold felt it would be a disservice to both motions to reverse the order because people who supported EPH were likely to oppose 4 & 6 if it happened before EPH, in addition to requiring substantive changes.

There was no objection to calling the question to definitely postpone the motion until after the discussion for EPH.

The motion to reverse the order failed upon a show of hands.

Proposed times were 30 minutes, 20 minutes, 16 minutes, 10 minutes, and 2 minutes. By a show of hands, debate time was set at 20 minutes.

Dave McCarty moved to delay discussion of the debate of EPH and the two other amendments linked to it (Nominee Diversity and 4 & 6) until the Sunday meeting (after the Hugo Ceremony), after the comparison of EPH data to the actual nominating data is released and can be discussed.

Mr. Spitzer asked if EPH was being used this year. The answer is, no, it wasn't being used this year but it was being tested, so in effect the data was being run two ways.

Gary Blog wanted to know how Nominee Diversity affected EPH or 4 & 6. Dave McCarty didn't believe they were related, but since the Business Meeting moved Nominee Diversity until after EPH on Sunday, both would be taken up at that time. Dave reported that he had summaries of how EPH worked on the Sasquan data in 2015 and on

both sets of Loncon 3 data (Hugo and Retro Hugo) in 2014. He said he would try to get paper summaries on these sets of data for Friday's business meeting (already on the website) and would have the report of what EPH did with both sets of voting processes (Hugo and Retro Hugo) in 2016 on Sunday. He felt that EPH is a significant change from how we currently do things and we should look at as many tested data sets of real data as possible before deciding whether to ratify this amendment.

Rick Kovalcik asked if we defeated the motion to postpone now, would we have another chance to do so on Friday. Rick felt we have enough data now to shoot this amendment "down in flames" but if the data is ambiguous, then he would be in favor of postponing it. The chair ruled that it would require a motion to reconsider the outcome of this vote in order to vote on it again on Friday.

Dr. Andrew Adams felt that a motion on Friday would not be a motion to reconsider but would be a new motion made at the main meeting instead of the preliminary meeting. The Parliamentarian clarified that all of the sessions are one meeting, so if we voted today to do a specific thing to the agenda and then decide that was wrong, or we want to undo or do a different thing to the agenda that interacts with that, then we either have to have a supermajority to vote to change something we've already done, or we need to have a motion to reconsider. Anyone who votes on the prevailing side of a motion can move to reconsider it, which requires a majority vote.

Mr. Spitzer asked when we get the data sets, will we have numbers of nominations and votes for each title, each point in the data, and it was pointed out that the MidAmeriCon II website, on the Business Meeting page, already has this data.

The vote to the question to postpone the three items of business (Nominee Diversity, EPH and 4 & 6) until Sunday's meeting was passed by a show of hands.

[Click here for the discussion of the motion.](#)

A.8 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.

Discussion: Before a time limit could be set, for 4 & 6, Tony Parker moved to pull back Item A.4, Nominee Diversity, from the postponed definitely motion and move it back to debate after Item A.3, Multiple Nominations. Lisa Padol spoke against this motion because she believed nominee diversity was linked to EPH by virtue of the fact that EPH addresses slates (either intentionally or unintentionally), as does Nominee Diversity. Both amendments address multiple items being nominated (e.g., multiple Dr. Who episodes nominated in one category). She felt that some people would vote for EPH and, if that passed, against Nominee Diversity; but if EPH failed, they would vote for Nominee Diversity.

Warren Buff felt that Nominee Diversity could safely be moved back to its original order because he felt it didn't have a reasonable chance of passing. Kevin Standlee made a parliamentary inquiry as to whether the motion to reconsider the vote on placing nominee diversity relative to two other items on the agenda would permit the motion to postpone to be debated once again. The chair responded that it would.

Terry Neill agreed with the original speaker that Nominee Diversity was going to be influenced by what the meeting was going to do with E Pluribus Hugo, and she felt they needed the data before deciding on Nominee Diversity. Kate Secor believed that Nominee Diversity was worthy on its own merits and should be considered separately and not linked to other items that were more controversial.

Colin Harris made a parliamentary inquiry: just to be clear about what was being considered. He believed there had been two motions, one to move Nominee Diversity after EPH, and another motion to move three items to Sunday. If we only rolled back the first reordering to discuss Nominee Diversity before EPH, then the motion to move the items to Sunday would still stand, and he wanted a ruling as to whether both motions would need to be rolled back. The Parliamentarian said the correct thing we should have done, when the discussion to move all three items was before the meeting, would have been to amend that motion to strike Nominee Diversity so it would not have been

affected by that motion. Nevertheless, he felt the motion to reconsider moving Nominee Diversity to Sunday “was a fine thing to vote on.”

Kent Bloom moved to suspend the rules and vote on whether to move Nominee Diversity back to its original position in the agenda. There was no objection to suspending the rules.

Nathanael Nerode made a parliamentary inquiry, asking if a vote “for” meant the discussion of Nominee Diversity would move back to Friday. The answer was yes.

The vote to move Nominee Diversity back to following after Item A.3 was passed by a show of hands.

Proposed times were 20 minutes, 14 minutes, 12 minutes, 10 minutes, 8 minutes, 6 minutes, and 2 minutes. By a show of hands, debate time was set at 10 minutes.

[Click here for Sunday’s discussion.](#)

B. NEW BUSINESS

B.1 Resolutions

The FOLLE Committee and YA Hugo Study Committee have submitted resolutions as part of their reports requesting the meeting to reform the respective committee with the ability to add new members. These resolutions will be taken up during committee reports.

B.2 Constitutional Amendments

Items under this heading have not yet received first passage and will become part of the Constitution only if passed at MidAmeriCon II and ratified at Worldcon 75. 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.

B.2.1 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](#) or ~~deleting~~ 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. Modify existing Section 3.2.5 as follows:

3.2.5 In the written fiction story categories (3.3.1-3.3.4~~X~~ 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.

3. *Insert the following section after existing Section 3.3.4:*

3.3.X Best Series. A multi-volume science fiction or fantasy story, unified by elements such as plot, characters, setting, and presentation, 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 upon the publication, since it qualified for its last appearance on the final ballot and by the end of the previous calendar year, of at least two (2) additional volumes consisting of a total of at least 240,000 words, and further provided it has not won under 3.3.X before.

4. *Insert the following before existing Section 3.8.3:*

3.8.X If any series and a subset series thereof both receive sufficient nominations to appear on the final ballot, only the version which received more nominations shall appear.

Proposed by: Series Hugo Committee

Commentary: The full report of the Best Series Hugo Committee is at [Appendix 3](#) of these minutes.

Discussion: The chair proposed 10 minutes for discussion. Joshua Kronengold moved to amend Best Series to match the amendment moved on page 139 of these minutes. He felt that this motion by substitution would make the Constitution friendlier to series that extend over time and to add a “Best Epic” category at the same length as Best Series. This motion was seconded by Lisa Padol. Five minutes of debate time on the amendment by substitution ensued.

Warren Buff felt the main motion represented the best compromise and preferred that that motion be discussed on the floor. Kate Secor asked if this created two categories. Mr. Kronengold said it would create one category but would make categories in general up for re-eligibility when a previously nominated work got substantially long enough that it would be worth considering again. There was no further discussion, and by a show of hands Mr. Kronengold’s amendment failed.

Rachael Acks made an amendment to remove Section 3.3.X to remove the text beginning “If such a work has previously been a finalist. . .” – in effect removing the re-eligibility of works that grow by two additional volumes. Ms. Acks felt that opening this category up to multiple eligibilities for an ongoing series was wrong.

Chris Gerrib said the intent of the amendment was to eliminate those series that win a Hugo but still allow eligibility for series that were nominated but didn't win. They would take a two-year break and then be eligible again. He also felt this should be discussed at the main meeting, not the preliminary meeting.

Kate Secor felt permitting re-eligibility would permit series to become dynastic groups and should be removed because it will hurt the category. Jason Spitzer said we don't currently have a policy that amounts to double-jeopardy. We shouldn't say that because you were part of a final five, you can't be nominated again. Mr. Kronengold pointed out that his amendment by substitution would remove the specific portion of the Constitution that barred works from being nominated more than once.

Colin Harris asked, if we removed the section on re-eligibility part, would the result be that a series would never be re-eligible again, or would it make a series always re-eligible? He felt that the constitutional clauses that say you can't win more than once for the same work would be running up the question: is this the same work? We've had novellas turned into novels that became eligible again. Mr. Harris did not think it would be clear to the average voter what the intent was, and if we did not clarify this now, we would need further amendments to the motion after consideration at Friday's session.

Jameson Quinn requested clarification: if Section 3.3.X were removed, would the amendment permit any series that has three volumes and 240,000 words to appear on the ballot. Tim Illingworth, the Deputy Presiding Officer, pointed out that a volume would also have to have been published in the previous year but otherwise, yes, that was the issue currently under discussion.

Mark Olson felt Mr. Harris's point was extremely valid and moved to return this amendment to committee to refine it and report back on Friday with a motion that could be voted up or down, where it is well-defined what the consequences would be in each case. Without objection, the motion was returned to committee, with Colin Harris appointed chair with the power to appoint others to the committee.

With debate time on this motion still needing to be set, Winton Matthews asked if the report time would come out of the debate time currently being set. The chair ruled that the report time would be included in the debate time.

Ben Yalow felt we could not set debate time because the motion had gone to committee and was no longer under the assembly. However, the chair pointed out that we sent only the amendment to committee, not the full motion. The parliamentarian, Don Eastlake, pointed out that the agenda was still under the control of the business meeting.

Mike Stern asked how could set debate time when we didn't know what the motion would be. The Parliamentarian reiterated that the business meeting controlled the agenda and that the debate time was set for ten minutes but could be changed at any time. Seth

Breidbart then moved to set debate on the amendment to the motion to 10 minutes and to set debate time on the underlying motion to 16 minutes, independently, but with both subject to usual procedure. This motion was seconded.

Mr. Harris pointed out that the committee was not going to consider anything substantive; they would just concisely look at making sure the motion does what the intent was; i.e., just clean up the wording and come back with a short amendment.

Ann Marie Rudolph asked if the meeting could consider different times, such as 4 minutes and 10 minutes, each separately. The chair replied affirmatively. Nathanael Nerode moved to consider this motion (and amendment) after EPH was discussed. He was ruled out of the order because Mr. Breidbart's motion was under discussion. Then, upon a show of hands, Mr. Breidbart's motion to split the discussion in twain passed.

Kate Secor asked if the order we considered the debate time controlled the order in which the items were discussed. The answer was no.

Mr. Nerode then moved that the consideration of Best Series and its amendment after EPH and 4 & 6 on Sunday, and was seconded. He felt series are particularly subject to slate voting and he wouldn't be able to rationally vote on whether to have a Best Series award until he knew what we were doing about slate voting.

Rick Kovalcik spoke against this motion. He felt that there was already a lot on the agenda for Sunday. A lot of people would be leaving the convention on Sunday, and those who remain had a lot to start tearing down. He felt we should have as little as possible to discuss on Sunday. By a show of hands the vote to move the discussion to Sunday failed.

The presiding officer announced that Colin Harris had appointed the following people to the committee to revise Section 3.3.8 of the amendment: Cliff Dunn, Mark Olson, René Walling, Roger Burns, Rachael Acks, and Jason Spitzer. The committee would meet at the conclusion of the preliminary meeting. The chair also announced that there would be an informal discussion of EPH, EPH+ and all other various scenarios at the conclusion of Friday's session.

[Click here for Friday's discussion of the motion.](#)

B.2.2 Short Title: December Is Good Enough

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution by ~~striking out~~ and [inserting](#) text as follows:

3.7.1: The Worldcon Committee shall conduct a poll to select the finalists for the Award voting. Each member of the administering Worldcon, the immediately preceding Worldcon, or the immediately following Worldcon as of ~~January 31~~ [the end](#) of the ~~current~~ [previous](#) calendar year shall be

allowed to make up to five (5) equally weighted nominations in every category.

Proposed by: Colette Fozard, Warren Buff, Nicholas Whyte

Commentary: The administrative strain on Hugo administrators has increased substantially in recent years, due to:

(a) extension of nominating rights to include members of the year N+1 Worldcon – requiring the Administrator to merge three sets of membership data, two of which are continually changing as new members join the respective conventions.

(b) a substantial rise in the number of Supporting members due to increased interest in the Awards.

Members also expect to receive their nominating rights (and PINs) rapidly after the ballot opens – typically in early January – while the Administrator has to continue merging membership data from that point until the eligibility deadline, with no control of the timeliness of the data feed from Worldcon N+1.

Changing the eligibility deadline will reduce this strain and ease the administration process. In addition, in the event that 3 Stage Voting passes, an earlier eligibility cut-off will ensure that the overall schedule remains manageable (e.g., for a nomination phase of 8 weeks starting on January 1, then a December 31 cut-off is significantly more robust and easier to handle than January 31).

Discussion: Seth Breidbart moved to limit debates for the remainder of the preliminary business meeting to one minute per speech if the total debate time was ten minutes or less; and limited to two minutes if debate was longer than ten minutes. Since this would be a suspension of the rules, a two-thirds vote was required to pass. This motion was seconded. Mr. Breidbart, speaking in favor of his motion said he had too often seen one person take five minutes “to say nothing very slowly and using up the entire side’s time.”

Ben Yalow spoke against the motion. He felt we sometimes have complicated motions with short debate times. It might take someone longer than one minute to make his or her point. He would rather one really good speech than many lousy short speeches. Ari Goldstein, speaking in favor, said people could ask for more time if it were required. Kate Secor, speaking against, felt it was important to give people the time they need. Did we really want to stop people from speaking just because they may not be able to express themselves in a very short period of time? A motion to extend debate can be can always be made. We should just move to extend debate and give everyone more time instead of doing it for individual speakers. Gary Blog spoke in favor of the motion because he wanted to hear as many people as possible speak. He wanted to hear more opinions, not one person’s opinion dominating an entire block of time allotted for or against a motion.

Warren Buff moved to amend by substitution a motion that if fewer than five people have spoken in favor or against a motion, that debate time automatically be extended by 30

seconds to allow an additional speaker until five people have spoken. This motion failed for lack of a second supporter. Jason Spitzer then inquired if we have to use all debate time. The chair replied that we do not have to use all debate time.

Normally, a motion to extend debate requires a two-thirds vote. Joshua Kronengold asked to amend the motion by substitution so that if fewer than five people have spoken on either side, the threshold for extending debate should drop to majority vote for that motion. The motion was seconded, but Ben Yalow raised a point of order because he felt this new motion was not a germane amendment since Mr. Breitbart's amendment was still on the floor. He believed that in attempting to alter the original motion, it would not be germane to the original amendment. Therefore it would have to be offered as a separate amendment and not while Mr. Breitbart's amendment was still on the floor. The chair ruled that Mr. Kronengold's motion was germane because the discussion was all about debate time and influence based on debate about how people vote.

A motion was then made to call the question on Mr. Kronengold's amendment by substitution, which was seconded. There was no objection, but the motion failed upon a show of hands.

A vote was then taken on the original motion by Mr. Breitbart. Again, by a show of hands, the motion failed.

Proposed times for debate on Item B.2.2, December is Good Enough, were 10 minutes, minutes, 6 minutes, and 2 minutes. By a show of hands, debate time was set at 8 minutes.

[Click here for Friday's discussion of the motion.](#)

B.2.3 Short Title: Two Years Are Enough

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution by ~~striking out~~ and [inserting](#) text as follows:

3.7.1: The Worldcon Committee shall conduct a poll to select the finalists for the Award voting. Each member of the administering Worldcon, [or](#) 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.

[*Provided that members of the 2019 Worldcon will retain their nominating rights in the 2018 Hugo Awards.*](#)

Proposed by: Warren Buff, Colin Harris

Commentary: The extension of the nominating franchise from two Worldcons (N and N-1) to three by including year N+1 was implemented as part of the drive to expand the voting population at a time when member participation in the Hugos was substantially

lower than it is now. This change has created some undesirable side effects, and we believe the most appropriate response is to return to the previous arrangement.

The inclusion of year N+1 creates a very high burden on the Administrators since (a) they have to merge three sets of membership data rather than two, (b) two of these are in motion with new members joining up to the eligibility cut-off date and (c) the most recently seated Worldcon is often still establishing robust data and membership processes at the point where the current Worldcon needs a reliable flow of quality data.

The removal of year N+1 will remove this burden while only marginally reducing the size of the voting pool. In a typical recent year, Worldcon N-1 might have 6,000 members at the eligibility cut-off, Worldcon N might have 3,500, and Worldcon N+1 might have 2,000 – but in the early months after being seated, Worldcon N+1’s membership will be dominated by people who participated in Site Selection and hence are also members of Worldcon N-1.

(In the first 6 months after being seated, Renovation added 150 members, Chicon 7 added 450, and Loncon 3 added 400 – and of course a good proportion of these would also have been members of one of the two prior conventions). We estimate that removing year N+1 would typically reduce the voting pool by perhaps no more than 200-300 people, i.e. well under 5%.

This change would also mean that individuals who only wish to join to participate in the nomination process would have to purchase memberships every two years rather than every three.

B.2.3.1 This Year’s Awards, This Year’s Nominators (*amendment by substitution*)

Moved, to amend Section 3.7.1 by deleting, “, the immediately preceding Worldcon, or the immediately following Worldcon”. The section would now read:

3.7.1: The Worldcon Committee shall conduct a poll to select the finalists for the 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.

Proposed by: Kate Secor, Randall Shepherd, Ian Stockdale, Ben Yalow, Ann Marie Rudolph, Kate Paulk, Rick Kovalcik, Pablo Vazquez III

Commentary: The Hugos are awarded by the World Science Fiction Society, and we feel that it is reasonable that only current WSFS members be able to participate in the selection process, so that the entire process reflects the beliefs of the members of the Society for the given year.

If people join who otherwise might not have because of memberships in other years, it will show the members’ dedication to the continuation of the Hugos and of Worldcon,

and may slightly increase the administering Worldcon's funding for their efforts in running the Hugos. Additionally, it will substantially reduce the burden involved in data transfer for the Worldcon Registration and Hugo subcommittees, as well as issues of Data Privacy rules for transferring data across international boundaries.

While we acknowledge the efforts that recent Worldcon committees have made to expand the voting pool, we feel that those efforts will not be substantially affected by slightly raising the bar to entry to participate.

Discussion: Proposed times for debate were 12 minutes, 10 minutes, 8 minutes, 6 minutes, and 4 minutes. By a show of hands, debate time was set at 10 minutes.

Mr. Yalow, as the maker of the amendment by substitution, said this is a motion about this year's Hugos. Philosophically, he believed that this year's Hugos should be picked by this year's members of the World Science Fiction Society ("WSFS") throughout the process. We would be saying "This is what this year's Society has chosen." They would be the only people who would nominate as well as the only people who would vote. This would also be clean administratively because it would eliminate dealing with data sets across international boundaries and other data-protection laws.

Colin Harris, as the maker of the original motion, spoke against the amendment by substitution. When the voting pool expanded to include the third year– the "future" year – it created an administrative headache because the future year is a moving target that adds new members all the time. Yet it adds relatively few people to the voting pool because, that third year has only just come in. For instance, the new Helsinki voters only added few hundred people to a list already consisting of approximately 6,000 potential voters. However, Mr. Harris's concern is with removing the previous year's members because in a year where there is a small Worldcon, the nominating pool could be down to a couple of thousand voters. That leaves the system far more gameable for those wishing to be "bad actors." A nominating pool consisting of prior year and current year members was the best solution because it makes for a large fixed pool of nominators, e.g., 5- or 6,000 people potential nominators in a year when there's a smaller-sized Worldcon.

Rick Kovalcik felt that nominating items for the Hugos didn't improve when we went from current year to prior and current year nominators. For example, if Paris won one year and New Zealand the next, that would still leave a small voting pool in the second year. Making it a one-year pool of voters would actually help smaller Worldcons because they would have more supporting voters and therefore more funds to work with. For example, if the original motion were in force now, MidAmeriCon II would have more supporting membership income.

Judy Bemis asked why we were debating instead of setting times. The chair explained that there was an amendment by substitution on the floor, and we needed to decide which one to debate later.

Rachael Acks sympathized that the current process might be hurting supporting membership income, but if you cut off the second year, you are going to have a lot of actual people who want to participate complain that they are broke. Her main interest is seeing that Hugo Award voting is accessible to as many fans as possible, and not all fans can afford supporting memberships. If you can give people more bang for their buck, you will get more participation, and the more participation, the more robust the awards will be. Therefore she favored two years over one year.

Kate Secor reiterated that this is an issue over who gets to nominate. Right now we allow three years' worth of people to nominate and only one year's worth of people to vote. So we are expanding the voting pool to those who would have only been nominators by telling them if they care enough to nominate, they probably would like to vote, and to do so they need to buy a supporting membership in the current year's Worldcon. She didn't believe this would have a huge impact on participation because it flips nominators into voters, which is what actually impacts the awards.

Dave Wallace opposed the motion. Last year was his first Worldcon, and he didn't join until after nominations had closed. He wanted to remind us that if this measure passes, you don't have the entire Worldcon nominating; only those who joined before cutoff date get to nominate, i.e., those people who are "thinking ahead." It also means that those trying to game the system can organize themselves and join the before the deadline while others who may not have their act together are shut out. If we go to a two-year system, the larger body of nominators is still there. He was fine, however, with getting rid of the third year of nominators.

Warren Buff agreed that the nomination cutoff means a lot of the current Worldcon's membership can't nominate. However, he felt that getting people to join a Worldcon early is better for the Worldcon's budget and make for a better Worldcon.

Adrienne Foster understood where the makers' motion was coming from. However, the reason we started the two-year process was because of the cutoff date. If we remove the previous year's nominators, we should remove the cutoff date as well.

Anne Marie Rudolph said this amendment acknowledges that the nomination process has some serious deficits. She felt this amendment would help focus the nominations by those who care the most about the outcome of the Hugos. This amendment would impact only nominations, not voting. Extension of the nomination process has a huge impact on the administration on the nomination process. A supporting membership of \$40 or \$50 is a low barrier to entry. People do not have to have attending memberships to nominate. If you are invested in this process, you are willing to make the sacrifice. It will discourage people who are not invested in the process from coming back year after year if they have to pay to destroy something they do not appreciate.

Lisa Hayes spoke against the motion. Originally she was going to speak in favor of the motion, but she was swayed by the arguments. She believed that anyone who becomes a member after the close of nominations in the current year should get something for that membership, including the right to nominate next year.

Randall Shephard offered Rick Kovalcik his speaking time. Mr. Kovalcik said that when we first went to two years, it was hard to buy a membership. You had to mail in a check or be present at a convention. The Internet makes it much easier now to buy a membership, and the bar to buying a supporting membership has been lowered considerably since we went to giving member the right to nominate for two years.

With less than a minute of debate time, the chair put the amendment by substitution to a vote. By a show of hands, the amendment by substitution failed.

Kate Secor wanted to know if this discussion had used up all the debate time. The deputy presiding officer said that the ten minutes would be available when the motion comes up for discussion. (A motion's debate time resets each day.)

[Click here for Saturday's discussion of the motion.](#)

B.2.4 Short Title: Three Stage Voting (3SV), or “The Only Winning Move Is Not to Play”

Moved, to amend Section 3.7 (Nominations) and Section 3.8 (Tallying of Nominations) for the purpose of creating an intermediate stage in the Hugo Award selection process by ~~striking out~~ and [inserting](#) text as follows:

Section 3.7: Nominations.

3.7.1: The Worldcon Committee shall conduct a [two-stage](#) poll to select the finalists for the Award voting. ~~Each~~ [In the Nominating stage, 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 3.4.

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

~~3.7.4: 3.8.2:~~ [3.7.4:](#) The Worldcon Committee shall determine the eligibility of nominees and assignment to the proper category of works nominated in more than one category.

~~3.7.5: 3.8.3:~~ [3.7.5:](#) Any nominations for “No Award” shall be disregarded.

~~3.7.6: 3.8.4:~~ If a nominee appears on a nomination ballot more than once in any one category, only one nomination shall be counted in that category.

~~3.7.7: 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) nominations in the default category.

~~3.7.8: 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 3.2.7 or 3.2.8, the Committee shall count the nomination even if the member already has made five (5) nominations in the more-appropriate category

Section 3.8: Tallying of Nominations. Qualification Stage.

~~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.~~

[3.8.2, 3.8.3, 3.8.4, 3.8.6, and 3.8.7 moved to Section 3.7.]

~~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.~~

3.8.1: The Qualification stage of the process shall be based on a long list of the top fifteen Qualifiers (including ties that include fifteenth place) from the nomination process in each category. Only WSFS members may vote in this stage.

3.8.2: The purpose of the Qualification Stage is to allow the membership to confirm their willingness to see each Qualifier taken forward as a potential Hugo Award Finalist.

3.8.3: In the Qualification Stage ballot, each voter may choose between the options "Accept", "Reject", and "Abstain" for each Qualifier in each category.

3.8.4: A Qualifier shall be eliminated from consideration for the Final Ballot if it meets the following two criteria:

(1) the number of "Reject" votes is at least 60% of the combined total of "Accept" and "Reject" votes;

(2) the number of "Reject" votes is at least the higher of 600 or 20% of the number of eligible voters.

3.8.5: The final Award ballots shall list in each category the five eligible Qualifiers who received the most nominations in the first stage Nominating Ballot and were not eliminated from consideration in the Qualification

Stage. If there is a tie including fifth place, all the tied eligible nominees shall be listed.

Provided that unless this amendment is re-ratified by every Business Meeting between the initial ratification of this amendment and the 2022 Business Meeting, Sections 3.7 and 3.8 shall revert to their wording prior to the initial ratification of this amendment, and

Provided that the question of re-ratification shall automatically be placed on the agenda of each Business Meeting between now and the 2022 Business Meeting with any constitutional amendments awaiting ratification, unless any of those meetings should fail to re-ratify the amendment, in which case no further re-ratification votes shall be held.

Proposed by: Colin Harris, Kevin Standlee, Nicholas Whyte, Colette Fozard, Warren Buff

Commentary: The essential argument for this change is that it enables us to directly address slates and bad actors in a direct way – and in a way that statistical solutions such as EPH and 4+6 cannot. We have put it forward in recognition of the fact that the reputation and integrity of the Hugo Awards are under sustained attack, and in the belief that a response is needed to this reality. We would of course have preferred it if such a response were not necessary. The rationale for the proposal is as follows.

-) Statistical solutions may reduce the number of slate nominees, but not sufficiently to act as a deterrent to slate campaigners or bad actors. Ensuring 1-2 non-slate candidates per category is ultimately a pyrrhic victory in terms of the reputation of the Awards; securing 2-3 finalists per category offers a strong incentive for slate campaigners to continue their efforts indefinitely, and continues to exclude nominees that would otherwise have made the Final Ballot from being recognized.
-) We have seen that the membership is willing to use No Award to reject finalists that they consider are not appropriate winners of the Hugo Award. However this test is applied after the damage has already been done. The proposal essentially moves the No Award test to an earlier stage of the process. The Qualification Ballot is not a ranking ballot, but specifically enables members to reject candidates that they believe have benefited from inappropriate promotion.
-) It is important that the Qualification Ballot is presented clearly as one in which “Reject” should be used only for candidates that members feel are not suitable for inclusion on the Final Ballot – typically due to abuse of process – and not as an opportunity to express preference among the acceptable candidates. The wording of the Qualification Ballot rubric will therefore need to be clearly presented.
-) It is similarly important to note that the Qualification Ballot is not used to re-rank the candidates for inclusion on the Final Ballot. Once any rejected candidates have

been eliminated, it is the ranking from the original Nomination Ballot that determines the ranking and hence which finalists should be taken forward.

Why now? We have been asked why we have brought this proposal forward now, when EPH has yet to be ratified and tested. Our concern is that the Awards are being further tainted every time manifestly unsuitable candidates reach the final ballot, and that we cannot therefore afford to wait until EPH has been tried before having a “Plan B” under way. (Assuming EPH is ratified in 2016 and is used in 2017, and does not resolve concerns satisfactorily, a new approach passed in 2017 and ratified in 2018 would only be in effect in 2019.)

Our suggestion is that 3SV should be passed now to ensure that there is a strong option in hand for protecting the future of the Awards. If this option is found to be unnecessary once the 2017 nomination process has been run, then 3SV need not be ratified.

Why this solution? We have put forward this particular option for an additional voting stage after careful consideration of a number of alternatives. In particular, we recognise the intrinsic attraction of solutions using a preference ballot against a long list of candidates – either as a “semi-final” to select the finalists for the Final Ballot, or as a direct change to the existing two-stage process. We appreciate the attraction of such solutions which have the sense of voting “for” candidates rather than “against” them.

We feel strongly that these options are however unworkable for both Administrators and members. A preference ballot requires voters to consider the merits of each candidate which requires both time and access to the material – and the latter will inevitably create demand for a voter packet. For Administrators, contacting say 15 candidates per category, and preparing a corresponding voter packet, is a Herculean task – and the members would face comparable challenges in absorbing all of this material.

In a three-stage process, with a semi-final second stage, this extra work also has to be compressed into a period which fits the overall schedule. In a two-stage process (i.e. Nominations followed by a Final Ballot as now, but with a longer list of Finalists), more time would be available, but the logistics for the host convention are impracticable in terms of larger numbers of Finalists to be accommodated at the Hugo Ceremony and Reception. Furthermore a two-stage process would still allow bad actors to present themselves as “Hugo Finalists”.

The proposed 3SV solution enables a “committee of the whole” of WSFS members to assume the mantle of assessing where abuse has taken place, and (as noted above) sending a clear message that this behaviour is unacceptable. The intent is for members to approve nominees they are happy to see on the Final Ballot in terms of process, and to reject those they feel have been engineered. This intent is key and will need to be articulated clearly in the ballot guidance. Members can also use their judgement to respond to “human shield” tactics where slates are put forward which mix credible candidates with egregious ones; this is much harder (if not impossible) to achieve with purely statistical solutions such as EPH.

3SV and EPH. If 3SV is felt to be necessary – to send a message that WSFS decisively rejects attempts to game the awards and will single out and reject candidates that gain from such tactics – then there is a separate decision on whether EPH should continue to be retained as well. While EPH is a sophisticated algorithm, it would arguably be redundant in rejecting slates if 3SV is in place (and indeed, 3SV makes it easier to separate tactical slates from genuinely correlated votes such as fans of a TV series nominating multiple episodes of that show). Moreover, it imposes a significant administrative burden and is a less transparent algorithm for members to understand.

Our view is that the other measures which are up for ratification i.e. 4+6 and Nominee Diversity – would combine with 3SV to provide a robust way forward for the Awards, and that EPH could potentially be dropped if it does not materially resolve the slate issue. As such we have introduced an amendment for additional annual re-ratification of EPH in 2017, such that the Business Meeting could choose to drop EPH if it proceeds with 3SV. The BM may of course choose to continue with both solutions – they are complementary – but we feel that this option should be available to the meeting in Helsinki.

Discussion: Gary Blog moved to postpone this motion indefinitely, which was seconded. This would effectively kill this proposal for this year and required a two-thirds vote to pass. (It can be resubmitted next year.) By rule, the time for debate was set at four minutes, with two minutes per side.

Mr. Blog said he loathed this amendment. He gave an example: he loathes *Doctor Who*. So he would not give *Doctor Who* his approval at the second stage vote. Other people might vote only for *Doctor Who*. He felt this motion actually encourages slate voting; for example, pitting *Game of Thrones* fans against *Doctor Who* fans. This also creates an additional stage of voting, which will just give the administrators more work to do.

Colin Harris asked the membership to allow this amendment to be debated because we are in a very serious period for the Hugos, where the reputation and integrity of the awards are under serious threat. He said we need to be brave enough to look at solutions and find the time and energy to debate these alternatives. Otherwise, he felt, we would all lose.

A two-thirds vote to call the question passed by a show of hands.

The motion to postpone indefinitely failed by a show of hands, and Three Stage Voting stayed on the agenda.

Proposed times for debate were 20 minutes, 18 minutes, 16 minutes, and 10 minutes. By a show of hands, debate time was set at 20 minutes.

[Click here for Saturday's discussion of the motion.](#)

At this time the chair proposed moving to the Mark Protection Committee report and election because the meeting was running late.

C. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MOTIONS

C.1.1 MPC Report and Nominations

Kevin Standlee, the chairman of the Mark Protection Committee (“MPC”) reported. For new attendees at the business meeting, Mr. Standlee explained that the MPC is the only permanent body of the World Science Fiction Society (“WSFS”). Its primary job is to take care of protecting and registering the service marks of WSFS, things like the word “Worldcon” and “Hugo Award.” The MPC is also responsible for maintaining the permanent websites of the organization: worldcon.org, NASFiC.org, WSFS.org and TheHugoAward.org. The full report of the Mark Protection Committee is attached as [Appendix 1](#) of these minutes.

To summarize, this year, the MPC successfully:

-) Obtained EU Mark Registration for WORLDCON and the Hugo Award Logo
-) Redesigned and reorganized the Worldcon/WSFS/NASFiC web sites

These two items in particular have concluded after more than a decade! The MPC has now full control of the Worldcon, NASFiC and WSFS websites. They have been rearranged and are now in a much more manageable form.

It has been the MPC’s responsibility to register trademarks in countries that have held more than one Worldcon. Until recently, we had registered our marks only in the U.S. The European Union (“EU”) is considered one country for the purpose of registering service marks, and we have been working for some time on registering some of our most important service marks with the European Intellectual Property organization. Mr. Standlee was pleased to report that earlier that week, the MPC received registration on the word “Worldcon” and on the Hugo Award logo. Later this year, the MPC expects registration on the phrase “Hugo Award” itself. Those are our three most important service marks. As an aside, he added that no one knows how Brexit will affect anything.

Nominations then opened for the MPC. The three members of the committee whose terms were expiring were Kevin Standlee, Tim Illingworth and Ben Yalow. Messrs. Standlee, Illingworth and Yalow were re-nominated, and there were no other nominations. Rick Kovalcik made a parliamentary inquiry: if no one else was nominated, did that mean that we didn’t actually have to have a vote? The chair replied that yes, it would have to wait till Friday, but we would not have a vote. A motion was made to close nominations, which was seconded and passed without objections.

B. NEW BUSINESS

The business meeting then resumed with setting debate times for new business.

B.2.5 Short Title: Additional Finalists

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution for the purpose of allowing the Committee to add up to two additional finalists to each Hugo Award category, by [adding](#) a new section after existing Section 3.8 as follows:

[Section 3.X: Additional Finalists. The Worldcon Committee may add not more than two additional finalists in each category, provided that such additional finalists would qualify to be in the list of nominees described in Section 3.11.4.](#)

Proposed by: Lisa Hayes, Lisa Deutsch Harrigan, David Wallace

Commentary: The Worldcon Committee already has the authority to add an additional category at its discretion. This proposal extends that authority to allow the Committee to add additional *finalists* as well.

The 3.11.4 list is the “Top 15” list of those nominees placing among the top 15 in each category, and also includes any nominees that received at least 5% of the nominations in a category, but not fewer than five nominations. This proposal would give the Worldcon Committee (in practice, the Hugo Awards Administration Subcommittee) the authority to add one or two additional finalists in any category from among the “Top 15” list. The Committee would not be *required* to add finalists in any category, but could at its sole discretion add zero, one, or two finalists in any category.

The makers of this motion presume that the Committee would include among its Hugo Award Administration Subcommittee persons they think qualified to judge the merits of works and to decide whether they should exercise their authority to add supplemental finalists to the final ballot. Such additional finalists would not be marked as “supplemental” on the final ballot, and it would only be known which finalists were added after the Hugo Awards were presented when the Section 3.11.4 list was published. In fact, the Committee would not need to say anything about why there were more than five finalists other than to point out that there are two possible reasons for it: ties involving the final position among the top five and the Committee’s discretionary picks.

The purpose of this amendment is to allow the Worldcon Committee to make a judgment call to allow additional finalists onto the final ballot if the Committee thinks that it would be in the best interests of the membership to do so. In past years (not just recently), it has been clear to many people that works placing in the top five probably did not reflect the true intent of the membership as a whole. There have been calls for Administrators to throw out individual ballots or disqualify finalists. Administrators have historically not *removed* works from the ballot except for technical reasons such as being published in a prior year or being the wrong length, or occasionally for not being sufficiently related to the field of science fiction, fantasy, or fandom. However, there is a rare, but extant precedent for a Committee to *add* a work when they think that the five finalists do not, for whatever reason, reflect the actual intent of the electorate. This proposal would make this authority explicit.

The makers of this motion do not wish to make the Hugo Award a juried award. They do, however, want to give the Committee additional flexibility in administering the Award by allowing them to add finalists to the final ballot, as long as those nominees are among the top fifteen nominated by the membership.

Discussion: A motion was made and seconded to postpone indefinitely, and the chair closed debate. Hyman Rosen wondered if debating whether to postpone indefinitely was another way to debate the motion. The chair replied that debating whether to postpone indefinitely is not meant to be a substantive debate on the motion.

Kevin Standlee raised a point of order. Under the Standing Rules, the motion to call the question is not in order when either or both sides have not had a chance to speak to the motion at all. The point was taken, the motion was not in order, and the speech in favor went first.

Aaron Davies believed this to be the most anti-democratic of all the Hugo modification options. He was as opposed to this motion as Gary Blog was to the prior motion.

Lisa Hayes, the maker of the motion, recognized the motion has flaws, but she felt it at least deserved to be debated.

Kate Secor spoke in favor of postponing indefinitely because she felt this motion was complete antithetical to the spirit of the Hugos.

A motion to call the question was made and seconded, although there were still people wishing to speak. The vote to call the question was taken and passed. With a two-thirds vote required to postpone indefinitely, a serpentine vote was taken, and with 81 in favor and 36 against, the motion to suspend indefinitely passed, effectively killing the proposal for this year.

B.2.6 Short Title: EPH+

Moved, to amend Section 3.A.1 (1) of the WSFS Constitution by ~~deleting~~ and adding words as follows:

(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.~~ *each nomination ballot shall give a point or fraction thereof to each remaining nominee on that ballot, according to the number of such remaining nominees, using the following pattern (known in voting theory as “Sainte-Laguë divisors”): 1 point for 1 remaining nominee, 1/3 of a point each for 2 remaining nominees, 1/5 of a point each for 3 remaining nominees, 1/7 of a point each for 4 remaining*

nominees, and 1/9 of a point each for 5 remaining nominees (extending this pattern as needed if a ballot legally has more remaining nominees).

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.

Proposed by: Jameson Quinn, Claudia Beach, Bonnie Warford, Catherine Faber, Andrew Hickey, Rogers Cadenhead, David Goldfarb, Lee Egger, Tasha Turner Lennhoff, Steven Halter, David Wallace, Oskari Rantala.

FAQ

Q. Can you explain the motivation behind EPH+ in plain English?

A. Sure, but you have to start by understanding EPH without the plus.

Q. OK. Can you explain the motivation behind EPH in simple English?

A. EPH, without the plus, is based a couple simple motivating ideas.

First off, insofar as possible, all voters should have the same power to affect the final result. You shouldn't have 5 times the voting power just because you happened to pick 5 things that happen to be popular with others. This voting power is the "points" in EPH. At each step in the process, the "point" from each ballot's is divided between the remaining works it supports.

Second off, you want a voting system which encourages people to vote for everything they consider worthy, and not just to "bullet vote" for their favorite work. For instance, a nontrivial number of Worldcon members are authors or close friends of authors. Such people are often dedicated, knowledgeable fans, with excellent taste. We don't want to give an advantage to those authors who only vote for themselves, as opposed to voting for themselves and anything else they find worthy. In order to minimize the strategic incentive for "bullet voting", during the elimination phase of EPH, all approvals count at full strength, as if the voter had supported only that one work.

Q. Now can you explain the motivation behind EPH+ in plain English?

A. The two motivating principles of EPH, as stated above, are in tension with each other. In fact, there is a theorem which states that any proportional system using approval ballots has incentives for bullet voting in at least some cases (C. Duddy, "Electing a Representative Committee by Approval Ballot: An Impossibility Result," *Economics Letters*, v. 124, 2014, pp. 14–16. <http://www.mimuw.edu.pl/~ps219737/maxCover-aaai2015.pdf>). EPH is an attempt to find a sweet spot of compromise between these two points.

But in fact, EPH still errs too much in favor of slate voters. In EPH, Slate voters get two advantages over organic voters. First, because there are so many different eligible works, some organic voters will inevitably fail to choose any works that have a chance of winning. Such "long tail" ballots are essentially wasted; there are no corresponding

wasted slate ballots. Second, the elimination phase, in order to avoid a bullet voting incentive, gives the full benefit of the doubt to slate voters by counting their approval fully even when they have several remaining uneliminated works approved.

To counterbalance these two advantages, we should give an advantage to organic voters in the points-calculation phase. And that's just what EPH+ does; a ballot with only one of its approved works remaining gets a full point; while a ballot with many can have as few as 5/9 of a point in total (just over half).

Q. Where do those strange “Sainte-Laguë” numbers come from?

A. Well, obviously you can look at Wikipedia for the history of the Sainte-Laguë and D'Hondt divisors. But here's an intuitive explanation for why they make sense.

Imagine the ideal situation; no “long tail” voters, and a perfectly proportional result. If you're choosing 5 finalists, then this “ideal world” means you should be able to divide up the voters into 5 equal groups of 20%, where each group unanimously supports one of the finalists. In the case where 40% of the voters were slate voters, there would be 2 slate finalists, and you'd divide the slate voters arbitrarily into 2 groups, one for each of them.

In the real world, of course, things are never quite so neat and even, with votes that can be divided into exactly 20% for each finalist. Some will have a bit more, some a bit less. How much less is the least we should tolerate? Well, it seems reasonable that the groups should at least “round off to” 20%. So a group that was at least half as big as the 20% ideal (10%) should tend to get a finalist; one that was at least 1.5 times as big (30%) should get two finalists; one that is at least 2.5 times as big (50%) should get three finalists; etc.

Roughly speaking, that's the motivation for the Sainte-Laguë divisors. If you want “half-size” groups to round up, then you need to use the ratios 1, 3, 5 for points, not 1, 2, 3, just as you saw in the percentages above.

Q. Couldn't you use numbers that fell off even faster, in order to give an even bigger disadvantage to slate voters?

A. Kinda, but not really.

First off, it's important to note that anything from “D'Hondt” divisors as in EPH to “Sainte-Laguë” divisors as in EPH+ yields a system that is in some sense proportional, while anything outside that range is no longer proportional in any sense. And in voting theory, when you push system design too hard to get one result there is often a possibility for strategic backlash that makes such system design ineffective. In this case, that means that if you try too hard to punish slate voters, the slate will just organize into 5 blocs of bullet votes. Sure, they could do that under EPH+ too, but since it's still a kind of proportional system, there's more of a balance between the risks and rewards for that strategy. If a voting bloc knows exactly how many supporters it has and how many nominations the strongest organic works will get, it might use strategic bullet voting to be able to control as many finalist slots in EPH+ as it would have in EPH; but the risk is that

if they guess wrong, they might end up with no finalists at all. In practice, they'll probably stick to the simpler strategy of slate voting.

Q. Is EPH+ worth the extra complexity it adds? Why?

A. I think it clearly is; but then again, I (Jameson) may not be the best person to answer this question. The advantages of EPH+ are clear; it helps ensure more of the finalists are determined by organic voters. As for the disadvantages and/or complexity: since I live and breathe voting theory, it actually doesn't seem any more complex than EPH to me. Though I realize that is probably not true for other people, it's hard for me to judge how much of a problem that is.

Q. This is complicated. Where can I read more about why it was proposed?

A. Start with [Bruce Schneier's](#) post. If you're up for some academic jargon, you can supplement that with [our paper](#). Finally, read [this post](#) in which I try to explain the reasons for EPH+ in plain language.

Q. Is EPH or EPH+ still needed if we have 3SV, or if we have 3SV along with some of the related options?

A. I believe that at least EPH is still necessary to prevent a slate from taking over the longlist. Here is the number of longlist slots a slate could get, averaged across 6 categories, assuming very weak ability to coordinate. Under ideal coordination ability, things would be much worse; they could get similar results with just about half the numbers shown on the x axis.

“SDV-LPE” is EPH; “SDV-LPE-SL” is EPH+; and “SDV” is a version of EPH which eliminates based on points and not approvals (and thus encourages bullet voting). (Note: ignore the “(out of 5)” in the label for the y axis.)

The lesson of the graph above is that even an imperfectly-coordinated slate could leave fewer than 5 organic results on the longlist, swamping 3SV, with as few as 300 voters; something that would take over 800 voters under EPH+.

Q. I want to look at lots of graphs!

A. Here is a graph of what a slate could have accomplished in the 2015 Hugos, averaged across 6 prose-work categories. This assumes slate coordination was no better than it was in reality (including the sad/rabid split and some slate voters who nominated a minority of non-slate works).

Same as above, but assuming idealized coordination among the slate (identical ballots, except as needed to prevent exact ties):

Here's a graph of what they could have done if "4 and 6" were in place (under similar assumptions):

(Note: ignore the “(out of 5)” in the label for the y axis.)

As above, for “5 and 6”:

Discussion: Gary Blog moved to postpone discussion of EPH+ until the Sunday session of the business meeting, after the vote on EPH (main) and 4 & 6. Lisa Hayes preferred to see the discussion of EPH+ prior to EPH (main) because if something is a plus, it must be better, and we might not even have to deal with EPH.

Jameson Quinn pointed out that even if the business meeting passed EPH+, for this year EPH still matters. A motion to call the question was made without objection. By a show of hands, the question of postponing EPH+ until after the discussion of 4 & 6 passed.

Jerry Gieseke asked how much time has the business meeting allocated on Sunday for scheduled items. The presiding officer responded that half an hour of debate time had been set for Sunday on various motions. We moved Nominee Diversity out.

Proposed times were 30 minutes, 20 minutes, 16 minutes, 12 minutes and 10 minutes. By a show of hands, debate time was set at 16 minutes.

[Click here for Sunday's discussion of the motion.](#)

B.2.7 Short Title: Defining North America

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution to [add](#) a new subsection after existing subsection 4.8.4 to define “North America” for WSFS purposes, as follows:

[4.8.X: For the purposes of this Constitution, North America is defined as: Canada, the United States of America \(including Hawaii, Alaska, and the District of Columbia\), Mexico, Central America, the islands of the Caribbean, St. Pierre et Miquelon, Bermuda, and the Bahamas.](#)

Proposed by: The Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

Commentary: When WSFS deleted the former zone definitions from the Constitution, it inadvertently created some ambiguity about which places might “trigger a NASFiC” should a site be selected there for a Worldcon. This is not entirely academic, as an actual, serious filed bid for Hawaii placed second in a four-way race in 1990. Hawaii is not part of geographic North America, and thus the selection of a Worldcon there might plausibly trigger a NASFiC election. In addition, there has been discussion about how the western half of Iceland can, by certain definitions, be considered to be part of North America. The NPSFC thinks that defining North America as the political entities concerned (and explicitly including Hawaii) would reduce any ambiguity about certain edge cases.

Discussion: Proposed times were 8 minutes, 6 minutes, 4 minutes, and 2 minutes. By a show of hands, debate time was set at 2 minutes.

[Click here for Friday’s discussion of the motion.](#)

B.2.8 Short Title: Retrospective Improvement

To replace the current “Retrospective Hugos” section (Section 3.13) of the WSFS Constitution with the following:

Section 3.13: Retrospective Hugos

3.13.1: A Worldcon held in a year that is an exact multiple of 25 years after a year in which no Hugos were presented may conduct nominations and elections for retrospective year Hugos for that year with procedures as for the current Hugos, provided that year was 1939 or later and that no previous Worldcon has awarded retrospective year Hugos for that year.

3.13.2: A Worldcon held in a year that is an exact multiple of 25 years after a year in which No Award won in a Hugo category may conduct nominations and elections for a retrospective category Hugo for that year and category with procedures as for the current Hugos, except that the category definition for that category when No Award won shall be used, provided that no previous Worldcon has awarded a retrospective category Hugo for that year and category.

3.13.3: In any listing of Hugo Award winners published by a Worldcon committee or WSFS, retrospective Hugo Awards shall be distinguished and annotated with the year in which such retrospective Hugos were voted.

Proposed by: Donald E. Eastlake, III and Jill Eastlake

Commentary: The current WSFS Constitution text is as follows:

Section 3.13: Retrospective Hugos.

A Worldcon held 50, 75, or 100 years after a Worldcon at which no Hugos were presented may conduct nominations and elections for Hugos which would have been presented at that previous Worldcon. Procedures shall be as for the current Hugos. Categories receiving insufficient numbers of nominations may be dropped. Once retrospective Hugos have been awarded for a Worldcon, no other Worldcon shall present retrospective Hugos for that Worldcon.

This amendment to the WSFS Constitution (1) condenses and generalizes the text for retrospective year Hugos, (2) adds provisions for retrospective category Hugos, and (3) requires that retrospective Hugos be distinguished in lists of Hugo Award winners with the year in which they were voted being noted.

Contrasting with the existing retrospective year Hugos:

-) The new text allows retrospective year Hugos for the years 1942 through 1945, when there was no Worldcon held due to World War II. The current WSFS Constitution does not permit retrospective Hugo Awards for those years and it makes little sense to allow retrospective Hugos for some years back to 1939 but not allow them for 1942 through 1945.
-) It also allows retrospective Hugos any multiple of 25 years after the year the Hugos previously skipped whereas the existing text allows them only 25, 50, or 75 years later. This makes the provisions simpler and more general.
-) And, the new text drops the superfluous sentence allowing categories to be dropped for retrospective year Hugos if there are insufficient nominations; other constitutional provisions permitting a Hugo category to be dropped due to lack of nominations or final votes automatically permit this.
-) (The year mentioned in the new text, 1939, could be changed to 1940 with no effect as retrospective year Hugos have already been awarded for 1939.)

The new text also adds the possibility of retrospective category Hugos if a Worldcon committee feels it is appropriate. 25 (or some larger multiple of 25) years after No Award won in a category, a Worldcon committee may run nominations and voting for that category for the year in which No Award won.

Finally, the new text requires that, in future published Hugo Award lists, any retrospective awards be indicated as such and give the year in which they were chosen.

Although we believe that, so far, this has always been done, there is currently no such requirement. A Worldcon could, for example, list the 1939 retrospective Hugos as if they had been selected that year, which would be misleading.

In no case is any Worldcon committee required to run any retrospective year or category Hugos.

Discussion: Ben Yalow moved to separate debate on Sections 3.13.1 and 3.13.2. The first part of this amendment, Section 3.13.1, covers the years during World War II. Section 3.13.2 addresses the question of years during which No Award won. Mr. Yalow believed that to be a separate question. A suggestion was made to then duplicate Section 3.13.3 and put it with both of the prior sections. Mr. Yalow agreed that if either of the two separated motions passed, then 3.13.3 would apply to whichever passed. The chair clarified that Mr. Yalow's motion was to separate out Sections 3.13.1 and 3.13.3 from 3.13.2 and 3.13.3. The motion was seconded.

Andrew Adams said he would like the ability to adopt Section 3.13.3 without the prior sections. The chair ruled that to be a second order motion and not in order because the base motion is not an amendment to substitute.

Xopher Halftongue asked what would happen to Section 3.13.3 if only one of Section 3.13.1 or Section 3.13.2 passes. The chair declared that if either one passed, then Section 3.13.3 passes.

Kevin Standlee asked if the motion to divide the question was debatable. The chair ruled that this was not debatable and the question was called.

By a hand vote, the motion passed, and the question was divided into two parts.

Kevin Standlee then moved to re-divide the original motion so that each of the three clauses would be a separate amendment and asked for unanimous consent, which he did not receive. However, since the motion was not debatable, the chair put the question to a vote. By a show of hands, the motion passed, and the amendment was divided into three parts.

Proposed times were 6 minutes, 4 minutes, and 2 minutes for each amendment. By a show of hands, debate time was set at 4 minutes each.

[Click here for Saturday's discussion of the motion.](#)

B.2.9 Short Title: Universal Suffrage

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution to limit the convention in issuing memberships without voting rights by [inserting](#) text as follows:

1.5.8: 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.

1.5.x: No convention committee shall sell a membership that is available to persons of the age of majority at the time of the convention (as defined by the laws of the country and other jurisdictions where the convention is being held), that allows attendance and full participation for the entire duration of the convention and that does not include all WSFS voting rights. Should no law of the country and other jurisdictions where the convention is being held define an age of majority, the convention shall consider all persons 18 years of age or older as being of age of majority.

Proposed by: Ron Oakes, Linda Deneroff and Tara Oakes

Commentary: This new clause strengthens 1.5.8 slightly by ensuring that no Worldcon committee will create a class of “attending only” membership without voting rights. This still allows for child and day memberships. As this only applies to memberships being sold, the convention is still permitted to create free, limited classes, such as press or assistant badges, that will have access during the entire duration but will not have WSFS rights.

While it is not foreseen that any current or near-future Worldcon committee or bid would choose to create an “attending only” membership, this would ensure that future committees would be bound by the tradition that Worldcon attendance and WSFS membership are interconnected.

Discussion: The chair proposed 6 minutes of debate time. Without objection, debate time was set at 6 minutes.

[Click here for Saturday’s discussion of the motion.](#)

B.2.10 Short Title: Non-transferability of Voting Rights

Moved, to amend Article 1 by ~~striking out~~ and inserting text as follows:

1.5.1: Each Worldcon shall offer supporting memberships and attending ~~memberships~~ supplements.

1.5.2: The rights of supporting members of a Worldcon include the right to receive all of its generally distributed publications. Supporting memberships held by natural persons may not be transferred, except that, in case of death of a natural person holding a supporting membership, it may be transferred to the estate of the decedent.

1.5.3: The rights of ~~attending members~~ supporting members who have an attending supplement of a Worldcon include the rights of supporting members plus the right of general attendance at said Worldcon and at the WSFS Business Meeting held thereat.

1.5.5: Voters have the right to ~~convert to attending membership~~ purchase an attending supplement in the selected Worldcon within ninety (90) days

of its selection, for an additional fee set by its committee. This fee must not exceed four (4) times the site-selection fee and must not exceed the ~~difference between the site-selection fee and the fee~~ price of an attending supplement for new **attending** members.

Proposed by: Dave McCarty and Ben Yalow

Commentary: In the past, we've had both supporting and attending memberships, each with a full set of WSFS rights. And, while it's been very rare to transfer supporting memberships, attending memberships are frequently transferred, with an administrative nightmare of ensuring the each membership, and each person, can vote only once.

This motion divides the membership in the Society (and the right to vote on the Hugos/site selection) from the right to attend the annual meeting of the Society. And it says that a person joins the Society irrevocably—once a (supporting) membership is associated with a natural person, then it stay with that person throughout, and cannot be transferred, which also means that the voting rights stay with that person permanently. You join the Society to participate in its affairs, and support its goals, and that support isn't something you can freely resell.

However, the right to attend the annual meeting of the Society is something that can be freely transferred. If a person buys an attending supplement, that supplement can be transferred to anyone who is already a member of the Society (which means someone who has a supporting membership already). So the large investment in attending the meeting is one that a person can make, but it's not irrevocable—that supplement can be sold to anyone who wants it.

This also doesn't prevent the Worldcon from selling “admissions”, which allow people to attend the meeting, without being members of the Society. And those admissions therefore don't require a supporting membership, and don't carry any voting rights for Hugos or site selection (since those are associated with membership in the Society, not with the admission to the meeting). This also follows the practices of other professional societies, many of which allow non-members to attend their annual meetings, although often at a higher price.

We do continue the practice of allowing things like clubs to buy a supporting membership, just for purposes of supporting the Society. However, the Constitution already restricts the voting rights of entities other than natural persons (see Sections 4.3 and 6.2 of the Constitution). And, in the case of death of a member of the Society, which would automatically transfer the membership via the estate, we do permit that transfer.

Administratively, it also makes life much easier for Hugo and site selection administrators. They will no longer need to keep track, through a chain of transfers, which voting rights have been exercised (and different committees have had different rules for how those cases are to be handled, since the Constitution doesn't explicitly cover those cases, except with the general rule that you only get to vote once). The proposers of this motion have been administrators for both of those votes, in the past, and

find that making administrators lives easier, without impairing the rights of the members to vote, is very much a feature.

But, while administrative ease is really a nice benefit, the philosophical underlying basis is the primary reason for this motion—it makes it clear that joining the Society is a decision that each person makes, and they continue to hold that position, and its accompanying rights, until they terminate due to the end of the convention. People can decide to attend the meeting, or not—and that can be transferred—but joining the Society is a philosophical decision that a person makes once for each Worldcon, and is held on to.

Discussion: The chair proposed 8 minutes of debate time. Without objection, debate time was set at 8 minutes.

[Click here for Saturday's discussion of the motion.](#)

B.2.11 Short Title: Young Adult Award

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution for the purpose of establishing an award for Young Adult literature by ~~striking out~~ and [adding](#) words as follows:

1. Insert words in existing sections 3.7.3 and 3.10.2 as follows:

3.7.3: Nominations shall be solicited only for the Hugo Awards, ~~and~~ the John W. Campbell Award for Best New Writer, [and the <blank> Award for Best Young Adult Book.](#)

3.10.2: Final Award ballots shall list only the Hugo Awards, ~~and~~ the John W. Campbell Award for Best New Writer, [and the <blank> Award for Best Young Adult Book.](#)

2. Insert the following section before existing Section 3.4.:

[3.X: <blank> Award for Best Young Adult Book.](#) [The <blank> Award for Best Young Adult Book is given for a book published for young adult readers in the field of science fiction or fantasy appearing for the first time during the previous calendar year, with such exceptions as are listed in Section 3.4.](#)

[Provided that filling the < blank> in this amendment to name the award shall not be considered a greater change in the scope of the amendment.](#)

[Provided that unless this amendment is re-ratified by the 2021 Business Meeting, Section 3.X shall be repealed and the modifications to 3.7.3 and 3.10.2 reversed; and](#)

[Provided further that the question of re-ratification shall automatically be placed on the agenda of the 2021 Business Meeting.](#)

Proposed by: Members of the YA Award Committee

Commentary: The YA award Committee is proposing a new WSFS award for Young Adult fiction that, like the Campbell Award, would not be a Hugo but would be administered by the WSFS. There have been many attempts going back to the 1990s to create a YA Hugo award, but none of these were successful. The previous year's YA Hugo Committee (2014-2015) determined that a Hugo was not feasible, while this year's Committee determined that an award in the mold of the Campbell has merits.

For details of the Committee's findings, please see the Report submitted to the Business Meeting. In brief, no sponsor is required for an award, which would be a WSFS-sponsored award. Like the Hugo and Campbell, it would be added to the Constitution. The award would be paid for and administered by each Worldcon and presented during the Hugo Ceremony.

This proposal represents the closest we could come to a consensus in the time allotted. Although there are areas where the members of the Committee do not perfectly agree, we feel this proposal reflects our general feeling that a YA award at Worldcon is viable. We recommend its passage, and the creation of a separate committee to move forward with consideration of a name for this new award and the physical template for it.

Why No Definition of YA?

Creating a Campbell-like award decreases the need for a strict definition of YA.

As demonstrated by the 2015 YA Hugo Committee Report, attempts to define YA produce extremely varied results, with attempts emphasizing intended audience, publishing categories and merchandizing, age of the protagonist, or elements internal to the narrative. A number of awards have chosen not to provide a definition.

Given the concern that we not recognize the same work as a finalist in more than one Hugo category, a Hugo category for YA would require that a constitutional amendment either distinguish YA from the existing fiction categories, or force authors/Hugo administrators to choose which of the two categories was most appropriate. With a Campbell-like award, the administrative need for an explicit definition is no longer necessary.

Finally, it is often argued that constitutional provisions function best when they leave room for the discretion of individual Worldcons, as well as changing times and interpretations. After deliberation, the committee concluded that it is preferable to keep references to teen/YA literature as general as possible.

Why "book" rather than "novel"?

According to industry observers, teen lit/YA is one of the most flexible categories with respect to word count, encompassing an extremely wide range. This variety is a strong argument for not using strict word count criteria. Because teen/YA lit is such a flexible category, an award should reflect that reality.

We also discussed “book” as a broader term that could encompass the variety of excellent works that voters might choose to recognize. The term “book” allows voters to nominate beyond otherwise limiting descriptors such as “prose,” “print,” and so on.

Dual Eligibility

As with the Campbell Award, a book nominated for a YA Award could also be nominated for a Hugo Award or Campbell Award, as these awards each have different criteria. As already established under the current rules, finalists have the opportunity to decline their nomination before the list is published.

Why the <blank> Award?

It became clear that this naming issue is beyond the scope of this year’s committee, and should be a separate matter if an award is passed. We therefore left the name <blank> in this vote’s proposal, with the provision that filling in the blank would not be considered a greater change and could be done as part of the ratification process.

The appearance of the proposed award cannot be established until the name of the award is approved. It seems best that the costs and time needed to solicit a design be postponed until the award is (potentially) passed and ratified.

Discussion: Gary Blog moved to postpone this amendment indefinitely, and was seconded. He felt there was nothing more to say on this subject.

Dave McCarty spoke against postponing indefinitely. He had been opposed to many of the YA proposals that have come before the business meeting in the past, but he believed this amendment deserved to be debated.

There was a motion to call the question, which was seconded. Without objection, the question was called. A two thirds vote in favor was required to call the question, and the motion to postpone indefinitely failed.

Proposed times were 20 minutes, 18 minutes, 16 minutes, 14 minutes, 10 minutes and 8 minutes for each amendment. By a show of hands, debate time was set at 14 minutes each.

[Click here for Saturday’s discussion of the motion.](#)

The meeting adjourned for the day at 12:54 p.m.

MAIN BUSINESS MEETING, FRIDAY, AUGUST 19, 2016

The meeting was called to order at 10:09 a.m. The business meeting staff consists of Jared Dashoff, Presiding Officer; Tim Illingworth, Deputy Presiding Officer; Donald E. Eastlake III, Parliamentarian; Linda Deneroff, Secretary; Lisa Hertel, Timekeeper; Lisa Hayes, Videographer; Kevin Standlee, Assistant Videographer; and, Warren Buff, Michael “MrShirt” McConnell, Colette Fozard, Sergeants-at-Arms.

The Business Meeting may be conducted in an order different from that shown in the agenda. Minutes will follow any new order, but contain the numbering in the agenda.

C. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MOTIONS

C.1 Standing Committees of WSFS

C.1.1 MPC Election Results

Ben Yalow, Tim Illingworth and Kevin Standlee were nominated to stand for election to the MPC at the preliminary Business Meeting. Since there were no other nominees, the presiding officer asked to suspend the rules and elect the nominees. Without objection, they were re-elected to the Mark Protection Committee.

C.2 Standing Committees of the Business Meeting

C.2.1 Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

The Nitpicking and Flyspecking Committee members for 2015-2016 were Donald Eastlake (Chair), Jared Dashoff, Linda Deneroff, Tim Illingworth, 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/rules-of-the-world-science-fiction-society/>. Note that this is a new address as a result of the revamp of the WSFS web site.

As noted under [Item B.2.7 Defining North America](#), when WSFS deleted the former zone definitions from the Constitution, it inadvertently created some ambiguity about which places might “trigger a NASFiC” should a site be selected there for a Worldcon. This is not entirely academic, as an actual, serious filed bid for Hawaii placed second in a four-way race in 1990. Hawaii is not part of geographic North America, and thus the selection

of a Worldcon there might plausibly trigger a NASFiC election. In addition, there has been discussion about how the western half of Iceland can, by certain definitions, be considered to be part of North America. The NPSFC thinks that defining North America as the political entities concerned (and explicitly including Hawaii) would reduce any ambiguity about certain edge cases, and thus we submitted the motion.

Verbal Report: Don Eastlake reiterated his written report and said that the committee has been attempting to minimize the number of nits and flyspecks that come before it because of the press of other business in the past couple of years. However, the elimination of regions from the Constitution means there is no longer a definition of North America in the Constitution, which is highly relevant to whether there is a NASFiC. The committee therefore proposed the above resolution, Item B.2.7, Defining North America, for this purpose.

Having made its report, the committee was then reappointed as currently constituted.

C.2.2 Worldcon Runners Guide Editorial Committee

The Worldcon Runners' Guide Editorial Committee members for 2015-2016 are Mike Willmoth <mwillmoth@earthlink.net> (Chair), Alex von Thorn <avt@worldhouse.com>, Bill Taylor <jazz@qnet.com>, Bobbi Armbruster <barmbru@gmail.com>, John Hertz <no email>, Marah Searle-Kovacevic <marahsk@gmail.com>, Sharon Sbarsky <sbarsky@gmail.com>. 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.

Comments: Mike Willmoth reported that in late 2015 the administrator of the WCRG website/wiki, Bill Taylor, reported a catastrophic outage. The hosting company upgraded the software, didn't perform a backup of the site, and wiped out the WCRG. Bill attempted to recover using previous backups, but they failed. Mike Willmoth had PDF copies of each page as of a few years ago, so he enlisted help in extracting the content to reload the site before continuing with making updates to the guide. As of the date of the submission of this report, that reload is in progress.

The WCRG can be found at <http://wcrg.conrunner.net>. Fans wishing to contribute to the wiki can create a userid/password before performing any edits deemed appropriate.

Verbal Report: Mike Wilmoth reiterated his written report. Late last year there was a catastrophic failure of the conrunner.net website hosted by Bill Taylor. Cat Yeager, a friend of Mike's, has been able to extract the data from existing PDFs that Mike had in his possession, and that information is currently being loaded onto the website. The

recovery of this older material should be completed by the end of the month and then they will continue forward with making the updates and bringing the website up to speed.

Terry Neill asked if the committee had looked on the Wayback machine. Mike replied that he will do so once Worldcon was over.

Having made its report, the committee was then reappointed as currently constituted.

C.3 Special Committees

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 Worldcons. We are grateful to a number of people, including Janice Gelb, Chip Hitchcock, and René Walling for spotting a variety of minor errors, which we have now corrected.

The Long List Committee for 2015-2016 consists of Mark Olson (Chair), Craig Miller, David G. Grubbs, Joe Siclari, Kent Bloom, Colin Harris, Kevin Standlee, Tim Illingworth, and Ben Yalow.

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

The current working website is at <http://www.smofinfo.com/LL/TheLongList.html>.

Verbal Report: Deeming the written report sufficient, there was no verbal report.

The committee was then reappointed as currently constituted.

C.3.2 YA Hugo Award Study Committee

Committee Members: Anna Blumstein, Adam Beaton, Jacquelyn Bowin, Warren Buff, Johnny Carruthers, Chris Garcia, Helen Gbala, Joshua Kronengold, Laura Lamont, Farah Mendelsohn, Adam Tesh, Tim Illingworth, Sue “Twilight” Mohn, David Peterson, Jodie Baker, Tehani Wessely, Dina Krause, Kate Secor, Marguerite Smith, Kevin Standlee, Lew Wolkoff, Peter De Weerd, Clark B. Wierda, Martin Easterbrook, Christine Rake (Co-Chair), Katie Rask (Chair)

[The written report of the YA Hugo Award Study Committee is attached as Appendix 2 of these minutes.](#)

This Committee was formed at Sasquan in 2015, following the report and motion by the 2015 YA Hugo Committee. That committee determined that under the existing methodology of the Hugo Awards, a separate category for YA fiction was not practical (the Hugo fiction categories being defined by word count, not by age categories). The Committee suggested instead the creation of a Campbell-like Award and requested the (re)formation of a Committee to focus specifically on the issues surrounding the creation of a Campbell-like YA/teen lit award, with the results presented at next year’s Business Meeting.

The 2015/2016 Committee therefore focused specifically on the issues surrounding the creation of a Campbell-like YA/teen lit award.

Findings: The Committee investigated the features of the Campbell and the Hugo, considered once more definitions of YA/teen lit, studied the costs and logistics of award creation, debated naming conventions, and addressed features most suitable in a proposal for such an award. Details of some of this work can be found in the Exhibits to this report, entitled ‘The Hugo vs. The Campbell,’ ‘Young Adult Award Considerations,’ and ‘Naming an Award and Designing a Trophy/Plaque.’

1. The Committee finds that a Campbell-like award is feasible under the WSFS Constitution. Currently, the text-based literature awards presented by the Worldcon Membership follow two organizational methods, awarded to: 1) *work* (categorized by *length*, the Hugos), and 2) *author* (categorized by *time in the field*, the Campbell). A YA Award would offer a third variation, presented to *work* (organized by *age group*).
2. No sponsor is required if WSFS rule establishes such an award. It would be a WSFS-sponsored award and the rules would be set by a vote of WSFS at the Business Meeting (and thus added to the Constitution).
3. The Committee worked on drafting a proposal built on its findings. In an ideal situation, proposals for constitutional amendments are released early in order to get feedback. In our case, the Committee’s main purpose (the investigation/report of a Campbell-like award) proved time consuming, but we felt it was better to properly consider all aspects of the award’s creation to do justice to it. That being said, we have drafted a constitutional amendment proposal reflecting our most recent discussions and compromises. We welcome the input of fellow WSFS members. The amendment proposal discussion is presented under [Item B.2.11 Young Adult Award](#).
4. We believe that the Committee should be (re)formed with the purpose of considering potential names for the award. We therefore left the name <blank> in the amendment proposal, with the provision that filling in the <blank> would not be considered a greater change and could be done as part of the ratification process.

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 (1) solicit and evaluate name ideas and thoroughly research all the options and/or (2) develop and refine a proposal based on the discussion at this year’s Business Meeting as well as additional public input.

Verbal Report: Katie Rask reported that while the prior year’s committee found that a Hugo-like award was not feasible due to methodology, the current year’s committee looked at a Campbell-like award for young adults. Potentially a YA award would address age.

Exhibit 1 compares the Hugo and the Campbell awards regarding logistics, sponsorship, and voting. Exhibit 2 discusses how a YA award work. Essentially, a YA award would be added to the Constitution; it would not need to be sponsored by anyone else; the business meeting would vote on the particulars; and each Worldcon and Hugo Administration Committee would be in charge of managing the award every year. Dual eligibility would be permitted, just as between the Hugo and Campbell awards. The naming of the award and what it would look like have been left as the work for a third committee, and asked the business meeting to extend the committee for another year to do so.

A Campbell-like award solves a lot of the problems that have come up in past business meetings. A Campbell-like award based on age-group solves the issue of defining what YA is and how the award would be categorized if it were a Hugo. A very strong definition of YA is not a good idea because trends change, and each year’s Worldcon should be allowed to define what they think is YA.

Word count also need not be an issue. Some word counts were presented in the written report, but Ms. Rask offered a few more:

There is a huge variation in word counts.

Book	Word Count
The Giver	43,617
Shiver	94,502
Twilight	118,975
City of Bones	130,949
Inkheart	146,809
Eragon	157,000
Froi of the Exiles	163,701
Harry Potter & the Deathly Hollows	198,227

The Giver has a low word count book; but *Deathly Hollows* has a large word count. Give the range, a definition by word count isn’t feasible for a young adult book.

The committee spoke with some YA authors – including Liebert Hugo, Veronica Roth (author of the *Divergent* series), Margaret Stoehl (author of *Beautiful Creatures*) and Marian Liu (author of the *Legends* series) – to see how they felt about a Campbell-like award versus a Hugo, and received positive response.

Gary Blog asked if there any feelers had been sent out regarding sponsorship of such an award. Katie replied that the committee had spoken with Hugo committee to determine whether a sponsor would be necessary. The Campbell itself (currently sponsored by Dell Magazines) is a unique award because of its history (originally it was not a WSFS award but has been grandfathered in). Because a YA award would potentially be added to the

Constitution, it would not need to be sponsored. Although not included in the award, the committee looked at the expense of the award. The expenses would be the same as with the Hugo, and each year's Worldcon would be responsible for how the award is paid for.

Ben Yalow noted that the committee had put out feelers to YA authors, and he inquired if the committee had surveyed the nominating pool to find out how many of them regularly read YA books and would they be likely to make informed decisions. Ms. Rankin said that the committee's report at Sasquan gave numbers from Loncon from the YA track that occurred there, the number of panels, the number of authors who participated, the number of authors who said they were interested in being on such panels. The numbers were very large. Most of the YA panels were standing room only. This report is still on line at <http://www.wsfs.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/minutes-2015.pdf> beginning at page 117. That report also gave numbers for nominees and voting submissions that would make it the least popular of all the categories, and a YA award appears very feasible. Given just the numbers of attendees at one Worldcon's YA track, there would be enough voting members to easily meet the lowest category requirement.

Without objection, the committee was then reappointed as currently constituted. [Click here for the motion to amend the committee.](#)

C.3.3 Report of the Best Series Committee

[The written report of the Best Series Committee is attached as Appendix 3 of these minutes.](#)

Verbal Report: Warren Buff said he tried to make his report available on line at the beginning of July. When it was available, it was published to the SMOFs mailing list and on the JOFs site on Facebook, where it was picked up by File 770. Mr. Buff hoped that everyone had found the report and read it. He felt that the publishing industry has moved to favor series publication over standalone novels over the past 30 years, and the Hugo Awards don't cover this very well. Series are nominated, but not a lot of them win in the Best Novel category. He felt it would improve the health of the Best Novel category to recognize series work as series work and standalone novels as novels. He believed the proposal the committee put together addressed that. The most common question regarded why renewability, and he felt that when a work has expanded such that it's fundamentally a new work, it can receive renewed eligibility. Mr. Buff cited as an example, "Flowers for Algernon," which won a Hugo as a Best Short Story and later was nominated in the Best Novel category. The committee tried to pick a compromise position that would consider a series being expanded as a new work. The amendment proposal discussion is presented under Item [B.2.1 Best Series](#), and there were no questions for Mr. Buff.

D. FINANCIAL REPORTS

The prior, current and seated Worldcons (and NASFiC) have provided written financial reports. Questions regarding these reports appear below the appropriate report.

D.1 Anticipation

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, 2015 to July 31, 2016**

Opening Balance	\$42,119.17
Administrative Fees	\$235.36
Grants:	
CSFFA (Aurora Awards)	\$200.00
Smofcon Scholarships	\$2,000.00
Video Archive Project	\$3,000.00
Can-Con	\$515.00
Total Expenses	\$5,950.36
Balance on July 31, 2016	\$36,168.81

Prepared by: René Walling on behalf of CanSmof Inc.

Note: All amounts in Canadian dollars (CAD)

Convention: Anticipation

Parent Corporation: Cansmof

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

Contact Email: HYPERLINK "mailto:cansmof@gmail.com" 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)

Geri Sullivan thanked Cansmof for its donation to the Video Archaeology project.

D.2 Chicon 7

Chicon 7 has now disbursed all its funds, and this is its final report to WSFS.

Chicon 7

Financial Statement

August 1, 2015 through August 5, 2016

	Beginning Balance	\$19,534.06
	Income	\$0.00
Expenditures		
Grants		(\$19,466.06)
Science Fiction Outreach Project	(\$1,466.06)	
ISFiC Press	(\$4,000.00)	
ISFiC	(\$5,000.00)	
Pass-along (Future Chicago Bid)	(\$2,000.00)	
Pass-along (2017 NASFiC)	(\$5,000.00)	
Worldcon Heritage Organization	(\$1,000.00)	
Con or Bust	(\$1,000.00)	
Loncon 3	(\$1,000.00)	
Other		(\$68.00)
State Filing Fees	(\$10.00)	
Bank Fees	(\$58.00)	
	Total Expenditures	(\$19,534.06)
	Closing Balance	\$0.00

Prepared by: Tom Veal (Corporate Treasurer) <treasurer@chicon.org>

Verified by Dave McCarty (Convention Chairman)

Convention: Chicon 7

Parent Corporation: Chicon Worldcon Bid

Current tax status: an Illinois not-for-profit corporation and tax exempt under §501©(3) of the Internal Revenue Code

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

Dave McCarty reported that this is Chicon 7's final report and the corporation will be dissolved by the end of the year when the paperwork is filed with the State of Illinois.

D.3 LoneStarCon 3

Profit & Loss August 1, 2015 – August 5, 2016

	Total
Opening Balance	\$13,438.63
Income (uncleared reimbursement checks)	\$4,338.70
Total Cash on Hand	\$17,777.33
Expenses	
610000 CHAIR'S OFFICE	\$0.00
610100 GENERAL EXPENSES	\$0.00
610102 Travel / Expenses Support	\$417.30
Total 610100 GENERAL EXPENSES	\$417.30
610200 PRE-CON	\$0.00
610203 Gifts	\$2,905.01
Total 610200 PRE-CON	\$2,905.01
610400 POST-CON	\$0.00
610402 Reimbursements POST-CON	\$2,378.80
610404 Misc. Post Con Expenses	\$1,854.77
Total 610400 POST-CON	\$4,233.57
610501 CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS	\$2,000.00
Total 610000 CHAIR'S OFFICE	\$9,555.88
620000 FINANCE DIVISION	\$453.25
630000 WSFS DIVISION	96.85
630300 MPC Dues	1,750.00
630800 Hugo award shipping boxes for w	66.70
Total 630000 WSFS DIVISION	1,913.55

660000 PROGRAM DIVISION	\$0.00
660100 GUESTS OF HONOUR	\$150.00
Total 660000 PROGRAM DIVISION	\$150.00
680200 IT SUPPORT	\$0.00
680202 Internet Services (Hosting etc.)	\$168.00
Total 680200 IT SUPPORT	\$168.00
Total Expenses	\$12,240.68
Income	\$17,777.33
Expenses	\$12,240.68
LoneStarCon 3 Checking Acct Balance as of 8/05/2016	\$5,536.65

ALAMO – LSC3 Share

Date	Description	Detail	Deposit	Expense	Balance
12/28/14	Deposit	LoneStarCon 3 Pass Along Funds Share	60,000.00		60,000.00
12/22/15	Check	Returned Mail – PO Box – LSC3		8.77	59,991.23
01/08/16	Check	MASFFC – Video Archeology Grant		3,100.00	56,891.23
01/19/16	Check	Science Fiction Outreach Project – Grant		500.00	56,391.23
05/01/16	Check	MidAmeriCon II – Grant – Sponsorship		2,000.00	54,391.23
05/01/16	Check	Space Agency Fan Fund – Donation		2,500.00	51,891.23
		Totals	60,000.00	8,108.77	51,891.23

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 <treasurer2016@alamo-sf.org>

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

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

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

Lenore Jones found this report confusing as there seemed to be two separate reports, and she wanted to know what the distinction between them was. Ben Yalow, who was not an official representative of LoneStarCon 3 but who worked on their finances, responded. There were two reports, one for LoneStarCon 3 and one for Alamo because the

Constitution requires that if any funds are turned over to a successor organization, that organization continues to be bound by the reporting requirements of the Constitution. A substantial amount of funding from LoneStarCon 3 was turned over to Alamo, its parent organization, which agreed to be bound by the reporting requirements.

Geri Sullivan thanked Alamo for its donation to the Video Archaeology project.

D.4 Loncon 3

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

All monies having been accounted for, and all corporate responsibilities discharged, this will be the final financial report by Loncon 3 to the WSFS Business Meeting.

Financial Statement - as of 30 June 2016¹

Income

	UK ²
Bid Pass-along	£80,767.84
Voting Fee (converted to UK£)	£23,083.78
Membership Income	£627,998.67
Art Show (Hanging Fees & Commission)	£7,241.41
Art Show Case Sales	£4,490.00
Dealers' Zone (tables)	£22,278.93
Sponsorship	£26,864.57
Advertising in Publications	£20,116.36
Merchandise Sales Commission	£3,429.17
Photo Competition	£150.00
Hospitality Beer Glass Sales	£1,197.54
Infotel Commission	£4,733.95
Mobility Scooter & Child Care Cost Recovery	£5,975.33
Donations and Miscellaneous	£1,019.21
Net VAT Receipts ³	£55,760.81
Pass-along Funds (Renovation)	£16,678.99
Pass-along Funds (Chicon 7)	£18,794.14
Pass-along Funds (LoneStarCon 3) ⁴	£11,561.42

¹ Bank accounts belonging to London 2014 closed on 7th August 2016, as company now shut down and VAT deregistration achieved.

² The accounts were kept in three currencies and reported in GBP using HMRC published exchange rates used for VAT purposes.

³ VAT is a sales-tax paid on most purchases made in the UK. It also must be charged by us on our membership 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. Net figure (in & out) shown.

⁴ In addition to Pass-along, we are grateful for additional direct support by LSC3/Alamo of \$2000 towards the printing and distribution of the Souvenir books, post-Loncon 3, and of the post-con pass-along/donation by Sasquan.

Pass-along Funds (Aussiecon 4)	£3,362.20
Pass-along Funds (Sasquan) ⁴	£3,282.99
Total Income	£938,787.31

Expenditures

Chairs & WSFS

Chairs Discretionary	£2,529.67
Hugo Losers Party at LoneStarCon 3	£3,696.46
Staff & Committee Weekends	£7,003.57
Bid Party Expenses	£2,937.64
Hugo Award Trophies	£6,931.79
Hugo Award Shipping & Adin	£1,658.18

Finance & Corporate

Credit Card Charges	£26,822.45
Accountant Fees	£15,069.90
Balancing Transfer ⁵	£1,367.32
General Insurance	£7,830.50
Bank & Corporate Charges	£192.30
Finance Office Costs	£2,383.69
Solicitors Fees (In place MPC dues)	£8,400.00

Site/Facilities & Operations

Convention Facilities (ExCel, Hotels)	£349,396.35
Convention Security	£40,546.90
Shipping & Storage	£18,088.18
Operations & Move-in/Move-out	£46,899.28

Publications and Promotions

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

Member and Staff Services

At-Con IT	£17,490.60
Web Hosting	£865.50
Mobility Scooter Rental	£2,940.00
Child Care	£7,013.40
Membership Forms & Expenses	£1,126.39
Membership Refunds	£1,525.22
Volunteer T-Shirts	£2,836.52
Gopher Rewards	£11,200.00

⁵ This entry relates to payments involving exchange of currency between UK and other currencies. Net figure (in&out) shown.

Programme & Events

Programme	£8,298.99
Green Room	£14,682.80
Guest of Honour Expenses	£18,211.38
Performances & Events	£35,967.59
Audio/Video Tech	£33,381.26
Hugo Receptions	£7,780.28

Exhibits & Fan Village

Art Show	£16,847.35
Art Showcase	£1,694.48
Chesley Reception	£2,496.00
Exhibits Expenses	£22,130.78
Furnishings/Decorator	£70,877.67
Fan Village (tents, carpets, beer glasses ...)	£36,958.74

Total Expenditure **£938,309.94**

Final Balance (to be passed along) **£477.37**

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.5 Detcon1

Detcon 1 has not yet disposed of its surplus, and therefore this is not its final report.

Income and Expenses to Date (as of July 26, 2016)

Balance as of 9/1/15	\$12,726.26
Income	
5/20/16 Bank Adjustment	\$1.00
Expenditures	
10/7/2015 State annual reporting	\$20.00
10/30/2015 Federal taxes and fees	\$1,940.00
12/18/2015 Quicken annual Subscription	\$137.95
5/26/2016 Grant to MidAmeriCon II for ASL Interpretation	\$1,790.00
Current Balance and Remaining Surplus	\$8,839.31

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

Detcon1 was the 2016 NASFiC and was run by Driving the Future, Inc., a 501(c)(7) not-for-profit organization, incorporated in Michigan.

Registered address:

508 Little Lake Dr.

Ann Arbor, MI

Contact: Tammy Coxen, President

chair@detcon1.org

Ph.: 734.276.3215

Officers:

Tammy Coxen, President

Don Wenzel, Treasurer

David Stein, Secretary

D.6 Sasquan

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

Sasquan Financial Report as of July 27, 2016

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 8-12-15	\$108,679.00
Walk-Ins At-Con	79,972.00
Total	\$1,091,120.00
CHAIR'S OFFICE / FINANCE	
Bank Interest	317.00
Currency gain/loss	(\$2.00)
Misc Donations	\$69.00
Total	\$384.00
DEALERS/ART SHOW	
Dealers Room (PAID tables)	\$33,500.00
Dealers Room – Power	2,319.78
Dealers Room (PAID booths)	\$17,610.00
Art Show - Pre-con (hanging fees) 4X4	\$6,537.00
Art Show - At-con (sales commission)	\$4,678.90
Art Show - Pre-con (table fees)	\$700.00
Art Show - Pre-con (shipping fees prepaid)	\$275.00
ASFA Contribution to Suite/Chesley Reception	1,500.00
Total	\$67,120.68
SERVICES/FINANCE	
Merchandise	\$91.68
Rental Fees from Mobie users	14,045.00

	Total	\$91.68
FACILITIES		
Red Lion Comp Rooms at 1:50 (est avg rate 2 hotels)		\$5,128.52
Davenport, Grand Comp Rooms at 1:40		\$11,010.00
Doubletree Comp Rooms at 1:50		\$4,015.44
Doubletree Comp Suite Presidential Con Ste		\$3,969.00
Doubletree Comp Suite Ambassador Den		2,977.00
Amazon Ballroom Rental		\$1,040.00
	Total	\$28,139.96
ADVERTISING & PUBLICATIONS		
Progress Reports		\$1,000.00
Souvenir Book		\$5,650.00
	Total	\$6,650.00
GRANTS, LOANS AND OTHER		
Chicago Pass-along		\$30,700.00
San Antonio Pass-along		\$20,000.00
Writers' Workshop Income		\$1,350.00
Parent Child Care Payments (offset to Kiddiecorp)		\$1,958.00
Bag Check Revenue \$2/bag		\$1,000.00
	Total	\$55,008.00
GARAGE SALE AND RESALES		
Garage Sale		\$500.00
	Total	\$500.00
TOTAL INCOME		\$1,269,690.24

EXPENSES

ACTUALS

CHAIR'S OFFICE

GENERAL EXPENSES

Committee Meetings	\$5,776.02
Wikispaces Support	\$400.00
Mailing Lists Support	\$1,100.00

AT-CON

Chair's Fund	\$3,674.24
Con Catering at DH Meeting	\$5,726.31
Hugo Loser's Party Subsidy MAC2	\$2,000.00

POST-CON

Thank-You Party (2016 Worldcon)	\$5,000.00
Membership Reimbursements	\$124,735.46
Div Head Meeting Reimbursements	\$41,652.93
Bid Reimbursements	\$4,838.76
Area Head \$200 Expense Reimb.	\$16,600.00
Shoulder Night Hotel Room Reimb.	\$20,495.98

OTHER

David and Vonda's Super Sekret Ribbons	\$402.00
SpoCon sponsorship	\$7,811.93
GOH Welcome Food Event	\$1,383.31
Staff Food Coupons	\$3,318.62
Member Souvenir Bags, Staff Flashlights	\$10,967.83
Total	\$255,883.39

EVENTS DIVISION**OPENING CEREMONY**

Opening Ceremony	\$152.17
Native American group	\$890.00

MASQUERADE

Masquerade Green Room	\$2,412.91
Masquerade certificates & prizes	\$41.63
Photography	\$11.50
Hall Costumes	\$8.00

HUGO AWARDS CEREMONY

Streaming nomination announcement	\$499.00
Hugo Ceremony Admin	\$670.43
Misc. Ceremony Expenses	\$1,637.61

DANCES

Worldprom 300A Weds	\$2,353.46
Girl Genius Ball Marie Antoinette Thurs	\$4,275.34
Fusion Dance Marie Antoinette Fri	\$4,496.86
Regency Dance Hall of the Doges Sat	\$4,910.95
Time Traveller's Ball Marie Antoinette Sat	\$3,513.25

EVENTS CATERING & STAFF SUPPORT

Misc.	\$2,104.48
-------	------------

LICENSING (ASCAP and BMI)

ASCAP	\$719.00
BMI	\$435.00
MPLC	\$800.00

FIRST NIGHT

First Night in the Park	\$550.00
-------------------------	----------

EVENTS, OTHER AREAS

Masq & Hugo Event Tickets	\$900.00
---------------------------	----------

Total **\$31,381.59**

TECH DIVISION**INTERNET**

Hugo Broadcast and Program Event Internet	\$1,715.70
Convention Office Internet	\$460.00

MAIN STAGE TECH (excludes Ushers)	
Main Stage Lighting	\$2,574.06
Main Stage Audio	\$1,232.21
Main Stage Video Cameras and Control	\$29,068.90
Main Stage Video Projection	\$12,466.30
Main Stage Equipment	\$3,224.73
Main Stage Security	\$9,223.00
SECOND STAGE TECH	
Second Stage Lighting	\$4,269.03
Second Stage Audio	\$4,275.50
Second Stage Video Cameras and Control	\$6,100.02
Second Stage Video Projection	\$3,195.50
Second Stage Staging	\$167.83
Second Stage Drapes	\$816.00
Second Stage Power	\$800.00
CABARET (Guinan's) STAGE TECH	
Cabaret Stage Lighting	\$1,772.25
Cabaret Stage Audio	\$1,649.00
Cabaret Stage Video Projection	\$2,890.00
Cabaret Stage Drapes	\$136.00
Cabaret Stage Power	\$250.00
PROGRAM TECH (excludes Ushers)	
Main Program	\$11,138.65
Audio Program	\$157.99
Dance Program	\$940.00
Concert Program	\$2,979.19
Flex Program	\$1,249.25
TECH OFFICE AND ADMIN	
Vendor Lodging	\$2,705.60
Transportation	\$5,360.39
Tax	\$8,074.62
Tech Crash Room - moved to Facilities	\$1,760.00
Tech Office	\$198.07
Tech Misc.	1,108.07
Total	\$121,958.75

EXHIBITS DIVISION

DECORATOR/SECURITY

Decorator 8'X24" tables	\$2,766.06
Decorator 8'X30" tables	\$3,003.46
Decorator Pipe and Drapes	\$8,764.82
Decorator Sofa/Loveseats	\$3,201.66

Decorator easels	\$1,524.60
Decorator poster boards	\$882.09
Decorator Display Cases	\$1,143.45
Decorator Chairs, Barrel Chairs	\$2,920.70
Decorator - other unspecified	\$374.12
Decorator - Standing Signs	\$1,214.24
Decorator - Carpeting	\$11,603.84
Decorator - forklift labor	\$3,295.11
Decorator - pallets	\$816.75
Daily carpet cleaning decorator provided carpet	\$980.10
Pedestal Tables and Linens	\$980.10
6' Tables	\$708.94
Pro & Fan Galleries	\$50.50
Hugo / WSFS Exhibits	\$5.44
GoH Exhibits	\$97.09
Special Displays	\$802.50
Worldcon Exhibit Colorado Springs History Shpg	\$2,613.47
Power	\$7,163.21
ART SHOW (Hall 2)	
Lights, panels, at-con supplies	\$490.81
Art show lighting - materials and build	\$3,023.56
Power and phone drops for art show	\$2,320.75
Miscellaneous	\$785.92
DEALERS (Hall 2)	
Power and phone drops for Dealers	\$1,196.85
Dealers Room Admin (pastries)	\$1,052.24
EXHIBITS - LOGISTICS	
Spokane Storage Rental & Insurance	\$1,140.00
Misc setup expenses	\$99.54
Trailer rental for Richard Stephens	\$850.00
FAN LOUNGE	
Fan Lounge - Other Costs	\$1,058.47
GAMING	
Misc.	\$176.00
Wi Fi for Gaming	\$600.00
Total	\$67,706.38
<hr/>	
PROGRAM DIVISION	
GUESTS OF HONOUR	
David Gerrold travel	\$1,117.23
David Gerrold Shipping	\$1,207.19
David Gerrold per diem	\$750.00

Vonda McIntyre per diem	\$750.00
Brad Foster travel	\$620.40
Brad Foster per diem	\$750.00
Tom Smith travel	\$1,000.00
Tom Smith per diem	\$750.00
Leslie Turek travel	\$968.00
Leslie Turek per diem	\$750.00
GoH Gifts	\$720.78
Guest Liaison Misc.	\$100.00
OTHER GUESTS	
NASA Guest	\$1,265.94
PROGRAM OPS	
Program Ops	\$701.00
Conv Ctr Catering Coffee/Tea Setup Crew	\$157.84
KAFFEEKLATCHES	
Kaffeeklatches & Literary Beers	\$745.00
CHILDREN AND YA ACTIVITIES	
Children Activities	\$1,597.94
YA Activities (& Teen Lounge)	\$200.00
Golden Ducks	\$250.00
Teen Lounge Reception Thurs Doubletree	\$303.93
PROGRAM IT	
Database - Grenadine & Web access/storage	\$1,800.00
OTHER PROGRAM CONTENT	
Library Outreach Promotions	\$1,000.00
Costume Workshops	\$259.80
Art Workshops	\$103.15
Match Game banners (up to 4)	\$200.00
DISCWORLD	
Discworld	\$300.00
Chesley Reception	\$3,998.51
WRITERS WORKSHOPS	
Writers' Workshops	\$900.00
MAKER ACTIVITIES	
Resin for 3-D Printers	\$75.35
Total	\$23,342.06
<hr/>	
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
At-Con Treasury/Cashier Expenses	\$385.84
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

At-Con Reg

Registration - Badges & materials (including forms) and \$500 travel	\$9,345.40
Shipping LSC3 Treasury supplies to Spokane	\$321.37

Total \$45,824.51

WSFS DIVISION

Business Meeting - coffee service	\$5,682.09
Business Meeting Ribbons, Batteries	\$26.74
MPC dues and grant	\$11,500.00
Site Selection 2017 Office Supplies	\$55.35
Vote counting food (Davenport Grand)	\$1,731.52
Hugo rockets	\$3,607.97
Mini Hugo Rocket, Mailing	\$297.03
Hugo rocket base construction	\$4,284.31
Hugo award plaque engraving	\$835.13
Shipping trophies and certificates	\$796.80
Hugo Packet Hosting	\$160.08
Nominee pins	\$866.11

Total \$29,843.13

PROMOTIONS & PUBLICITY DIVISION

Fan Advertising	\$1,005.00
Convention Promo Parties	\$200.00
Spokane Astronomical Society, Stonerose Center	\$2,000.00
US Regionals & Other	\$1,052.98

PROMOTIONAL MATERIALS

Flyers	\$194.02
Bookmarks, posters, post cards, etc.	\$262.63
Table Kits	\$1,281.56

PRESS RELATIONS

Press Relations	\$60.27
-----------------	---------

WEB SITE (Was IT Support)

Internet Services (Hosting etc.)	\$576.81
At-Con Consumables	\$10.76

Total \$6,644.03

PUBLICATIONS DIVISION

PR1

PR1 - Production and mailing	\$6,287.81
PR2	
PR2 - Production and mailing	\$4,762.52
PR3 (Nom Ballot)	
PR3 - Production and mailing	\$6,058.05
PR4 (Final Ballot)	
PR4 - Production and mailing	\$8,575.58
Special PR 4 ballot (Hugo, Site) Mailing	\$3,920.00
AT-CON PUBLICATIONS	
Souvenir Book	\$33,051.90
Membership CD	\$2,933.00
Hugo Awards Booklet	\$4,345.10
Pocket Program/Convention Guide	\$16,109.54
Restaurant guide	\$7,219.68
Internet for Newsletter at Doubletree	\$600.00
PRINT SERVICES	
Shipping (printer, other items) from Boston	\$4,483.98
Paper	\$738.48
Other Consumables (Ink, toner, printer rent)	\$1,200.00
POST-CON MAILING COSTS	
Post-Con Souvenir Book shipping	\$10,960.43
Total	\$111,336.07

FACILITIES CONVENTION CENTER SUB-DIVISION

CONVENTION CENTER – HIRE

Basic Hire \$90,335.00

CONVENTION CENTER – OTHER

Convention Center Ancillaries (general) \$88.00

Convention Center Usher Labor \$45,229.50

Convention Center Provided Chairs, Staging, Tables \$23,187.88

Convention Center /INB Water Service \$4,454.53

Pre-convention Facilities meeting 2/15 \$877.71

Total \$164,172.62

FACILITIES HOTELS SUB-DIVISION

FACILITIES - Hotels

Function Space Rental - Doubletree \$11,291.00

Ancillary & Ad-Hoc Costs \$196.06

Function Space Rental - Grand (Amazon) \$883.52

Party Maven \$1,015.16

Suites Attrition Davenport \$3,027.00

Wireless at Davenport High Speed Whole Hotel \$1,000.00

Anime Gaming Wi-Fi at the Doubletree	\$625.00
Doubletree Carpet Cleaning Con Suite	\$500.00
FACILITIES - USE OF COMP ROOMS	
Taff Winner room	\$864.92
David Gerrold hotel 7 nights Grand	\$1,184.76
Vonda McIntyre hotel 6 nights Doubletree	\$892.32
Brad Foster hotel Grand (per Mike) 6 nights	\$864.92
Tom Smith hotel 6 nights Doubletree	\$892.32
Leslie Turek hotel Grand (per Mike) 7 nights	\$1,083.84
Fan Lounge - Suite Hire Nighttime	\$1,746.54
Consuite - Overflow Seating Rooms Hire	\$4,164.16
Consuite - Doubletree Presidential Suite	\$3,969.00
Staff Den - Overflow Rooms	\$3,123.12
Staff Den - Doubletree Ambassador Suite	\$2,977.00
Art Show Setup Comped Room (Walt)	\$148.29
GOH Lounge Suite at Doubletree	\$1,887.76
Kiddiecorp Suite (Doubletree)	\$5,010.88
Tech crash room (24 nights)	\$1,627.44
MC Room Subsidy	\$956.82
Old Pharts Party Suite	\$703.98
NASA/Knott Hotel Room	\$319.84
Gene Armstrong comp room	\$705.00
OTHER	
Tips & gratuities - facilities & hotel staff	\$960.00
Hotel Liaison Expenses	\$366.37
Total	\$52,987.02

OPERATIONS DIVISION

Security	\$36.14
IT Infrastructure	\$369.20
Hardware (purchased)	\$604.67
Rentals for At-Con IT	\$12,168.78
Communications (phones)	\$1,214.24
Communications (Radios)	\$1,720.60

LOGISTICS/MIMO

MIMO/General use Carts	\$977.29
MIMO Packing Material	\$299.91

CENTRAL LOGISTICS

Seattle Trucks (all departments)	\$4,413.98
Total	\$32,804.81

HOSPITALITY DIVISION

PRE-CON

Loncon - Hugo Losers	\$8,788.00
Loncon - Hugo Nominee Gifts	\$1,545.01
Loncon - Closing Ceremony	\$200.00
Loncon - Hugo Losers Invitations	\$184.00
CONSUIITE	
Consuite Restaurant Orders	\$11,000.00
Consuite - Elec Equip	\$927.90
Consuite - Kitchen/Serving Equip	\$2,000.00
Consuite - Fridge Truck Rental	\$3,527.88
Consuite - Plastic Sheeting	\$589.95
Consuite - Beverages (incl Coffee)	\$4,000.00
Consuite - Food (Costco, CashnCarry)	\$9,348.66
Consuite - Sysco Foods	\$3,500.00
Ice provided by Doubletree	\$1,435.00
STAFF SERVICES	
Staff Den - Food	\$8,916.66
Staff Den - Supplies	\$1,742.31
Staff Den - Equipment	\$19.53
GREEN ROOM	
Catering	\$8,435.82
PRE-HUGO RECEPTION	
Pre-Hugo reception	\$7,731.91
	Total
	\$73,892.63
<hr/>	
SERVICES DIVISION	
OFFICE	
Office Supplies	\$3,456.12
Office Equipment	\$156.39
RIBBONS	
Ribbons and Rosettes	\$4,154.40
Additional Ribbons, special order	\$324.65
CHILDCARE	
Kiddiecorp Payment	\$10,170.00
Misc.	\$195.83
ACCESS	
Mobie Hire - passthrough	\$14,750.00
ASL and CART Services at Bus Mtg	\$5,782.23
INFORMATION	
Info Desk	\$6.50
VOLUNTEERS	
Misc.	\$45.00
Staff and Volunteer T-Shirts	\$6,028.00

SIGN SHOP

Signs	\$5,799.79
Kjell Standups (4 or so)	\$347.00

TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

Shuttle Service (including Mobie transport)	\$31,285.99
---	-------------

BAG CHECK ROOM

Supplies, Misc.	\$41.87
-----------------	---------

Total	\$82,543.77
--------------	--------------------

TOTAL EXPENSES	\$1,089,320.76
-----------------------	-----------------------

SUMMARY

Total Income	\$1,269,690.24
---------------------	-----------------------

Total Expense	(\$1,089,320.76)
----------------------	-------------------------

Net Surplus	\$180,369.48
--------------------	---------------------

50% Pass-Along	\$90,184.74
-----------------------	--------------------

PASS-ALONG DISTRIBUTIONS

Suite for Finland - Historic Davenport	\$394.00
--	----------

Hugo Award second pressing	\$3,608.33
----------------------------	------------

7 Hugo Rockets shipped by Leane 11-15 to Jeff Orth	\$601.39
--	----------

MAC2 Pass-Along (net of above)	\$20,790.28
--------------------------------	-------------

Worldcon 76 Pass-Along (to MAC2 in escrow)	\$25,000.00
--	-------------

Loncon Retroactive Pass-Along	\$5,000.00
-------------------------------	------------

MAC2 Additional Pass-Along	\$3,395.00
----------------------------	------------

Worldcon 75 Additional Pass-Along	\$3,395.00
-----------------------------------	------------

Worldcon 76 Additional Pass-Along	\$3,395.00
-----------------------------------	------------

Worldcon 75 (Finland) Pass-Along Funds	\$24,606.00
--	-------------

Total	\$90,185.00
--------------	--------------------

Post-Convention Distributions/Grants

Lucy Huntzinger, DUFF Donation	\$2,000.00
--------------------------------	------------

ASFA Donation	\$2,500.00
---------------	------------

Bill Burns, Efanazines Donation	\$1,000.00
---------------------------------	------------

MACII, grant for NASA related costs	\$5,000.00
-------------------------------------	------------

2 SMOFCon Scholarships	\$4,000.00
------------------------	------------

Worldcon History Organization	\$5,000.00
-------------------------------	------------

Con or Bust Donation	\$2,000.00
----------------------	------------

Int'l Costumers Guild Donation	\$5,000.00
--------------------------------	------------

TAFF	\$2,000.00
------	------------

Space Agency Fan Fund	\$15,000.00
-----------------------	-------------

FANAC.org	\$1,000.00
-----------	------------

Westercon 69	\$5,000.00
--------------	------------

Westercon 70		\$5,000.00
	Total	\$54,500.00
REMAINING FUNDS		\$35,684.48

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

Approved by: Sally Woehrle, Sasquan Chair <sallywho42@msn.com>

Convention: Sasquan

Parent Organization: SWOC (formerly Seattle Westercon Organizing Committee)

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

Address: PO Box 88154, Seattle, WA 98138

Contact Email: info@swoc.org

Convention Website: www.sasquan.org

Officers and Members:

President: Ari Goldstein

Vice President: Sally Woehrle

Treasurer: Katharine Bond

Pat Porter

Alexander von Thorn

Marah Searle-Kovacevic

Jerry Gieseke

Adam Bird

Alejandro

Terry Neill commended Sasquan for the granularity of its financial report.

D.7 MidAmeriCon II

MidAmeriCon II Financial Statement August 1, 2014 to July 25, 2016

INCOME

Memberships	\$676,896.98	
Voting Fees from Loncon	\$24,963.12	
Transfer from Bid	\$5,709.47	
Chairs Office / Finance	\$11,119.73	
Dealers and Art Show	\$55,135.00	
Advertising and Publications	\$14,131.26	
Pass-A-Long Funds	\$77,400.00	
Grants and Misc Income	\$16,790.00	
Total Income:		\$882,145.56

EXPENDITURES

Chairman's Division		(\$16,178.23)
General Expenses	(\$5,539.31)	
Pre-Con Expenses	(\$2,485.33)	
IT – Support	(\$2,233.23)	
Guests of Honor	(\$4,665.36)	
Other Guests	(\$755.00)	
GOH Book	(\$500.00)	
Finance Division		(\$34,810.81)
Sales Tax	(\$25.00)	
Fees	(\$22,543.51)	
Insurance	(\$3,108.79)	
Licensing	(\$720.00)	
Pre-Con Expenses	(\$439.65)	
At-Con Expenses	(\$7,973.86)	
Facilities Division		(\$99,925.02)
Kansas City Convention Center	(\$76,640.00)	
Convention Center - Other	(\$2,293.60)	
Convention Center - Catering	(\$11,490.00)	

WSFS	(\$1,097.00)	
Hugo Administration	(\$8,404.42)	
Exhibits Division		(\$10,389.82)
Art Show	(\$3,937.41)	
Dealers	(\$2,475.00)	
Exhibits – Logistics	(\$84.88)	
Fan Fair	(\$3,778.53)	
Gaming	(\$114.00)	
Programming Division		(\$3,000.00)
Kids Programming	(\$3,000.00)	
Services Division		(\$3,230.00)
Member Services - Ribbons Etc.	(\$2,730.00)	
Incident Response Team	(\$500.00)	
Publications		(\$21,704.74)
Progress Report 0	(\$1,403.60)	
Progress Report 1	(\$5,160.23)	
Progress Report 2	(\$8,425.82)	
Progress Report 3	(\$6,715.09)	
Progress Report 4		
Marketing		(\$17,067.33)
Advertising (Outbound)	(\$6,861.07)	
Convention & Open Events	(\$3,454.92)	
Promotional Materials	(\$5,729.69)	
Local Promotions	(\$1,021.65)	
	Total Expense:	(\$206,305.95)
Overall Total		\$675,839.61

Submitted by: Joyce Lloyd, Convention Finance Division Head

Verified by: Ruth Lichtwardt, Convention Chair

Convention: MidAmeriCon II

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

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

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

Convention Website: <https://www.midamericon2.org>

Officers and Members:

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

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

Treasurer: Ruth Lichtwardt – rlichtwardt@icloud.com

Secretary: Carol Doms – carol.doms@gmail.com

Board Members:

Paula Helm Murray – kaylisdragon2@gmail.com

Jeff Orth – jeff.orth@gmail.com

John J. Platt IV – jplattiv@gmail.com

Earline Beebe – earlinembeebee@sbcglobal.net

D.8 Worldcon 75

Worldcon 75 Financial Statement August 22, 2015 to July 26, 2016

Income

Voting Fees from Sasquan	98,393.00 €
Memberships (roughly 2400 attending and 1800 supporting)	198,605.00 €
Pass-along from Sasquan and Millennium Philcon	42,174.86 €
Paper publications	2,000.00 €
Ads in Progress Report 1	180.00 €
Total income	341,352.86 €

Expenses

Chair division	Travel reimbursements	4,055.10 €
	Staff meetings	6,282.62 €
Facilities division	Messukeskus convention center	37,866.50 €
Design resources division	Progress reports	1,314.40 €
	Postage	487.10 €
DevOps	Web and other systems	666.73 €
Finance	Bank and other payment fees	6,123.50 €
Ops/Turva		118.65 €
Outreach	Ads	1,876.24 €
	Promo items	1,393.93 €
	Tables and parties at cons	1,242.60 €
All		1,082.04 €
Total Expense		62,509.41 €
Overall total		278,843.45 €

Prepared by: Pasi Vihinen, Finance DDH <pasi.vihinen@worldcon.fi>

Approved by: Crystal Huff <crystal@worldcon.fi> and Jukka Halme <jukka@worldcon.fi>, Convention chairs

Convention: Worldcon 75
Parent Organization: Maa ja ilma ry
Current Tax Status: Non-profit and pre-certified as VAT-free for Worldcon 75
Address: Worldcon 75, c/o Maa ja ilma ry, PO Box 665, FI-00101 Helsinki, FINLAND
Contact Email: hallitus@worldcon.fi
Convention Website: <http://www.worldcon.fi/>

Officers:

Eemeli Aro, Chairman
Pasi Vihinen, Vice Chairman
Sanna Kellokoski, Treasurer
Saija Aro, Secretary
Vesa Sisättö

A. BUSINESS PASSED ON

The following item was ratified at Chicago in 2012 and must be re-ratified by MidAmeriCon II in 2016 in order to remain part of the Worldcon Constitution.

A.1 Short Title: Best Fancast

[Click here for the motion.](#) Debate time was set at 6 minutes.

Discussion: Kate Secor said this category has proved that it has a sufficient diversity of nominations and is worthwhile to continue. Also, all the podcasts that advertise for the Hugos make it great marketing tool. Upon a show of hands the Best Fancast category was re-ratified and became part of the Constitution at the close of MidAmeriCon II.

The following items were ratified at Sasquan in 2015 and must be re-ratified by MidAmeriCon II in 2016 in order to remain part of the Worldcon Constitution.

A.2 Short Title: The Five Percent Solution

[Click here for the original motion.](#) Debate time was set at 6 minutes.

Kevin Standlee admitted that he made a significant mistake when he drafted this motion last year. He inadvertently amended references to 5% that have very little to do with each other. He only meant to remove the minimum threshold necessary to appear as a finalist. He therefore moved to strike the second clause of the amendment, striking the reference to Section 3.11.4 from the revision, which deals with the Top 15 list and has nothing to do with the threshold for getting on the final ballot.

A.2.1 Short Title: Amendment to The Five Percent Solution

Moved, to amend the ratification of the pending constitutional amendment “The Five Percent Solution by striking out the second clause, and thus leaving existing section 3.11.4 unchanged

Proposed by: Kevin Standlee, Todd Dashoff, Terry L Neill, and Ita Vandebroek

Commentary: The stated legislative intent of the original proposal was to “eliminate the requirement that finalists must appear on at least 5% of ballots in a category.” The second half of the amendment has nothing to do with that minimum percentage requirement to make the shortlist. It refers to a requirement in Section 3.11.4 that the long list of nominees released after the announcement of the Hugo Awards include nominees that received at least 5% of the nominations in a category, even if not in the top 15 positions. The makers of this motion, one of whom was involved in the drafting of the original proposal, think that this amounts to a drafting error, and that we should leave Section 3.11.4 unchanged.

The makers of this motion think that this constitutes a lesser change to the proposed ratification, inasmuch as it would leave the WSFS Constitution closer to its current form, and that therefore the amended proposal could be ratified immediately without requiring an additional year of ratification.

Discussion: Darcy Conaty asked if this meant we would have to ratify this motion again next year. The chair ruled that this would be a lesser change, because it removes a change to the Constitution, and would not require ratification next year.

Stephanie Sullivan asked if we remove the revised Section 3.11.4, would anyone getting less than 5% of the vote still be part of the Top 15 list. The presiding officer responded that yes, if an item appeared on the final ballot, by definition it would be part of the Top 15 list.

By a show of hands, the motion to remove the second clause of the original motion (regarding Section 3.11.4) passed, leaving only the first clause (regarding Section 3.8.5) in play.

Steven DesJardins spoke in favor of the motion, saying that the reason for this motion was that in past years, the Short Story category had fewer than 5 finalists because of the 5% rule, not because there wasn't enough potential finalists, but because there were too many, and the vote was divided too many ways. The long lists from the 1980s show that the voting was much more concentrated. Three-quarters of the long list came from just two or three magazines. Today, the magazine market is much more fragmented, and it is much harder for a given work to appear on 5% of the ballots. He felt the rule was no longer effective.

Ben Yalow spoke against the motion. Though he felt the arguments for striking the 5% rule were strong, he felt the 5% rule was still useful because once you get down to that level of work, what you get is a lot of noise and not a lot of signal. The difference

between the fifth place work and the sixth place work—one of which will get on the Hugo ballot and one of which won't – is close enough to a random number and could just be a random statistical fluctuation.

Jameson Quinn supported the motion. He reiterated what Mr. Yalow said, but added that, as a statistician, if the difference between fifth and sixth place is a statistical fluctuation, then the difference between 6% and 5% may be just as well be such a fluctuation. The way to avoid statistical fluctuations deciding the winner is to have a second round of voting. It is regrettable that who gets that extra level of attention and scrutiny is, to some degree, a matter of luck, but that is unavoidable. Once it gets the extra scrutiny, he believed, the winner is determined by merit.

Daniel Rego spoke against the motion. He asked the meeting to consider that if so few people are bothering to read a work that it falls below a certain threshold, then perhaps it isn't Hugo worthy.

Chris Gerrib, co-maker of the motion, said that it wasn't that there were too few voters, but that the nominations were spread out over a lot of eligible short stories.

Kate Secor asked to amend the motion by adding a three-year sunset clause so visit the issue again when we have the numbers. The presiding officer ruled that that would be a lesser change. The motion was then seconded.

Dr. Andrew Adams felt we already have enough data and didn't feel the need for a sunset clause.

Kevin Standlee moved to close debate on the amendment and the underlying motion. By a show of hands, the question was called. The first vote was to add a sunset clause, and by a show of hands, the motion failed. The next vote was on the underlying motion (without Section 3.8.5), and by a show of hands the amendment was re-ratified and became part of the Constitution at the close of MidAmeriCon II.

A.3 Short Title: Multiple Nominations

[Click here for the motion.](#) Debate time was set at 8 minutes.

Warren Buff, the maker of the motion, said that this motion was proposed last year to codify the traditional way the Hugos work; i.e., making explicit the understanding that an individual cannot be nominated in two categories for the same work, and that is all this motion addresses. No one spoke against the motion, and by a show of hands it passed and became part of the Constitution at the conclusion of MidAmeriCon II.

A.4 Short Title: Nominee Diversity

[Click here for the motion.](#) Debate time was set at 8 minutes.

Donald E. Eastlake, the maker of the motion, said he had done a study. Over the entire history of the Hugo Awards perhaps two episodes of a TV series have been nominated in

a given year. But in the last 10-15 years, there have been times when all the nominees in a presentation category came from the same series or there have been three or four works by the same author nominated in a written category. This crowds out other options and limits the voters. This motion would resolve that problem and limits slots on the ballot to no more than two, chosen by the ones that received the most nominations. For the written categories, authors can withdraw works that they consider not representative.

Dr. Andrew Adams asked how this would be implemented. The administrators only notify authors and productions after they become finalists. Would an author or production be notified that they have four works and given the choice of which two to withdraw? Or are they not to be given a choice? Mr. Eastlake believed that the first of the two situations would be the only way it could be administered. However, all the details of administration are left to the specific Hugo Award committee, and they would have to tell an author, for example, that there were five of their works that would potentially be on the final ballot, explain the situation to them, and have them withdraw any that are not representative. In the case of multiple authors, they would have to make a decision.

Winton Mathews inquired if there would be instructions on the nominating ballot saying you could not nominate an author or production more than twice. Mr. Eastlake said there was no requirement to do anything like that. The Hugo administrators are required to send out Article 3 of the Constitution, which describes the Hugo Awards, so everything would be in one place. Mr. Mathews then asked if there were four nominations for one author or production, would the Hugo administrators choose the top two. Mr. Eastlake replied that they could do so.

Dr. Andrew Adams was concerned that the motion was not clear on the procedure regarding that authors would be notified to make a choice as to what appeared on the final ballot when there were multiple nominations for a single author or work (or multiple authors or works). If the Hugo administrations simply took the top two nominations, the finalists would not know they had been nominated more than twice. Therefore he moved to refer this motion to a committee for further study. The motion was seconded.

Darcy Conaty raise a point of order and asked if Section 3.2.5 of the Constitution,

3.2.5: In the written story 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 the author wrote.

would apply to this motion.

Mark Olson spoke against referring to committee. He felt we didn't want to write too much Hugo administration constraint into the Constitution, so he felt this motion to be "fundamentally unnecessary." Also, if it were necessary, he believed this would constitute a greater change and push this into a second ratification next year.

Elsbeth Kolvar supported referring this motion to a committee because she believed the committee would need only a half-hour to review this motion, do some wordsmithing, and make sure everything fit together.

Jason Spitzer wasn't totally against the motion, but he wasn't sure why we would refer it to a committee when he felt Section 3.2.5 and the original motion were perfectly clear.

Nathanael Nerode pointed out that Section 3.2.5 does not cover dramatic presentations. It applies only to the story categories. The Nominee Diversity amendment applies to dramatic presentations, so he believed there did not appear to be an opportunity for the creators of dramatic presentation series to remove specific nominees of their choice before the ballot was announced. He did not know if that was deliberate or not, but he felt the motion should be referred to committee.

Colin Harris said Mr. Nerode's last point was well made. However, he pointed out that Section 3.2.5 was designed to be very narrow. It was designed to allow authors withdraw works that an editor has changed and that the author did not feel was representative. The reality is every year we allow nominees to withdraw themselves from any category, and it happens frequently. So he did not feel there was any need to refer this motion to committee. He also felt it was essentially implicit that the potential nominees would be consulted as part of the process.

Lew Wolkoff asked if the presiding officer would rule if the language contemplated by the proposed committee would constitute a lesser change (so we could ratify the motion this year) or a greater change (which would extend ratification for another year). The presiding officer replied that he could not make a specific ruling until he saw the language.

Stephanie Sullivan spoke in favor of referring to committee. Her concern was that the language of the amendment as currently written did not provide for informing the authors regarding their multiple nominations. From what she understood of the process, we only tell them when they are on the final ballot. So an author has two items on the ballot; he or she isn't told they were actually nominated for four items. Referring the motion to committee would allow the potential finalists to have some say and some idea as to what was going on with their works.

Ben Yalow moved to extend debate time by two minutes, equally divided, which was seconded. It required a two-thirds vote, and by a show of hands it failed to pass. On the matter of referring to committee, by a serpentine vote – 73 in favor and 60 against – the motion was referred to committee. The presiding officer asked Dr. Andrew Adams to be the chair, and appointed Seth Breidbart, Stephanie Sullivan, Cherise Kelley, Gary Blog, Darcy Conaty, Peter de Werrdt, and Nathanael Nerode. The committee was instructed to meet at the end of Friday's session and report back on Saturday.

[Click here for the committee report.](#)

A.5 Short Title: Electronic Signature

[Click here for the motion.](#) Debate time was set at 10 minutes.

Terry Neill was the maker of this motion, and she felt it was a suggestion to convention committees to allow electronic signature for site selection ballots, with a direction that, they must offer paper ballots as well. Many of our site selections are going to be international. It is difficult to deal with paper internationally. This is a note from the business meeting to seated Worldcons and bids that it is acceptable to the business meeting that they pursue electronic signature if all parties agree to it.

Joni Brill Dashoff raised a point of information. The presiding officer asked Ms. Dashoff to come to the podium, and the secretary pointed out that he was telling his mother what to do. Ms. Dashoff was the site selection administrator for Sasquan. Sasquan did not ban electronic signatures, but would not accept the Adobe electronic signature because while everything showed correctly on the screen, only the signature would print.

Kate Secor, the other maker of the motion, said as this year's deputy site selection administrator she found an enormous desire by the membership for electronic signature. Why can't I do this like everything else? What she particularly liked about this motion is that it doesn't force us to do anything; it provides the ability to do it if every group involved agrees to it. If we don't pass something relatively quickly, site selection administrators will be heavily chastised by the membership for not doing it. By passing this, the administrators can come back and say "Well, I could do it. Here are all the people that you have to convince [first]."

Geri Sullivan spoke against the motion. She pointed out that what Ms. Secor had just said, while it would take the pressure off the site selection administrator, it would put the pressure on the bids. The bids have a strong reason not to want any of this information public or known beyond the site selection administrator. All the arguments against electronic signature that have been made in the past still stand. A bid could be damaged because they were willing to do electronic voting. We must protect the anonymity of the site selection votes.

Warren Buff spoke in favor of the motion. Last year he was concerned that electronic site selection voting was permitted, but he was told they were not electronic means and his bid committee was not given a chance to consent or not consent, and he does not know how his bid would have voted. This motion makes it clear that we consider electronic signatures and the means around them to be a matter that the bids need to agree on, along with the administering convention. In that regard, he felt this motion clarifies what should have been the position in the first place.

Cliff Dunn was concerned that the election will be flooded by people with only a passing exposure to any bids and that it will create a Hugo-style voting flood. It is easy to envision a well-financed bid "buying" a con by paying for their members' site selection fee.

Ari Goldstein pointed out that you can have a voting flood now by paying for postage stamps. Furthermore, as laws evolve, there are going to be laws in various countries, municipalities and jurisdictions requiring the ability to electronically sign things. As an

organization, we should be out in front of that. And yes, everybody wants it. “Really, I have to use paper? Are you kidding me? What is this, the twentieth century? Seriously?” Being progressive, especially given who and what we are, is kind of what we do.

Dave McCarty pointed out some disingenuousness. Paper can’t be both too much of a burden and not a burden. This motion won’t change things as long as everyone agrees. However, for anyone who’s ever been on a bid, protecting anonymity of these votes is important. The general population doesn’t understand that, and that’s okay. But lack of anonymity can destroy life-long friendships. This motion is phrased in the best way possible, but it will put pressure on the bids, and he volunteered to explain why to anyone who needs it.

Linda Deneroff pointed out that courts are using electronic signatures all the time without a problem, and the issue of privacy is being overrated. The administrators who are receiving the ballots are still the only people who will see the information and will separate the ballots from the personal information before the votes are counted. The information will still be private.

Kent Bloom, who has also been involved in site selection in the past as both a bid representative and as an administrator, said that privacy issues are real and this is different from what court systems, which are of public record, have. The idea that everyone can agree on an individual’s behalf whether they want to allow electronic voting is a false idea because the rights of the individual member are being ignored. All sides are allowed to see the vote, but they are not allowed to associate them, because of the paper process, with an individual member. If this ties it together with electronic signatures and electronic ballots, then that protection goes away.

Seth Breidbart spoke in favor of the motion. The issue of confidentiality is extremely important. It’s the reason some decades ago he introduced idea that the name and the vote be on separate sides of the paper ballot. As a professional in the field, he knows of several ways that signatures and votes can be kept separate and that anybody can verify that only these particular people voted, and these are the votes, but can’t tell how each individual voted.

Nathanael Nerode moved to move to extend debate by two minutes, one minute per side, and it was seconded. This required a two-thirds vote and, by a show of hands, it failed.

The presiding officer, without objection, then put the motion before the floor. By a show of hands, the motion was ratified and became part of the Constitution as the conclusion of MidAmeriCon II.

B. NEW BUSINESS

B.2 Constitutional Amendments

Before considering any new business, Dr. Andrew Adams asked whether ratification of any business passed this year could be postponed a year so that ratification would occur at the 2018 Worldcon and not Worldcon 75.

The presiding officer, in consultation with the deputy presiding officer and the parliamentarian, believed that ratification of an item passed this year could be delayed by defeating the ratification of the item passed this year and then next year reintroduce and pass it as first passage (with roughly the same text, or modified) that then come up for ratification in 2018.

Joshua Kronengold asked whether amending the motion with a major change that can then be removed the following year as a minor change would do the same thing, and the presiding officer concurred.

At this point, Ben Yalow, while believing the presiding officer to be correct, wanted it to be formally recorded as a correct decision. Therefore, he wished to appeal the ruling, have the appeal defeated, and have the Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee record it as one of our Rules of Continuing Effect.

Dr. Andrew Adams then moved that the meeting state that it is feasible to reintroduce ratification by suspending the rules and reintroducing something as new business after defeating ratification. The presiding officer reiterated that the resolution was to delay ratification by defeating ratification of an amendment and suspending the rules to reintroduce that motion as new business in the same year. Thus, the new business, if passed, would get first passage and be up for ratification the following year, thus delaying ratification. A two-thirds vote would be required to suspend the rules and insert new business after the close of submission of new business.

Gary Blog asked why not just add a sunset clause to whatever motion he was concerned about. The presiding officer responded that the idea wasn't to re-ratify but to delay ratification.

Mark Olson noted that this would change the process of re-ratification from a majority vote to a two-thirds vote. He believed that because this was likely to happen only with items that are controversial, he wanted to make the re-introduction of an item whose ratification had just been defeated a majority vote instead of a two-thirds vote and asked if we could create a standing rule to do so.

The parliamentarian restated that what Mr. Olson asking for was a standing rule that says the motion to suspend the rules to reintroduce a constitutional amendment whose ratification was just defeated requires only a majority vote. The presiding officer believed Mr. Olson's motion would be in order once the business of the appeal was concluded.

Mr. Yalow agreed to withdraw his appeal in order to allow Mr. Olson's motion to proceed.

Jameson Quinn asked if it were not possible to add as a lesser amendment a "sunrise clause," such that an amendment would not take effect for one year and be subject to a ratification vote at the end of that year. Mr. Olson withdrew his motion, and the parliamentarian ruled that all questions of suspending ratification be referred to the Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee to report back at the Saturday meeting. The Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee declared this meeting open to anyone who was interested. Lisa Hayes objected on the grounds that she wanted her husband (Kevin Standlee) for some of the convention.

Ben Yalow suggested that, from a technical viewpoint, what the business meeting might be required to do is to take Mr. Olson's motion and refer it to committee because a nonexistent thing cannot be referred to committee. The motion to refer Mr. Olson's motion to committee required a majority vote, which passed by a show of hands.

B.2.1 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](#) or ~~deleting~~ words as follows:

Debate time on the amendment by substitution was set at 5 minutes. [Click here for the original motion and discussion.](#)

Colin Harris, the chair of the committee revising this motion submitted the following changes to section 3 of the original amendment.

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. Modify existing Section 3.2.5 as follows:

3.2.5 In the written fiction story categories (3.3.1-3.3.4~~X~~ 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.

[**3.3.X Best Series. A multi-volume science fiction or fantasy story, unified by elements such as plot, characters, setting, and presentation, appearing in at least three \(3\) volumes consisting in total of at least 240,000 words by the close of the previous calendar year, at least one volume of which was published in the previous calendar year, and which has not previously won under 3.3.X.**](#)

3.3.Y Previous losing finalists in the Best Series category shall be eligible only upon the publication of at least two (2) additional volumes consisting in total of at least 240,000 words since they qualified for their last appearance on the final ballot and by the close of the previous calendar year.

All other portions of the original amendment remained unchanged.

Mr. Harris reported that the committee reviewed the original motion, but restricted themselves to the question of re-eligibility criteria and looked at the merits of a number of options. The first option was to allow everyone to be permanently re-eligible (you can win it again, even if you've won it before). The second option was to exclude the winners but allow anyone who lost another opportunity. The third option was to exclude anyone who had been short-listed. Excluding everyone who was nominated would reduce the number of nominees. The committee believed that excluding everyone who had been nominated would very rapidly reduce the pool of eligible nominees because after three years 15 series would be barred from eligibility. The committee concluded that the original makers of the motion had been right to exclude winners. This is an unusual Hugo because you are recognizing bodies of work built up over many years, and as such it is a hall of fame for the series. Once it's in the hall of fame, you don't need to be in it again. But the committee also agreed they wanted a degree of churn, to make sure that there are different winners. Again, the committee felt that the original makers of the motion had been correct in their choice. What the committee then did was identify the text to be refined and streamlined. Therefore they proposed the above amendment by substitution.

The presiding officer then clarified that what the committee did was to break original clause 3.3.X into two clauses: 3.3.X and 3.3.Y.

Mark Richards' moved to call the question. However, since there had not yet been a speech against, the presiding officer ruled it out of order.

Geri Sullivan said that while the new motion extended eligibility requiring two new books with a minimum number of words, it did not appear to require that one of those books be published in the previous year. Mr. Harris said the main eligibility requires a work be published in the prior year, but the re-eligibility clause does not require it.

Linda Deneroff, the secretary, moved to change "since" to "after" in the following sentence:

3.3.Y Previous losing finalists in the Best Series category shall be eligible only upon the publication of at least two (2) additional volumes consisting in total of at least 240,000 words **since** after they qualified for their last appearance on the final ballot and by the close of the previous calendar year.

There was no objection to changing the one word. The presiding officer then put the motion to accept the amendment by substitution to the floor. There was no objection, and the amendment by substitution was passed by a show of hands.

Debate time on the revised amendment itself was set at ten minutes.

Warren Buff commended Mr. Harris's committee for improving the text of the motion. This amendment is an attempt to bring our awards in line with the state of publishing as it has been for a couple of decades. We are creating a category for something that sometimes is never completed – some series are designed to be interminable – we have to consider a work as it stands. Passing this amendment will help improve the Best Novel category as well as recognize work in the current state of the art.

John Dawson asked if an author who wrote multiple series and won a Best Series Hugo would be still eligible for a second Best Series nomination.

Kate Secor spoke against the motion because she believed that if this amendment passed we were going to see authors starting to split up series in order to continue to be eligible and felt this to be an intolerable burden on voters coming to a long-running series for the first time and having to read multiple volumes in order to vote on those up for an award. While she agrees the state of publishing has changed, she didn't feel this was the way to go.

PRK spoke in favor. He was one of the jurors for the Sara Douglas award in Australia that recognized series. That award had a similar issue where the series had to be considered finished before it was eligible. If there were subsequent works, they would be considered a new series. Of all the series nominated for the award, only one had been previously considered for Best Novel, and the series that won had never been considered for Best Novel. Therefore he believed there is a significant difference between the two awards.

Jo Van Ekeren asked how a series would be differentiated from a subseries. People like CJ Cherryh and Terry Pratchett who have series with subseries, and how would they be defined for purposes of this award. Chris Gerrib replied "y'all get to figure it out". If it gets enough nominations, it will be on the ballot; if it doesn't, it won't. If the nominators want Eric Flint on the ballot each year, then he's going to be on there every year.

Ari Goldstein asked and the presiding officer confirmed that if a writer is on the ballot and loses, he has to write something else to get back on the ballot.

René Walling asked if Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee came up with a proposal for delaying ratification of a motion, could it be used this year to delay ratification of this motion. Tim Illingworth replied that provided the committee came up with a standing rule amendment that is passed this year, it would be in effect for next year. If the committee came up with a motion that needs to amend the Constitution – and it might – then that would be up for ratification next year, so it couldn't be used now. Don Eastlake added that in that case, the assembly could, by a two-thirds vote, have any amendment to the standing rules go into effect immediately, in which case it could be implemented this year.

Kent Bloom spoke against the motion in the form of a question: if an author who writes multiple series and has won for both series then writes a crossover novel combining the

two series, would one or the other of the two existing Hugos be retroactively disqualified? The presiding officer indicated that this would simply be counted as a speech against because he didn't believe any of the makers could reasonable speak to that.

Mr. Harris believed that if this amendment passed, we are accepting the reality that this is a complex area and, as in many other areas, we are going to trust the judgment of the voters. There is no way to legislate this, and it would go against our traditions to do so. He added that when the vote comes up, we need to consider whether we trust the voters.

The parliamentarian, Don Eastlake, quoted Section 3.2.11 of the Constitution:

The Worldcon Committee is responsible for all matters concerning the awards.

and added that means the Hugo administrators decide all these issues.

Terry Neill moved to amend this motion with a sunset clause to have it come up for re-ratification at Worldcon 2021. This motion was seconded. There was no debate, and by a show of hands, the amendment passed.

Tim Illingworth wished to make a nitpicking change to the amendment, to change Section 3.3.Y to Section 3.2.Y, putting into the general Hugo rules and not the list of awards. Mr. Harris objected to this on the grounds that the two paragraphs of the restated amendment were originally all one paragraph in the original motion. His concern was if that second paragraph were moved to a different part of the Constitution people may not read it and realize there is an additional constraint for this particular Hugo.

Kent Bloom raised a point of order, noting that by standing rule, the secretary is permitted to rearrange sections to put them into their most logical forms. The presiding officer said this point was well-taken and that the issue will be taken up on the back end.

The presiding officer then asked if anyone wish to debate the underlying amendment with the new sunset clause any further. Since there was an objection, a two-thirds vote was required to call the question. By a show of hands, the question was called. Then by a show of hands the amendment was passed and sent on to Worldcon 75 for ratification.

B.2.2 Short Title: December Is Good Enough

Debate time was set at 8 minutes. [Click here for the motion.](#)

Collette Fozard, as one of the makers of the motion, agreed to answer questions.

Dennis Caswell objected to the motion because he felt works published in December would be at a disadvantage in getting on the ballot. The presiding officer clarified that this motion set the cutoff for members' eligibility to nominate, not a cutoff for nominations.

Terry Neill spoke in favor of the motion, repeating what the presiding officer said. This motion has nothing to do with what works are eligible for the Hugo. It sets who the pool

of nominators will be with. Currently, if someone is not a member of the seated Worldcon or the following Worldcon by the end of January, then you cannot nominate. This would change the cutoff to December.

A two thirds vote in favor was necessary to call the question, and it passed with a show of hands.

The motion to change the cutoff for the nomination pool also passed by a show of hands and was sent on to Worldcon 75 for ratification.

The presiding officer then asked for unanimous consent to move up Item B.2.7, Defining North America, in the remaining minutes of this session. Without objection, the meeting moved to discuss Item B.2.7.

B.2.7 Short Title: Defining North America

Debate time was set at 2 minutes. [Click here for the motion.](#)

Kevin Standlee, as one of the makers of the motion, said the motion was simply to reinstate a definition of North America into the Constitution that didn't yield absurd results. We inadvertently created a situation where, if Hawaii won the right to hold a Worldcon, we would end up having to hold a NASFiC. Some people might actually like that, but it was not the intent when the zone definition was dropped from the Constitution. Therefore, Hawaii is explicitly added as part of the definition of North America because it is a U.S. State. With time expired, Mr. Standee asked for, and by unanimous consent was granted, two additional minutes for questions.

Winton Mathews why Alaska and the District of Columbia were being specifically added to the definition when they are normally considered part of North America. Mr. Standlee replied that as a parliamentary principle, when you have an enumerated list, anything of the same class not on the list is excluded. Therefore Hawaii, Alaska and the District of Columbia were specifically included. Guam, American Samoa, or other islands that are U.S. territory but not part of North America are excluded. Puerto Rico is eligible on its own as part of the Caribbean.

Darcy Conaty asked what happens if Texas secedes? Mr. Standlee felt that would be a waste of time to answer.

Aaron Davies asked for the definition of Central America. Did it include Panama and everything north of that? Mr. Standlee responded that Panama is the southernmost country in Central America.

Geri Sullivan asked why Central America was being included as part of the definition of North America. Mr. Standlee responded that it was included because it was part of the historical definition of North America for site selection purposes.

Warren Buff was against the motion because it removed fannish whimsy. He liked the idea of at least joking about a Reykjavik NASFiC bid because Reykjavik is on the North American tectonic plate.

Jason Spitzer felt that this motion was just a waste of time. Whimsy aside, we can figure out when to hold a NASFiC, and if we want to hold a NASFiC in a year when Worldcon is in Hawaii, whoo-hoo.

With no further discussion, the motion passed by a show of hands and was sent on to Worldcon 75 for ratification.

The meeting adjourned for the day at 12:48.

MAIN BUSINESS MEETING, SATURDAY, AUGUST 20, 2016

The meeting was called to order at 10:02 a.m. The business meeting staff consists of Jared Dashoff, Presiding Officer; Tim Illingworth, Deputy Presiding Officer; Donald E. Eastlake III, Parliamentarian; Linda Deneroff, Secretary; Lisa Hertel, Timekeeper; Lisa Hayes, Videographer; Kevin Standlee, Assistant Videographer; and, Warren Buff, Michael “MrShirt” McConnell, Colette Fozard, Sergeants-at-Arms.

The Business Meeting may be conducted in an order different from that shown in the agenda. Minutes will follow any new order, but contain the numbering in the agenda.

E. SITE SELECTION RESULTS

The special order of business at this session was the site selection results for the 2018 Worldcon and the 2017 NASFiC. The 2019 bidders are permitted question time, but they graciously offered to dispense with it so that the meeting could move along more quickly. The 2017 Worldcon question time is protected by the Standing Rules, but there was no objection to suspending the rules and dispensing with that question period.

E.1 Worldcon 2018

Michael Lee, the site selection Administrator, along with Kate Secor, his deputy, thanked the bid committees for their participation in this year’s Worldcon and NASFiC site selections. Mr. Lee then thanked everyone who assisted with the site selection processes and announced the voting results.

First Ballot	Mail-In	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Total
New Orleans in 2018	49	74	176	295	594
San Jose in 2018	82	121	209	263	675
None of the Above	1	0	3	0	4
Invalid Ballots	3	1	0	0	4
Xerpes in 2010	0	2	0	0	2
Weehauken, NJ	2	0	0	0	2
Minneapolis in '73	1	0	0	0	1
Traincon'18 on the Canadian	0	0	3	0	3
Peggy Rae's House	0	0	4	1	5
'95 in '95	0	0	1	0	1
Highmore 50	0	0	1	0	1
Slab City	0	0	1	0	1
San Juan	0	0	0	1	1
Billings in 2018	0	0	0	1	2
Total with Preference	138	198	398	567	1301
Needed to Win					651

First Ballot	Mail-In	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Total
No Preference	2	3	5	10	20
Total Valid Votes	140	201	403	577	1321

The presiding officer asked for a motion to make the results of the election final and destroy the ballots, which was then moved and seconded by acclamation. And without objection, it was so ordered.

Andrew Trembley, the chair of the 2018 San Jose bid committee, thanked his opposition for a great race. He then turned the podium to Kevin Roche, the 2018 Worldcon chairperson, who also thanked the New Orleans bid for a wonderful and friendly campaign. Many of them, he said, would be working on the San Jose Worldcon.

The official name is **Worldcon 76 in San Jose**. The website is www.worldcon76.org, and the registration system is live. Presupporters will be contacted via email with a link to upgrade their memberships. Friends of the Bid (or higher) who voted are automatically attending members. As is traditional with SFSFC conventions, there are some noncorporeal guests of honor. The Ghosts of Honor are Bob Wilkins and Edgar Pangborn. Fan Guests of Honor are Pierre and Sandy Pettinger, and Guests of Honor are Chelsea Quinn Yarbro and Spider Robinson, with other guests to be announced.

Mr. Roche then announced some of his staff: Cindy Scott will be the Treasurer, and Debbie Breitscheider will be his Executive Assistant.

Membership rates are \$50 for a Supporting membership and \$160 for an attending membership. PR0 was then distributed, and Mr. Roche announced that the registration table would open at 11 am. Lastly, he said the dates are August 16-20, 2018.

Rick Kovalcik asked if there be an extra charge for paper publications. Mr. Roche responded that while the default is electronic publications, he felt the savings from that would cover the expense for those people who want paper copies, which is opt-in. He also requested that, if you want paper copies, to specify if one copy per household would suffice or if each member in a household should receive a copy. Dennis Caswell said he was a presupporter and voted, but he does not have internet access. How can he be contacted? Mr. Roche responded that he could upgrade while at MidAmeriCon II, but that there is an upgrade path for anyone who does not have internet access. The convention has noted who has opted out of electronic notification and will be contacting those people by mail.

Tammy Coxen then presented Mr. Roche with his Future Worldcon chair ribbon.

E.2 NASFiC 2017

Michael Lee, the site selection Administrator, gave a rundown of the 2017 NASFiC vote count.

First Ballot	Mail-In	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Total
San Juan in 2017	15	40	66	112	233
Valley Forge in 2017	26	26	51	79	182
None of the Above	0	0	0	0	0
Invalid Ballots	1	0	0	0	1
Minneapolis in '73	0	1	0	0	1
A Vale Frog	0	0	1	0	1
Michael Nelson's House	0	0	0	1	1
Yoyodyne Systems	0	0	0	1	1
Total with Preference	42	67	118	193	420
Needed to Win					211

Mr. Lee then thanked everyone who assisted with the site selection processes, and Kate Secor then thanked Michael Lee for his hard work.

The presiding officer asked for a motion to make the results of the election final and destroy the ballots, which was then moved and seconded by acclamation. And without objection, it was so ordered.

Pablo Vasquez, the chair of both the NASFiC bid and convention, made his presentation. He thanked Valley Forge for being admirable competition and thanked the site selection group for their hard work.

Mr. Vasquez announced that the Guests of Honor are Daina Chaviano, Tobias Bucknell, George Perez, Brother Guy Consolmagno, S.J.; Javier Grillo-Marxuach, and Paula Smith, and said that the website was up and running, and the same for registration. PR0 was then handed out, and he then thanked his committee. The Sheraton Puerto Rico Hotel and Casino will be the site of the convention, and he described its amenities. San Juan is the oldest city in the U.S., and this will be the first major fan-run convention in Puerto Rico. The dates are July 6-9, 2017; the website is www.northamericon17.com, and conversion from supporting to an attending membership is \$75. A Friend of the Bid or higher who voted has an automatic full attending membership.

Dave McCarty, as final act as chairman, said that as part of the closing of Chicon 7's books, the convention had set aside \$1,000 for whoever won the NASFiC, and the check would be delivered to NorthAmeriCon '17 later that day.

Gary Blog asked both conventions whether there would be room parties or a fan village. Mr. Vasquez replied "room parties, absolutely." Mr. Roche also replied that there would be room parties, and added that any noise complaints would come to the convention, not the front desk.

Mr. Vasquez continued by noting that hotel reservations for NorthAmeriCon '17 would be open in the next few months, and there would be no extra charge for paper publications, though email will be the default.

Mr. Blog asked if the infinity pool would be available to just convention members or to all hotel occupants. Mr. Vasquez replied that it's a public hotel pool and that the only way for fans to occupy it exclusively is to fill up the hotel.

Isabel Schecter thanked Mr. Vasquez for uniting the bid team into a *familia*, and Tammy Coxen, WSFS Division Head, presented a Future NASFiC Chair ribbon to him. Then, in her capacity as Detcon 1 chair, she passed along a check for \$6,000 to San Juan.

Sally Woerhle, the chair of Sasquan, then passed along a check for San Jose in the amount of \$3,395. This is an addition to the \$25,000 held in escrow for the winner of the 2018 Worldcon. She then also passed along an additional check to Worldcon 75 for \$3,395, which is also in addition to the \$25,000 they received last year from Sasquan. And since enough members of the SWOC board of directors were present, they had voted to present \$1,000 to the San Juan NASFiC, which would be forthcoming.

F ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

F.1 MPC Report

Kevin Standlee first reminded the two nearly seated WSFS conventions to appoint their members to the MPC. Joni Dashoff had already accepted the appointment on behalf of Worldcon 76 and Randall Shephard has agreed to be the San Juan's MPC representative.

He then made a supplemental announcement to Thursday's report. On Friday afternoon our UK solicitors contacted the MPC and informed us that the European Union Intellectual Property Agency had certified and completed our registration of the service mark in the European Union of "Hugo Award".

F.2 Nitpicking and Flyspecking Committee

The Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee held an open meeting on Friday, August 19, after the Business Meeting to consider the question of postponing ratification of constitutional amendments.

The committee feels that the best ways of achieving this are either to:

- (a) pass a greater a greater amendment to the item awaiting ratification, if appropriate, or
- (b) add a pair of sunrise and sunset clauses prior to ratification.

These would take the form:

Provided that this amendment shall not come into effect until the close of the 2017 Business Meeting, and

Provided, further, that the question of re-ratification shall be automatically placed on the agenda of the 2017 Business Meeting, with any constitutional amendments awaiting ratification.

Tim Illingworth gave the report, reiterating how to delay ratification.

The presiding officer asked for a sense of the business meeting that the sunrise/sunset was the preferred way to go about delaying ratification of a constitutional amendment pending ratification.

Ben Yalow believed that while the mechanism could clearly work, he believed it was premature to make any such ruling until it was tried.

Gary Blog noted that we have always had sunset clauses, but he asked if a sunrise clause was new or had we used it in the past. Mr. Illingworth responded that having delayed provisions and exceptions is perfectly normal, but we have not used a sunrise clause before. Rick Kovalcik asked if there has been a motion. Subsequently, the motion to prefer sunrise/sunset clauses was seconded. Kent Bloom noted that resolutions are not binding on future business meetings. They are merely advice. By a show of hands, the resolution was adopted.

F.3 Nominee Diversity Committee

[Click here for the original motion.](#)

[Click here for the initial discussion.](#)

Debate time was set at 8 minutes, and this report comes out of that time.

Andrew Adams, the chair of this special committee reiterated the motion as passed last year did not appear to meet the intent of the makers of the motion that should there be multiple finalists from the same creator, that it would be the creator who has first opportunity to decide which of those works should appear on the final ballot. They could, of course, leave that up to the will of the voters by saying just take the ones with the highest number nominations. The intent of the committee was to propose amendments to the motion that would not constitute a greater change so it could be ratified this year but better reflect the intent of the original makers of the motion. The revised motion is below:

A. BUSINESS PASSED ON

A.4 Short Title: Nominee Diversity

Moved, to amend by substitution with the following:

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 co-authored works, in common, only the two works in each category that have the most nominations shall ~~be eligible to~~ appear on the final ballot. [The](#)

Worldcon Committee shall make best efforts to notify those who would have been finalists in the absence of this subsection to provide them an opportunity to withdraw. For the purpose of this exclusion, works withdrawn ~~by their author or authors under Section 3.2.5~~ shall be ignored.

Commentary: This change brings the constitutional amendment closer to current practice and is thus a lesser change.

Discussion: Priscilla Olson asked if the intent of the motion was to contact the authors in advance before creating the list of finalists. Mr. Andrews replied that that was the intent of the original makers of the motion, and so that was this committee tried to refine while making a lesser change. Warren Buff asked the presiding officer to rule if this was a lesser change. Given that any potential Hugo finalist, if their work were to appear on the final ballot, is given the opportunity to withdraw, then this brings the amendment more in line with current practice and is therefore a lesser change.

Kate Secor appealed the ruling of the chair, which was seconded.

Winton Mathews asked, if the ruling were sustained, how would it affect the amendment by substitution? The presiding officer explained that if his ruling were sustained and the amendment by substitution could be ratified this year and take effect immediately. If the ruling were not sustained, it would mean the amendment by substitution was a greater change. In that case, the vote would be first passage this year and have to be ratified at Worldcon 76.

A motion to extend debate by four minutes, evenly divided was made, seconded and, upon a two-thirds showing of hands, passed.

Ms. Secor raised a point of inquiry. If we pass the amendment by substitution and it is found to be a greater change, then the amended resolution would have to be ratified at Worldcon 76. If the amendment to the resolution didn't pass and we went back to voting on the original motion, it could be ratified at this year's meeting and take effect next year. The presiding officer clarified that there are three things happening: (1) there is the chair's ruling regarding whether this is a lesser change; (2) if it is decided that this is a greater change and then the business meeting passes the amendment by substitution and passes the underlying motion, that constitutes first passage and needs to be ratified next year; and (3) if the amendment by substitution is a lesser change, it really doesn't matter if we pass the amendment, because either way it's ratified (it changes the wording, but it doesn't change last year's first passage and this year's ratification).

Ingvar Mattson asked for further clarification. If the amendment were passed as a lesser change, would the underlying resolution be ratified? The presiding officer said there would be three votes: the chair's ruling, the amendment, and then the underlying motion – for a total of three votes.

Rick Kovalcik moved that the sergeant-at-arms be informed that whenever possible when it is clear who the next speaker is, that the sergeant-at-arms walk the microphone to the

person speaking in order to speed up the meeting. This was not a debatable motion, and by a show of hands, the motion failed.

The presiding officer's opening statement on the appeal noted that this amendment brings the process for handling this subsection in line with the current practice of the Hugo administrators, which is to contact the finalists, tell them their work has been nominated and ask if they would like to withdraw it. Thus, telling someone that he or she has more than one potentially nominated work is more in line with current practice than not telling the person, which would put the motion further away from current practice.

Ms. Secor, who appealed the ruling, agreed that current practice is to ask the finalist if he or she wants to be on the ballot, that's a straight up and down. The provisions of this amendment would allow the finalist to choose which item he or she wants on the ballot. We do not currently allow finalists to choose which things they want to appear on the ballot. This would be a significantly greater change from current practice.

Dr. Andrews disagreed. Current practice already allowed a finalist with four works in a category to choose if he or she wants all, none or some of them to appear on the ballot. This amendment would simply codify it.

Joshua Kronengold agreed that Ms. Secor's argument was incorrect and what this amendment would do is simply codify current practice. However, codifying custom is not a lesser change. A lesser change reduces the scope of an amendment. A lesser change reduces the amount something does. This is not a lesser change because it adds something new.

Seth Breidbart argued, by example, in favor of the ruling. "Mike" has four short stories that are potential finalists. Current practice is that the administrator calls him and says, "These four stories can be finalists. Do you want to withdraw any of them?" And for each one Mike says "Leave it, withdraw it, leave it, withdraw it" – whatever he likes. According to this amendment, that is exactly what would happen if the amendment passed and the motion ratified.

Ben Yalow also asked for clarification: He believed that under current practice, as stated, the administrator would tell the person you have two works on the ballot. We do not tell the person, "Oh, by the way, if you withdraw one of your works, another work of yours gets on the ballot." He wanted the ruling of the presiding officer that the amendment as stated would say that we would not tell the person, "Oh, by the way, if you withdraw one of your works, another work of your works pops up." The parliamentarian, as one of the makers of the original motion, said currently Article 3.9.1 of the Constitution requires contacting the finalists to determine if they want to withdraw. It is correct that we do not notify them in advance of their decision that another of their works may then appear on the ballot, and this amendment would not change that. The presiding officer concurred with the parliamentarian and Mr. Yalow.

Dave McCarty pointed out that the most popular nominee is not necessarily the Hugo winner, and he would rather the rules not pick that. He favored letting the creators of the works choose what they believed to be their best up-to-two chances of winning the Hugo.

There was no objection to calling the question, but Mr. Standlee asked the maker of the motion to close debate to withdraw the motion to close debate, which was granted. He then asked for unanimous consent to allow 30 seconds for the presiding officer to make a closing statement on the appeal, but there was an objection. Upon a majority vote, the presiding officer was granted 30 seconds for his closing statement. He believed that the committee's amendment put the rules back in line with current practice by Hugo administrators and was therefore a lesser change. A majority vote was required to sustain the ruling of the chair (that this is a lesser change). By a show of hands, the presiding officer's ruling was sustained.

The parliamentarian noted that the details of administration, and that the Constitution specifically leaves that to the administrators. It can be inconsistent from year to year, and that's the way it is.

Rich Horton said the amendment says nothing about if an author has three stories nominated all three are tied, and asked how it would be decided which two go forward. The parliamentarian repeated: "if it doesn't say and you can't figure it out, it's whatever the Hugo administrators decide to do; it's delegated to them." See Section 3.9.3 of the Constitution: in this particular case, all three nominees would be listed, but generally, it's up to the administrator to figure these things out.

By a show of hand, the committee's amendment to the underlying motion passed.

Rick Kovalcik argued that he saw nothing in this amendment that said the author or the responsible party would be told which item got the most nominations. The parliamentarian responded that the number of nominations any particular work got would not be revealed until it's publicly released after the voting. The finalists would not be so informed.

Dr. Adams pointed out, however, that a finalist could simply ask the administrators to pick just the two with the highest nominations. The parliamentarian also pointed out that saying that the equivalent of the finalist saying, "I do not wish to withdraw any of my works."

Ben Yalow believed we had not had any debate on the underlying motion and therefore it would be premature to close debate and vote on it.

Mr. Standlee moved to erase all existing debate time on the motion and create a time limit of one minute per side and limited to one person per side. The motion was seconded and passed by a show of hands.

As the maker of the motion, Mr. Eastlake said this was a great, improved motion; it gives the voters greater choice, and everyone should vote in favor of it.

Hyman Rosen said that since we were debating other ways of controlling what gets on the ballot (such as EPH and 4 & 6), he didn't feel it appropriate to micromanage the individual nomination lists. If the nominators choose to nominate four episodes of a series, then that's what the voters have chosen and that's what the finalist list should contain.

Mr. Kronengold moved to amend the motion to add a one year sunrise and a one-year sunset clause. By the new procedure recommended by resolution earlier in the meeting, this amendment (which creates a delayed ratification) was in order. It was seconded, but it was not debatable. By a show of hands, the motion failed.

The presiding officer then put the question to the meeting, and without objection, the underlying motion, as amended, was ratified by a show of hands and became part of the Constitution at the conclusion of MidAmeriCon II.

B. NEW BUSINESS

Adam Tesh moved to bring the YA motion up for discussion after B.2.3. This was seconded and, by a show of hands, so moved.

B.2 CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

B.2.3 Short Title: Two Years Are Enough

Debate time set at 10 minutes. [Click here for the motion.](#)

Warren Buff felt that three years creates a ton of administrative overhead to match the current year's membership list with the next year's membership list at a time when both lists are expanding. The gains are miniscule (150 additional nominators) compared to the amount of work (50 hours) for the administrators. This is a recent innovation that we have found to be impractical from an administrative standpoint, and by this amendment we would simply be returning to the prior way of creating the nominator pool. There was no objection to calling the question. With a show of hands, the motion passed and was sent on to Worldcon 75 for ratification.

B.2.11 Short Title: Young Adult Award

Debate time was set at 14 minutes. [Click here for the motion.](#)

Katie Rask thanked everyone for their support, reiterated the rationale behind the amendment and pointed out that she considered whatever name is chosen for this award to be a lesser amendment. She pointed out that the motion contained a sunset clause for the motion to be re-ratified three years after ratification. A lot of people had ideas for names for an award the committee spent a lot of time discussing this, but they left it for next year's committee to address because they found it to be a very complicated issue. Next year's committee could research the logistics, the legal elements, the social elements associated with particular individuals or named topics, make the information

public beforehand, and present it to the business meeting next year, at which time it could be voted on.

Kate Secor, while not totally opposed to a YA award, believed this award to be detrimental because it segregates YA and would prevent a YA book from winning a Hugo Award. A Hugo is the award that's meaningful to an author, and Ms. Secor had concerns that creating a separate award will make those authors feel they could never win the award. She said the Campbell or the currently blank awards are not really Hugos.

David Peterson said he had also spoken to YA authors who feel that a Campbell-like award is not a bad solution. He reminded everyone that a YA award was first proposed 25 years ago and has been constantly defeated. He said the committee has heard the voters' objections and has taken them seriously, and that is the best compromise.

Colin Harris, while actually in favor of this proposal, objected to approving it this year because, as Ms. Rask pointed out, some questions remain, such as the exact definition of the YA award and how it would be administered if it's not a Hugo. He felt that if we passed this now, would be potentially putting something into the Constitution that would be changed next year, and he would rather see a complete proposal before passing this motion with a possibly delayed ratification next year.

Mike Stern moved to change the name of the award to the Gernsback award, but it did not receive a second.

Chris Barkley spoke in favor. It has taken a long time coming to reach this point, and he thanked Katie Rask, Warren Buff and Dave McCarty, and all the other committee members, for all their hard work. He also thanked the loyal opposition because you can never learn anything from people you always agree with. He urged everyone to vote for this amendment because he believed it to be the best way forward. He further urged members to be mindful that this isn't about any individual. "What we do here builds legacy. We build legacies by building things, not denigrating or destroying. We have to move forward."

Andrew Adams said because our awards are under attack, including the Campbell award, this is not the time to be adding a new award because it would just be attacked right from the beginning. He felt we should delay implementing any new award until we have a solution to dealing with these attacks.

Warren Buff noted that he had asked at Friday's session to help bring our awards closer to the state of the art by recognizing a series award; at this session he asked to help bring our awards close to the state of publication by recognizing a YA award. He too had been opposed to a YA award in the past, but encouraged everyone to pass this motion because he believed a Campbell-Award-like solution would be the best way to recognize the great work that goes on in YA while not creating an administrative nightmare regarding which category something goes into between Best Novel, Best Novella, and Best YA book.

Mark Olson asked for clarification: Since this motion is not yet part of the Constitution, considering the filling-in-the-blank in this amendment a lesser change null and without

any effect on next year's business meeting? The presiding officer said that was correct. Mr. Olson then said he was of two minds regarding this amendment. He thought it was a pretty good solution, but that any change next year would be a greater change, including giving the award a title. He wanted to see a complete amendment so we could pass it and be done with it.

Cat Faber argued that if we defeated the amendment this year, it would still be at least three years before it passes and is ratified; if we didn't pass it this year, it might not get proposed again because people are getting discouraged. She encouraged everyone to vote for the amendment this year. If we have to make a major change next year, then we have to make a major change and it will be three years, but it's not extra time.

René Walling said he'd rather have a fully baked solution. Any greater amendment we might pass next year might not be as good as a fully baked solution.

Kevin Standlee said that while he was skeptical of the overall proposed, he wanted to remind everyone that perfect is the enemy of good, and that if we didn't move forward now, he didn't believe we would ever move forward.

Seth Breidbart, while generally in favor of a young adult award, he moved to add a one-year sunrise clause, so it can be perfected. This motion was seconded.

Jameson Quinn inquired if the sunrise clause could only be added only during the second year's ratification process, but the presiding officer noted that that wouldn't stop someone from adding it at any time. Joshua Kronengold pointed out that a sunrise clause here was irrelevant. If we were to make a greater change next year, that would automatically delay it; if we didn't, it wouldn't.

The amendment to add a sunrise clause for one year was defeated by a show of hands. A motion to call the question on the underlying motion then passed by a show of hands; and by another show of hands, the underlying motion (B.2.11) passed and sent on to Worldcon 75 for ratification.

B.2.4 Short Title: Three Stage Voting (3SV), or “The Only Winning Move Is Not to Play”

Debate time was set at 20 minutes. [Click here for the motion.](#)

Colin Harris opened by saying that this is a complex issue, and we have a difficult set of challenges to overcome. He asked everyone take a breath and consider this motion at this session so that we could give this motion and EPH the respect and time and thought they deserved. He then reiterated that we are engaged in a difficult set of challenges for the reputation and integrity of the Hugos, and we need to deal with those challenges. In effect, this motion would insert a second stage of voting, between nominating and voting. It would involve publishing the long list of 15 nominees, and people would be able to vote yes, no, or abstain on whether they believe each of those items is an appropriate candidate to be on the short list. Candidates would be rejected if they received more nos

than yeses and 600 or 20% of the population of nos (so it would require both a large absolute number and a majority against to be excluded from consideration). Once they were excluded, the top five from the nominating ballot would go through to the final ballot no matter which counting scheme is in place (either EPH or the current scheme).

We have to ask ourselves, he continued, what is the success criteria for the safe continuation of the Hugo Awards? It is becoming apparent that with things like EPH we absolutely guarantee a couple of good candidates per category, but is the reputation of the awards preserved by having a couple of good candidates per category and two or three slate nominees per category? He and the other makers of this motion did not believe that that is an acceptable long-term solution. If this motion passes now, next year – assuming EPH is in place and we’ve had a year of it – if EPH doesn’t result in the results we would hope for, this motion would be ready to be ratified and taken are forward.

Time is of the essence. The more years with “No Award”, the more damage the Hugo Awards will sustain. What this motion essentially does is bring the “No Award” test forward, to reject candidates seen as being on the long list only by abuse of process that the vast majority of voters believe should not be there. This is not about looking for edge cases or to remove Doctor Who nominations. This is about the committee of the whole standing up and saying we will not play this game.

At first sight this motion looks like a negative thing, a black ball against people. We considered other options; for example, the idea of a semifinal type voting which has been promoted online. Asking people to do a rank semifinal of 15 candidates and 15 categories is not practical for the voters or the administrators. This motion not asking for detailed consideration. Historically, people didn’t put things below No Award just because it wasn’t to their personal taste; they would typically rank things they liked, then maybe put No Award or leave the rest of the category blank. No Award was there to say we really didn’t think this was deserving of consideration, not just that we don’t think it was deserving of winning. The intent of the makers was that the nominators should basically vote yes unless there is absolutely no way they would consider a particular work. This is simply a chance to say this is an abuse of process and should be “no awarded”.

Kate Paulk spoke against the motion. She pointed out that that, as written, this proposal is for a vote of all the membership. Since some of the membership are highly committed to having works of their choice stay in and works that they dislike stay out, what does this motion do to prevent a highly motivated antithetical group from using this to knock out worthy candidates? What does this motion do to enhance the reputation of the Hugo Awards or increase the membership, which, given the popularity of science fiction as a whole, should have a voting base more than double its current base? If there are thousands upon thousands of voters and thousands upon thousands of nominators, the ability of any one specific faction to dominate anything is massively diluted, whereas, in her opinion, this proposal would expose the awards to even more likelihood of manipulation and do a great deal of damage to the reputation of the Hugos as a whole, to

the reputation of the Hugo committee for honesty, and to the potential future of the Hugo Awards.

Dave McCarty, speaking as an administrator, said one unintentional consequence of this motion that he believed would be a “great good” is that it would crowdsource determination of eligibility without damaging the reputation of the Hugos. He believed that to be of far greater benefit than the small thing of setting up a second vote. One of the hardest jobs the administrators have is determining the eligibility of the nominees because so much knowledge is needed for it. He felt this motion was inherently democratic, and if a group was 50% plus one, then, yes, they should get to say what’s there, and he didn’t care who that group consisted of.

Hyman Rosen submitted an amended proposal that would not remove any rejected nominee from the final ballot (if they had enough nominations to be a finalist), but instead to increase the number of finalists through the fifth nonrejected entry. Thus, no nominee who would have otherwise made the final ballot is removed from the final ballot. Jeff Haas asked for clarification: if two semifinalists were rejected, would the list of finalists increase by two. Mr. Rosen responded yes and possibly even more, if there were more rejected ones above a non-rejected one. Mr. Standlee asked if we had actual text of the motion, but the text was trapped in email because the room did not have wifi. The parliamentarian attempted to get it on the screen.

In the meantime, Rachael Acks asked if the list were extended as proposed, would the things that were rejected (that would still be on the ballot) be marked as having been rejected or just glossed over? Mr. Rosen responded that once the final ballot was determined, there would be no indication of what was rejected. Ms. Acks noted that if there were eight items on the ballot, it would be obvious that three items were rejected, but Mr. Rosen responded that it might also be due to a tie for last place.

Kate Secor asked, as an extreme example, what would happen if the entire long list were rejected. Mr. Rosen said he was a programmer and he therefore considered edge cases. He defined the last accepted entry as either the fifth non-rejected entry or, if there wasn’t one, then the fifth entry on the list. You would always get five, assuming there were five nominees on the long list.

Don Eastlake moved to defer this motion to a committee to report at the Sunday session. He added that if his motion were defeated, he believed we should defeat the motion to amend because it was too complicated to try to get through at the Saturday session. There was no discussion and by a show of hands the vote to refer to committee passed by a show of hands. Mr. Rosen was appointed to the committee, as was Don Eastlake, with others members to be added.

[Click here for the report of the committee at Sunday’s session.](#)

B.2.8 Short Title: Retrospective Improvement

Debate time for each motion was set at 4 minutes. [Click here for the original motion.](#)

To replace the current “Retrospective Hugos” section (Section 3.13) of the WSFS Constitution with the following:

This motion was split into thirds. Ruth Sachter moved to discuss Section 3.13.3 first, and then Sections 3.13.1 and 3.13.2, respectively. This was seconded, and there was no discussion. By a show of hands, this motion passed.

Section 3.13: Retrospective Hugos

3.13.3: In any listing of Hugo Award winners published by a Worldcon committee or WSFS, retrospective Hugo Awards shall be distinguished and annotated with the year in which such retrospective Hugos were voted.

As the maker of the motion, Don Eastlake believed that all cases Worldcon has printed lists of Hugo Award winners that distinguished Retrospective Hugo Award winners from in-year winners and indicated when they were voted, but they could print, for example, the 1939 retrospective winners as if they had been awarded the following year. This amendment would simply impose a requirement that these awards be noted as being voted retroactively.

Kent Bloom asked that this constitutional amendment be converted to a resolution. He believed this level of detail, instruction to a Worldcon, was essentially a wasted effort. You can't do anything about it, and by the time you even find out about it, it's already done. But he agreed that it was a good idea and should be recommended. Mr. Bloom's motion was seconded, but there was an objection to changing the underlying motion to a resolution. There was no debate, and a vote was taken. There was, then, a call for a division. That vote failed to reach the threshold 20% required to agree. Then, by a show of hands, this portion of Section 3.13 passed and was sent on to Worldcon 75 for ratification.

Section 3.13: Retrospective Hugos

3.13.1: A Worldcon held in a year that is an exact multiple of 25 years after a year in which no Hugos were presented may conduct nominations and elections for retrospective year Hugos for that year with procedures as for the current Hugos, provided that year was 1939 or later and that no previous Worldcon has awarded retrospective year Hugos for that year.

Don Eastlake explained that this was a very simple cleanup. It does not give a list of how many of the multiples of 25; any multiple of 25 years later a retrospective Hugo can be awarded, and it removes verbiage regarding the number of nominees. It permits retrospective Hugos to be awarded if the Worldcon wishes to do so in any year. It seemed weird to him that there could be Retro Hugos for 1939, 1940 and 1941, but not the rest of the war years (1942-1945) because no Worldcon was held during those years. The only thing it would add would be a restriction that the Retro Hugos could not be considered for years prior to 1939.

MrShirt felt this was getting ridiculous because most of the people from those years are no longer alive to receive the Hugo.

David Dyer-Bennet found it much easier to nominate for this year's Retrospective Hugos than the current Hugos, and added that most of the older works are still available. Tools like ISFDB made it easy to check out the names that were there, and he recognized most of them because he had read them when he was a teenager. He added that there still are people who know and care about that period.

Stacey Helton was against the motion because it would remove the 100 year restriction. This text would allow it to be any exact multiple of 25 years, which means it could be 200, 250, 500 years down the road. If all the authors are no longer alive, she did not see the point in honoring them because they are not around to recognize the honor.

Leigh Ann Hildebrand recognized the concern about whether or not the honorees were alive or dead, but she preferred to see a continuation of our heritage.

Mark Richards had mixed feelings. He appreciated the concept of recognizing our heritage, he did not want to see the Retro Hugos entrenched as a permanent part of the Hugo Awards. Right now as they are constituted, they have a sunset clause. Once we pass 100 years, we're done.

Colin Harris pointed out that there are only about half a dozen years that the Retro Hugos haven't covered, maybe ten if the war years were included, so we'll basically be done in a few years because everyone who can do Retro Hugos is doing them. By a show of hands, this portion of Section 3.13 passed and was sent on to Worldcon 75 for ratification.

Section 3.13: Retrospective Hugos

3.13.2: A Worldcon held in a year that is an exact multiple of 25 years after a year in which No Award won in a Hugo category may conduct nominations and elections for a retrospective category Hugo for that year and category with procedures as for the current Hugos, except that the category definition for that category when No Award won shall be used, provided that no previous Worldcon has awarded a retrospective category Hugo for that year and category.

Don Eastlake began by saying this section might be more controversial. It would add Category Hugo to the Retro Hugos: If "No Award" should win in a category one year, then in 25 years (or later, if no previous Worldcon had done this yet), a Worldcon may rerun that category using the same definition of the category that had applied in the previous year when No Award won. No Worldcon is ever required to do this, but if they did, then in the listing of the Hugos it would say this was retrospectively awarded 25, 50, whatever years later.

Daniel Rego asked if these Retro Hugos would preclude items that had been on the ballot when the category was originally balloted. Mr. Eastlake responded that the ballot would be completely open: items could be renominated and new items nominated.

David Wallace proposed to amend the motion by substitution 10 years for 25 years. However, this was not seconded.

Ben Yalow felt the motion to be completely inappropriate. “We do not judge the decisions made by the voters under any circumstances.” No Award is listed, just like any other winner, and we should not second-guess the voters.

Priscilla Olson thought that this was a wonderful way to refute the vote at Sasquan. “Just for the fact that that it’s so wonderfully cool,” she felt we should vote for it.

Elsbeth Kolvar spoke against the motion. She believed that once a category has been voted on, it doesn’t get voted on again.

Kevin Standlee felt this was a fatally flawed motion for administrative reasons. It would be very difficult for a 25-, 50-, et cetera hence Worldcon to be able to recreate the administrative rules in place at the time that existed, and we should spare them the attempt to do so.

Jameson Quinn felt this was a good idea, but not the right time to do it. He said we have plenty of time to pass something like this in the future, and we don’t have to do it now.

Joshua Kronengold proposed changing 25 to 50, but was not seconded.

By a show of hands, the vote on Section 3.13.2 failed.

Secretary’s Note: The section 3.13.3 will be renumbered 3.13.2 when it is passed on to Worldcon 75.

B.2.9 Short Title: Universal Suffrage

Debate time was set at 6 minutes. [Click here for the original motion.](#)

Ron Oakes, the maker of the motion, said that when he went looking through the Constitution, he noticed there is no requirement in it that would permit the creation of a membership class that allowed people to attend the entire Worldcon but not to vote for the Hugo Awards or site selection and/or participate in the business meeting. This motion is an attempt to prevent that from happening. He simply wanted to close the barn door before the horse left.

René Walling said he had posted a financial analysis of the various scenarios possible for breakdown of the memberships, and he believed the economics of Worldcons would preclude such a thing from happening.

Priscilla Olson moved to change the word “sell” to “offer.” She said MidAmeriCon II gave away over 300 free memberships, but she didn’t know how many of them included voting privileges. She was concerned about any free memberships including voting rights. The consensus of the meeting was to change “sell” to “provide”.

Darcy Conaty said believe the commentary explicitly states that if they don’t want to limit the availability of the convention to offer free memberships that do not include voting rights. Free memberships should not include voting rights, in her opinion, and so

the commentary clarified that. The presiding officer pointed out that the discussion is not included in the Constitution.

Mr. Oakes replied that the intention of the motion was to cover regular purchased memberships. Comped memberships that allow full access for the CART, ASL and tech support people do not include voting rights; however GoH memberships generally come with voting rights, and this motion would not change that. He simply did not want people who would normally be at the meeting suddenly finding themselves without voting rights because they checked the wrong box.

There was an objection to calling the question on Ms. Olson's motion to amend, and debate continued.

Elsbeth Kolvar spoke in favor of the motion. She said we are not selling; what we're doing is providing. We offer memberships to our guests of honor. The underlying motion could mean that our guests of honor do not receive voting rights. "Provide" is a simple one word change, and it clarifies what's going on.

Lenore Ann Jones believed the current motion did not say anything about free memberships. We have many free memberships, such as for our CART operators, press, and our interpreters; they currently do not receive voting memberships. Ms. Jones believed this amendment would force us to offer voting memberships to all those people, and she didn't think that was a good idea.

Seth Breidbart said the motion as worded said "that is available to persons of the age of majority." He asked if that meant to any person of the age of majority or did it mean to the general public? Did it have to be available to *anybody* over the age of majority? If that were the case, then things like press memberships wouldn't matter because they're not available to just anyone. The presiding officer said it was available to anyone.

KJ believed that if a member of the press or CART operator is a fan of science fiction and wants to vote in the Hugos, why not let them.

Rick Kovalcik replied that if a member of the press or camera operator wants to vote, they can buy a membership or at least a supporting membership. A convention could decide to offer AAA memberships without voting rights, and I think the original wording of the membership makes it clear that that is forbidden. Other committees have recently do things the membership did not expect, and he hoped that has been stopped. He felt we need to close the barn door before more horses leave.

Upon a show of hands the question was called.

Upon a show of hands, the motion to change "sell" to "provide" failed.

Debate upon the main motion commenced. Kent Bloom objected to putting it in the Constitution since he believed it was no more effective than a continuing resolution of the business meeting. Although he thought this was the right thing to do, he didn't believe we could actually require it. There is no means of enforcement, and there are likely still going to be Worldcons that will want to have different membership structures.

Andrew Adams believed anyone who attended the meeting would have voting rights, even if a convention sold a membership that didn't convey the right.

Mike Van Helder noted that when he first started attending Worldcons, if he had bought a membership that included full attendance but not the right to come to the business meeting, he would have happily bought it.

A vote in favor of the underlying motion was held. The motion passed and was sent on to Worldcon 75 for ratification.

At this point Kevin Standlee moved to adjourn, but upon a show of hands, the motion failed.

B.2.10 Short Title: Non-transferability of Voting Rights

Debate time was set at 8 minutes. [Click here for the motion.](#)

Seth Breidbart moved to amend the motion to say "except that in the case of death of a natural person holding a supporting membership, it may be transferred to or from the estate of the decedent," because he believed that letting the membership die in the estate was not useful. The motion was seconded. Mr. Yalow asked if once a membership is transferred to an estate, it is not a natural person. This being correct, Mr. Breidbart withdrew his amendment.

Ben Yalow spoke in favor of his motion, saying that the amendment separates membership in the World Science Fiction Society (and the right to attend the annual meeting of the society) from the convention membership. Membership in the Society would be irrevocable; membership in the convention could be transferred. He felt it was nearly impossible to keep track of transferred memberships and who had what rights.

Linda Deneroff reported that Bruce Farr, a former Worldcon treasurer, had told her that very few people actually transfer their memberships with voting rights, and it is not an administrative nightmare. What this motion would do is cut down the number of people buying memberships in advance if they don't know if they can attend the convention.

Upon a show of hands the question was called.

Upon a show of hands, the motion failed.

The presiding officer thanked the interpreters, the CART operator, and the volunteers and people who donated for coffee, all of whom helped make the meeting more accessible.

Without objection, the meeting adjourned at 1 p.m.

MAIN BUSINESS MEETING, SUNDAY, AUGUST 20, 2016

The meeting was called to order at 10:09 a.m. The business meeting staff consists of Jared Dashoff, Presiding Officer; Tim Illingworth, Deputy Presiding Officer; Donald E. Eastlake III, Parliamentarian; Linda Deneroff, Secretary; Lisa Hertel, Timekeeper; Lisa Hayes, Videographer; Kevin Standlee, Assistant Videographer; and, Warren Buff, Michael “MrShirt” McConnell, Colette Fozard, Sergeants-at-Arms.

The Business Meeting may be conducted in an order different from that shown in the agenda. Minutes will follow any new order, but contain the numbering in the agenda.

B. NEW BUSINESS

B.2 CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

B.2.4 Short Title: Three Stage Voting (3SV), or “The Only Winning Move Is Not to Play”

Debate time was set at 20 minutes. [Click here for the original motion.](#)

[Click here for Saturday’s debate.](#)

There had been a motion to defer this amendment to a committee that would report at this session, and Hyman Rosen presented the revised motion, which now read:

Moved, to amend Three Stage Voting (“3SV”) as follows:

Strike the new 3.8.2.

3.8.4 A Qualifier shall be ~~eliminate from consideration for the Final Ballot temporarily designated as rejected~~ if it meets the following two criteria:

...

...

Amend the new 3.8.5:

~~The final Award ballots shall list in each category the five eligible Qualifiers who received the most nominations in the first stage Nominating Ballot and were not eliminated from consideration in the Qualification Stage.~~ The final Award ballots shall list in each category the Qualifiers on the long list from the first Qualifier through the last accepted Qualifier and any Qualifiers tied with it. “The last accepted Qualifier” is the fifth Qualifier on the long list not designated as rejected, providing it exists, otherwise the last such Qualifier providing it exists and is below fifth place, otherwise the fifth Qualifier on the list. No Qualifier on the ballots shall have its rejected status marked.

Proposed by: Hyman Rosen, Donald Eastlake, Tim Illingworth and Jo Rhett

Commentary: this change increases the number of entries on the Final Ballot by including any “rejected” item that is above the fifth non-rejected item.

Discussion: Mr. Rosen then spoke in favor of the revised motion. The basic premise was to no longer remove rejected entries from the list of finalists, but to add everything from the fifth non-rejected finalist to the final ballot. People say it’s an honor to be nominated; it can mean that a significant minority of fans have found some work to be of value. As originally constituted, 3SV would, for whatever reason, remove a majority vote to remove such works from the list. There have been trends in the past that initially met with great hostility; cyberpunk, New Wave, etc. Therefore, he felt 3SV as it stood, was not a good way for the fan community to deal with the possibility of having works that just a few fans like to be nominated, appear on the ballot, and get some recognition. On the other hand, since it’s possible for a significant minority to fill up the list of nominees “with things that no one will vote for and no one likes” (except for that minority), this revision is the best of both worlds. It would allow minority groups to get their favorites on the ballot if they gets enough nominations, and allows additional slots for other nominations.

Ari Goldstein asked for a clarification. If there was a list of 15 nominations and ten were rejected, would there then be 15 nominations on the ballot. Mr. Rosen responded that that was the case.

Andrew Adams spoke against the motion. He noted that it was an honor just to be nominated (or a finalist, since he noted we have changed the nomenclature), except if one finished on the final vote below No Award. He pointed out that we already list the top 15 finalists (and sometimes more if they get more than 5% of the nominations) in the data that comes out afterwards and he felt that removing items at a second stage of nomination would be less embarrassing than items being on the final ballot and coming out behind No Award, especially when finalists may have been placed on the ballot without any knowledge of what was going on. In his official capacity this year, Dr. Adams said, he knew “quite a few of the people on the award” were unaware, despite efforts to inform them about the controversy, about what they were getting into. They were put into a position of thinking that they were validly nominated for a major prestigious award and then insulted by finishing below No Award on the results.

Kevin Standlee moved to end debate and call the question on the motion to amend. There was no objection. Then, by a show of hands, the motion to amend failed.

Colin Harris then made his opening remarks in favor of the original amendment. He reminded people of the key point of the amendment: preserving the reputation of the awards. While EPH increases diversity, he asked whether if it was successful to have one or two non-slate candidates in a category that is heavily under attack. If people can call themselves finalists year after year, even if they’re not winning, it’s an incentive to carry on and keep stacking up those finalist recognitions. This motion says we are not interested in encouraging those behaviors, and we’re going to reject people who manipulate the awards that way. This amendment creates a committee of the whole to

identify the egregious candidates as opposed to simply unpopular candidates. He said it assumes intelligence and thought on the part of the voters as well as assuming that they will accept things they may not like as long as they are appropriate and represent minority interests. He added that if we don't trust the whole of WSFS, we might as well not have a business meeting. Fundamentally, EPH has limitations and someone will find a way to game it. This year it was "human shield candidates". The best way to distinguish such from legitimate candidates is that we all make our own minds up. He felt this motion was a very flexible solution because whatever tactics are applied to the construction of slates, the voters can indicate what they think is appropriate. It makes us all responsible. He concluded that the makers of the motion chose a simple up/down vote because it's meant to be a short, sharp filter. It's not realistic for the voters to read everything.

Gary Blog moved to amend 3SV to add both a sunrise and sunset clause. The sunrise would be in 2018 and the sunset in 2021. However, it was pointed out that the amendment already included a sunset clause every year between now and until 2022.

Lisa Padol asked if the amendment were passed this year, would it still need to be ratified in 2017 and not go into effect until 2018. If that were the case, then no sunrise clause for 2018 was necessary. There was no second, and Mr. Blog then withdrew his motion.

Ben Yalow spoke against the underlying motion. While in general he was in favor of things that decrease the power of slates and believed 3SV was well-intentioned, he felt the motion asked voters to make political judgments about the nominated works. He believed that we should look only at the merits of the works. He said we should not play Vox Day's game; we should judge works solely on their merits and not make political statements, but under 3SV there is no time for anything but political decisions.

Cat Faber felt it was pretty clear which works were nominated for harassment or grieving purposes, so she didn't believe it would take long to figure these things out.

At this point, Rick Kovalcik passed out sets of the Long List from the previous night's Hugo Awards and the datasets showing the disparities in nominations between the current system and EPH. Unfortunately, he had not had time to make more than five copies of the dataset, and he asked people to share them.

Stephanie Sullivan spoke against 3SV because she felt it added more negativity to our community. She said we are always responsible for our votes. She felt that while the makers of the motion wanted to put the community at the heart of the vote, she believed it would actually remove a section of our community from it and that there are better ways to stop slates. She pointed out that anything can be gamed when there is a consensus vote if a sample size is small enough, and that the best way to actually stop the gaming of the system is to be positive. She said we need to put more positivity into our community and rally around the Hugo Award to get more people involved to less the influence of any small group.

David Dyer-Bennet said he liked Ben's hope for less obvious politics and trust in people, but at the previous night's Hugo Ceremony there were two specific statements, where winners felt it was necessary to comment on these politics while accepting their Hugo Awards. And that didn't seem to him to be an actual, effective way to keep "that political sort of thing less of a big deal, less visible". There was some question as to whether this was a speech in favor or a speech against, but the presiding officer ruled it was a speech in favor.

Ari Goldstein felt that the more time pressure created for the voters, the smaller the subsection of voters will be who have the leisure time and the bandwidth to make informed decisions. This measure, he felt, was well-intentioned, but would be counterproductive to what we want to achieve because if you shrink the sample size, you make the slates more powerful. He gave an example of NRA (National Rifle Association), which is a very small group that works hard and is very influential in Washington, D.C.

Dave McCarty felt we were already engaged in what 3SV would do, but we're forced to do it at voting time. He felt everyone was under a misconception that our nomination process is a democratic vote. Democracy is about majority rule. We're taking small pluralities and picking the best, which is how a small group is able to game the system. Either the administrative team weights the answers (as a pollster would do) or adopt a democratic process building to a democratic majority in all the cases, which is how you overcome a perverse minority. Therefore, he was in favor of this amendment.

Daniel Hoge asked how much time would be allotted to rejection stage, and would a reading packet be available at that time. As one of the makers of the motion, Colette Fozard replied that a two-month period was projected for the rejection stage. The packet would not be available at that time. This purpose of this amendment was simply to move the possibility of "No Award" to this second stage of voting.

Darcy Conaty asked for the definition of "voters." When the motion speaks of "20% of eligible voters," does it mean voters or nominators? The presiding officer responded, and Mr. Harris concurred, that it would be voters; i.e., the current year's membership. Mr. Harris added that it would not be the number of ballots returned; it is everybody who is eligible: attending, supporting and YA members at the time of the close of the ballot – a deliberately high threshold as to how many people have to reject a work.

Gary Blog: reiterated the question. Using Mr. Blog's example, Mr. Harris explained: If 3SV were in effect now, members of Sasquan and MidAmeriCon II would have been eligible to nominate in the first stage, but only member of MidAmeriCon II would have been eligible for the second stage. The presiding officer explicated that second stage voting would be by members only, which by definition means only the members of the current year's Worldcon.

Gillian Nichols felt 3SV can also be gamed, and we would be giving an extra opportunity to a hostile minority to down-vote things that would otherwise be approved. While it may

not be large enough to completely knock something off the ballot, it could also incite factionalism among regular fans. She provided an example: fans of author A decide that author B has already won enough and decide to down-vote his stuff to make sure that their choice has a less competitive set of works to go up against. Ms. Nichols felt we'd likely wind up with a lot of things being knocked off due to fan factionalism.

James Bacon urged putting this amendment forward. He felt that transparency was fundamental in any fair system, and he had no problem understanding 3SV. Better to give no award earlier. As both a Hugo Award winner and loser, he said he would much prefer to be a loser again at any stage rather than see the stress and pressure on our fellow community members continue.

Mike Stern said he is a procrastinator, and he felt this was another round of voting on which to procrastinate. He agreed with Mr. Yalow: you have to vote on the merits of the work, and if there's nothing to ready, then he couldn't vote at all.

Rick Kovalcik agreed with Mr. Harris. He felt this was the best solution we have and, having a computer science degree and reading the motion, he also believed it would be very hard to game the system. You need 60% of people voting in this phase to game the system. He reiterated what Mr. Bacon said: better to be knocked out at the second stage than deal with the angst that currently exists. Mr. Kovalcik said he knows porn when he sees it; he knows when something is there for the wrong reason.

Carol Doms spoke against this motion because while we're looking at something that is happening right now, we need to look to the future of the Hugo Awards. This motion looks like collusion among SMOFs deciding things for the Hugos, and she didn't think that was a good thing. The current controversy will eventually pass, just as other controversies have, but 3SV will only add fuel to the fire. She also said that while it was the right of the winners who voiced their opinions at this year's Hugo ceremony, she didn't agree with them because that too only added fuel to the fire. When people look at the future, will they consider the awards to be legitimately awarded?

Kevin Standlee moved to reset debate to four minutes, two minutes to a side. With less than a two-thirds show of hands, the motion to extend debate failed.

Mike Willmoth had concerns about the motion. He said that until he could look at the data regarding how it compares against the other options, he would not vote for this motion.

Jameson Quinn moved that we add language to state that it is the sense of the meeting in Section 3.8.2 that "no Qualifier should be voted down for purely aesthetic reasons." He didn't care if this was simply a resolution of the business meeting. Mr. Standlee raised a point of order that a resolution was out of order because a motion was under consideration. Mr. Quinn then moved to add the statement "No Qualifier should be voted down for purely aesthetic reasons" to Section 3.8.2. There would be no way for the vote counters to know. The motion was seconded, but there was no time for debate and, by a show of hands, the motion failed.

Darcy Conaty again asked who was eligible to vote because “voters” are a moving target. The presiding officer reiterated that if someone were to buy a membership at 11:58 p.m. on the day nominations closed and could get a PIN in time, that person would be eligible to vote in the second stage of voting.

With time in favor of the motion having expired, the parliamentarian pointed out that it was possible under our rules for people to continue to oppose amendments. If somebody needed to stop this process, he or she needed to gain recognition and then move to call a question.

Daniel Rego wanted to add a brief sentence at the end of Section 3.8.5, to read, “Any rejected Qualifier that has received more votes than any of the final nominees will be noted on the final ballot, but that choice will not be allowed to be voted upon.” This motion was not seconded.

Rick Kovalcik asked and the presiding officer answered, that if the motion passed this year, it would need to be ratified next year. At this point the question was called, and upon a show of hands, the original underlying motion passed and was sent on to Worldcon 75 for ratification.

C. COMMITTEE REPORTS

C.3 Special Committees

C.3.2 YA Hugo Award Study Committee

[Click here for the Committee’s report.](#)

Warren Buff moved to suspend the rules and reconsider the motion to re-form the YA Committee, with Aurora Celeste as chair. His goal was to have the committee move at a faster pace during the coming year, so that the members of the business committee have time to consider the committee’s suggestions and research. Joshua Kronengold asked if the committee membership would remain the same. The presiding officer confirmed that the motion would change only the chairperson and added that he had no intention of changing the membership of the committee. The motion was seconded. It would take a two-thirds vote to suspend the rules. Without debate and by a show of hands, the committee was reconstituted.

A. BUSINESS PASSED ON

A.7 Short Title: E Pluribus Hugo (Out of the Many, a Hugo)

Debate time was set at 20 minutes. [Click here for the original motion.](#)

Before the maker of the motion, Jameson Quinn, spoke in favor of it, he asked for a technical fix to the motion (as proposed by Dave McCarty), to amend 3.A.4. The motion changes the way a work would be added to the ballot if a prior work is withdrawn. The motion reads as follows:

3.A.4: After the initial Award ballot is generated, if any finalists 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. they will be replaced by other works in reverse order of elimination.

The revised section was seconded and debate began on amending the motion.

Andrew Adams asked if this was a lesser change. The presiding officer ruled this to be a lesser change because it went back to current Hugo practice. Edmund Schweppe then appealed the ruling of the chair, and debate was set at four minutes, at the end of which a vote in favor would sustain the presiding officer's ruling.

The presiding officer then explained his ruling. A lesser change meant that it is a change that the people who first passed the motion would have definitely agreed to had it been proposed last year because it would bring the new system (EPH) closer in line with the current system.

Ben Yalow did not believe this to be a lesser change is because the rerunning is an orthogonal process to the currently existing eliminate and replace. It provides something entirely different and therefore one cannot say that a particular thing is greater or lesser or closer or further, because in fact, it is so different that making those kinds of comparisons is impossible.

Anne Marie Rudolph believed this to be a lesser change because effectively there is less process involved in this and therefore less impact. The first run that gives a ranking of works would be used to replace any works that are withdrawn, rather than taking that work out of the original run and redoing the whole thing, which could slightly change all the results.

Seth Breidbart, who voted for EPH last year, said this point was raised, and the idea was that rerunning the list was a fairer change than not rerunning it.

Rick Kovalcik said if this is a lesser change to the Constitution, then how people would have voted last year is irrelevant.

The presiding officer's closing remarks reiterated the argument that this amended motion brought EPH closer in line with current practice, and therefore was a lesser change.

By a show of hands, the presiding officer's ruling on the amendment was sustained. The question was then called to close debate, which required a two-thirds vote. Upon a show of hands, the motion to close debate passed. Then, upon a show of hands, the motion to amend the underlying motion passed.

Kevin Standlee then moved to bring his foreshadowed amendment to the fore to require annual re-ratification until 2022.

Moved, to substitute the following new enacting clauses for the existing clauses in the E Pluribus Hugo Proposal to require annual re-ratification until 2022:

~~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.~~

Provided that unless this amendment is re-ratified by every Business Meeting between the initial ratification of this amendment and the 2022 Business Meeting, Section 3.A shall be repealed, and

Provided that the question of re-ratification shall be automatically placed on the agenda of each Business Meeting between now and the 2022 Business Meeting with any constitutional amendments awaiting ratification, unless any of those meetings should fail to re-ratify the amendment, in which case no further re-ratification votes shall be held.

Proposed By: Colin Harris, Kevin Standlee

Commentary: This is an adjunct to the 3SV motion. It provides additional opportunities to repeal EPH in the event that the Business Meeting decides to adopt 3SV (or an alternative solution) in place of EPH as a means to address the issues experienced in recent Hugo ballots. EPH can of course be retained alongside such additional measures, but the Business Meeting may not wish to do so in view of the administrative load and the loss of voter understanding associated with the complex algorithm.

Discussion: Kevin Standlee spoke in favor of his motion. He believed that the business meeting needs the ability to move a little bit faster than it has been moving, and that, while generally in favor of requiring two years on all changes, he felt this was one where we would be better off giving ourselves the flexibility for the next several years to say, "Let's get out of this now."

David Wallace, while in agreement with the general feeling behind this amendment, he believed it was the wrong approach to take and offered a substitute amendment. Mr.

Wallace's approach would be to allow any business meeting between now and the ultimate re-ratification of EPH to vote to suspend the effects of EPH for one year.

Mr. Wallace reasoned that if we vote to not re-ratify at some intermediate stage and then we discover that we needed EPH, as might be evident in the results of the following year, it would take two years to bring it back. By taking Mr. Wallace's approach, the business meeting can bring back EPH just by voting not to suspend it for the following year. Therefore, he urged rejection of Mr. Standlee's amendment, after which he would introduce his amendment.

Ms. Secor made a parliamentary inquiry: If an item is to be re-ratified every year and in one of the intervening years if it's amended, would that trigger a re-ratification of two years? The presiding officer responded affirmatively.

René Walling asked if this was not an amendment by substitution. The presiding officer then clarified that since Mr. Standlee's amendment was not an amendment by substitution, it was not in order to make a second-order amendment.

Ingvar Mattson asked if this motion would constitute a lesser change. The presiding officer said yes, because it would require re-ratification.

The question was then called and a serpentine vote was taken. By a vote of 96 in favor to 99 against Mr. Standlee's amendment to the underlying motion failed.

Mr. Wallace then introduced his proposed amendment as a clause to EPH:

[Provided that any business meeting prior to 2022 may move to suspend the changes introduced by E Pluribus Hugo for the following year's Hugo nominations \(only\).](#)

The motion was seconded.

Cliff Dunn then asked if Mr. Wallace had intended to include the two previously rejected clauses that were not struck out, or had he just intended to include this clause as standalone? Mr. Wallace responded that it was in addition to the clause requiring re-ratification in 2022.

Don Timm asked if this the suspension of the rules in this amendment would require a two-thirds vote or a majority vote for passage. The presiding officer pointed out that the motion did not mention a suspension of the rules, only a suspension of the changes implemented by EPH.

John Dawson asked if Mr. Wallace's amendment was a lesser change that would not require re-ratification. The presiding officer said it was a lesser change because it keeps the changes in for less time.

Mr. Wallace then spoke in favor of his motion. This is a time of flux when the Hugo Awards are under attack, and we don't know how things are going to move forward. Additionally, it's not entirely clear how many different pieces are going to be needed to

be able to get to where we want to go or how those things will interact. We have an ongoing problem, and he felt this amendment afforded flexibility in terms of crafting the correct solution as we go forward by allowing the business meeting to suspend EPH and/or bring it back, whichever was deemed necessary.

Janice Galeckas's concern was that it was always going to be one year behind the issue we're trying to deal with.

Joshua Kronengold called the question, which was seconded, and there was no objection. Upon a show of hands, the amendment to the underlying motion passed.

The discussion then turned to the ratification of the underlying motion, E Pluribus Hugo. Judy Bemis moved to call the question, which was seconded. However, there was an objection. The motion to call the question and end debate therefore required a two-thirds vote, which upon a show of hands it received.

Upon a verbal vote, the rules were suspended to permit Dave McCarty a two-minute review of the previous night's Hugo results. There were only five copies of Mr. McCarty's report due to its length (51 pages) and because it hadn't been finished until 6 a.m. that morning. [The two page summary is attached at the end of these minutes as Appendix 3.](#) The other available report was the Long List, which was released after the Hugo ceremony the night before.

There were nine categories that had one change or another. For Novel and Novella, there would have been no change to the ballot, but in the Novel category one item that made the Long List would have been knocked off. The Novelette category would have had one change; in the Short Story, Related Work categories there would have been two changes; and the Graphic Story category would have had three changes. All told, there would have been 9 categories out of 18 that would have been affected by EPH, with some number of entries in the top five being adjusted. He concluded that, on average, EPH would have changed just more than one item per category where slating is present, but that it also changed items in the long list, where slating was not present, and that there were unintentional changes that also had some effect.

Jerry Lore asked how something with more points ended up on the ballot than something with fewer points. Mr. McCarty responded that that was one of the things that is non-intuitive if you don't actually run EPH. When two items have the lowest points for the final position and only one can move on, the selection is made by which has more nominations.

Gary Blog asked why Dramatic Presentation is not shown in the summary. Mr. McCarty explained that both he and Jameson Quinn felt that the one item that would have changed in those categories was misleading because the categories are too narrow. Since any movement there had nothing to do with the behavior of slates, they felt it best to exclude those categories when trying to determine what EPH does.

Marc Olson asked if there was a way to let Mr. McCarty and Mr. Quinn answer questions jointly in order to speed up the process. The business meeting agreed to suspend the rules for ten minutes to allow Messrs. McCarty and Quinn to respond to questions. EPH, for all practical purposes, eliminates ties in the nomination process.

Mike Lowrey asked if the application of EPH would have eliminated any of the winners from the ballot. Mr. McCarty responded that for this year the answer was no, but in testing Loncon 3 data, a Hugo winner would have been eliminated. There were nominees for fifth place, and EPH knocked one off (by breaking the tie). He clarified that it would be mathematically unlikely for ties to happen under EPH, and if we adopted it, we might never see a tie again.

Rich Lynch felt that EPH was so opaque it could be snake oil, and he asked Mr. McCarty if he would recommend EPH. However, the presiding officer ruled that this was debate and, therefore, out of order at this time.

Kate Paulk asked if EPH would be applied to the Dramatic Presentation categories. Mr. McCarty responded that it would, but for purposes of comparison, the answers were not as germane as on the other categories. Mr. Quinn felt it wasn't appropriate because the category was a data nightmare. He pointed out that Mr. McCarty had had very little sleep when he put together the summary, and Best Dramatic Presentation Short Form would have required as much work as all the other categories put together. Ms. Paulk then asked how much work EPH would place on future Hugo administrators. Again, the presiding office ruled that this was debate.

Mark Olson then moved to devolve into a Committee of the Whole for five minutes. It was seconded, and upon a show of hands that appeared to be greater than two-thirds, the meeting moved to Committee of the Whole, Tim Illingworth presiding. The presiding officer stepped down.

[The minutes of the Committee of the Whole are attached as Appendix 4.](#)

Geri Sullivan moved to extend the Committee of the Whole for an additional 3 minutes, but the motion failed.

Upon a show of hands, the ratification of EPH passed and became part of the Constitution at the conclusion of the Business Meeting at MidAmeriCon II.

John O'Halloran moved to commend the Hugo administrators and the team that reviewed EPH, the numbers and the stats; in particular, he commended Mr. McCarty for staying up all night long to provide the reports for this session to enhance the discussion on EPH. There was no objection, and a round of applause ensued.

B. NEW BUSINESS

B.1 Resolutions

B.1.1 Short Title: Double Duty

Rick Kovalcik moved to suspend the rules and request Worldcon 75's Hugo administrators to provide a long lists both as determined by EPH and the prior method of calculating finalists. The motion was seconded. The parliamentarian considered this to be a resolution of the business meeting to request this information. Mr. Kovalcik spoke in favor of his motion. He felt that people were still confused about EPH, and in order to be able to rationally decide next year whether to suspend EPH for a year or do something else with it more data would be good. He felt this was something the meeting would need in order to make a decision.

Jameson Quinn said this information would already be provided under EPH. The regular count is what is used in EPH.

Kate Secor requested that the meeting request that Mr. McCarty and Mr. Oakes use the same existing software to run the comparison, so that we are not putting a burden on next year's administration to provide the software and also to help the Hugo administrators figure out how to run it.

Andrew Adams spoke in favor of the resolution. He felt that the information from the EPH would be quite complex to produce, and so would the process of doing it. However, the original data is relatively would be simple to pull out from that and not be a significant burden on the administration next year.

Doctor Science felt we should be aware that EPH has a high chance of changing who gets a Hugo Award in both the Dramatic Presentation and Art categories. That's what happened with the 2014 data: both the first and second-place pro artists were knocked out by EPH. She felt that although the data is easily derived, if you publish both sets of data, people will know who deserved to win the Hugo, and who didn't.

Lisa Hayes spoke in favor of this motion. Since we passed a motion to re-evaluate EPH for the next several years, it would be helpful to have the data with which to evaluate it.

In answer to a question from Mr. Jameson regarding an opinion from next year's Hugo administrators, Colette Fozard, the deputy Hugo administrator for Worldcon 75, said as a point of personal privilege that while the Hugo committee will implement EPH as now required by the WSFS Constitution, she didn't have any input that would to sway debate of this motion one way or the other.

There was a motion made to call the question, and there was no objection. By a show of hands, the motion to run the nomination data long list using both the original method and EPH passed, and next year's Hugo administrators were requested to run the data using the two different mechanisms and report back the nominating data.

A. BUSINESS PASSED ON

A.6 Short Title: 4 and 6

Debate time was set at 10 minutes. [Click here for the original motion.](#)

Ari Goldstein moved to amend 4 and 6 to add the clause to require annual re-ratification until 2022:

[Provided that any business meeting prior to 2022 may move to suspend the changes introduced by 4 and 6 for the following year's Hugo nominations \(only\).](#)

The motion was seconded and unanimously passed.

Stephen desJardins, the maker of the motion, first made a parliamentary inquiry: would it be a lesser motion to change the references in this amendment from 4 to 5. The presiding officer ruled that that would be a lesser change, and Mr. desJardins so moved, and the motion was seconded.

Mr. desJardins, then spoke in favor of his amended motion. He first compared 5 and 6 against the current 5 and 5. Under EPH, the same five things would still make the ballot, but one more item would be added. In his quick review of the 2015 and 2016 data, about 75 to 80% of the time, what was added was a non-slate work, and the rest of the time, a slate work that got knocked off by EPH got back on. He felt it was more important to have a wide selection of non-slate works to choose from on the final ballot. Using 5 and 6, having something from the slate get back on would not be as big a deal, and therefore he felt this would be a substantial improvement over 5 and 5.

He felt that with 4 and 6 in conjunction with EPH hurt non-slate voters more than it hurt slate voters because slate voters would get one of their nominations knocked off anyway.

The other point he wanted to make is that this would be a lesser change from the current system. The nomination process would stay the same. He also considered the case where there was no slate: would this be a good change on its own merits? He believed it was. The field is more diverse, in terms of subgenres, and expanding the number of works we put on the ballot would be good for everyone.

Cliff Dunn asked how many people actually use all five nomination slots versus four? The presiding officer ruled the question out of order. The parliamentarian reminded everyone that a point of information is to get clarity on what a motion does.

Mr. Goldstein said that Mr. desJardins had said that his amended motion doesn't significantly change the current procedure, but considering that the business meeting just passed EPH, how did Mr. desJardins define "current procedure"? Would current procedure be determined by what was done this year, or what EPH would do next year?

The parliamentarian pointed out that the real question before the meeting was whether this is a greater or smaller change, and it's a smaller change. The deputy presiding officer agreed: it's a smaller change because it strikes three changes from the Constitution.

Lisa Hayes spoke against and pointed out that last year's business meeting spent an inordinate amount of time debating the specific numbers, and she felt those were the numbers we should say yay or nay on.

Ann Marie Rudolph asked if the amended motion would expire in 2022 if not ratified then, and the presiding officer said that it would.

Kate Paulk said the wording on the last sentences of 3.7.1 stated "four equally weighted nominations". She asked if that was required to be changed, and if so, would that be a lesser or a greater change. The presiding officer pointed out that all references to "four" would change to "five" if the amended motion passed. Ms. Paulk clarified that she was asking if the words "equally weighted" needed to be changed in light of EPH. The deputy presiding officer pointed out that that would be changed by EPH, but this motion could stand as an independent change to the Constitution.

A motion was made to call the question to change all references from 4 to 5, which was seconded. Since there was an objection, the vote was taken and the motion to call the question passed.

By a serpentine vote of 84 to 61, the amended motion passed, and 4 and 6 became 5 and 6.

The motion now read:

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution 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:

3.8.1: 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.

[Secretary's Note: The second sentence of 3.8.1 was eliminated by the revisions included in E Pluribus Hugo.]

Without any further debate and by a show of hands, 5 and 6 was ratified and became part of the Constitution at the conclusion of MidAmeriCon II.

Jerry Gieseke proposed a resolution that next year's Hugo administrators run the data both ways. The presiding officer pointed out that all that was needed was lose the sixth nominee.

Rick Kovalcik moved to suspend the rules and adjourn *sine die*. This was out of order, however, because the motion, EPH+, had been postponed definitely and therefore had to

be handled before the meeting could adjourn. There was an objection to suspending the rules, and a two-thirds vote sustained the objection.

B. NEW BUSINESS

B.2 CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

B.2.6 Short Title: EPH+

Debate time was set at 16 minutes. [Click here for the original motion.](#)

Jameson Quinn asked that the same sunset clause be added to this motion. He then pointed out that there is zero extra work, but gets us extra benefit. Mike Stern pointed out that the sunset clause already existed because it only amended Section 3.A.1 of EPH; it didn't change anything else in EPH. Mr. Quinn then withdrew his request and then made a speech in favor of the motion. Since EPH passed earlier in this meeting, this amendment would add no extra work for the Hugo administrators, but it would get us extra benefit.

Dave McCarty was no more against EPH+ than EPH, but since we don't yet have data about what EPH does for real, he felt we should delay this motion until next year, at which time we will have the data points – under the old way, EPH, and EPH+ – and we can make an informed decision.

Daniel Rego asked for clarification. Since this amendment is tied to EPH, if EPH were voted down, would this amendment would be voted down as well. The presiding officer replied that it would.

A motion was made to call the question and seconded. However, since there were objections, a two-thirds vote was necessary, and the motion passed.

The vote for EPH+ passed by a show of hands and was passed on to Worldcon 75 for ratification.

Clark B. Wierda moved to adjourn *sine die*. Without objection, the meeting adjourned *sine die* at 12:48 p.m.

APPENDIX 1

REPORT OF THE MARK PROTECTION COMMITTEE

Membership and Structure

Members of the Mark Protection Committee (“MPC”) from August 2015 through July 2016 were as follows, with the expiration of membership listed in parentheses after their name: Stephen Boucher (elected until 2018), John Coxon (elected until 2017), Linda Deneroff (elected until 2017), Paul Dormer (appointed by Loncon 3 until 2016), Donald E. Eastlake III (elected until 2018), Bruce Farr (elected until 2018), Glenn Glazer (appointed by Sasquan until 2017⁶), Deb Geisler (appointed by Detcon 1 until 2016), Tim Illingworth (elected until 2016), Michael Lee (appointed by Worldcon 75 until 2019), Dave McCarty (elected until 2017), Mark Olson (appointed by MidAmeriCon II until 2018), Kevin Standlee (elected until 2016), and Ben Yalow (elected until 2016). The term for Randall Shepherd expired at the conclusion of the 2015 meeting, and the MPC thanks him for his service to this committee. Kevin Standlee was elected Chairman; Linda Deneroff, Secretary; and Bruce Farr, Treasurer. Although the term for Scott Dennis expired at the conclusion of the 2015 meeting, he was appointed assistant treasurer by the MPC for the current MPC term. Our Canadian agent is Adrienne Seel.

Worldcon Intellectual Property (“WIP”) is a California public benefit/non-profit corporation (also recognized as a 501c3 tax-exempt charity by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service) controlled by the MPC that holds the MPC’s bank account. The WIP 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 was discharged at last year’s first MPC meeting and its tasks assigned to the Hugo Awards Marketing Committee.

Registration of EU Marks:

Over the course of 2015-2016, the MPC (through WIP; see above) has pursued its service mark applications in the EU. Several groups opposed our marks, and throughout the year, we have been in consultation with our solicitors in the UK over how to proceed. We note that without the large donation from Sasquan (far more than the “traditional” donation of US\$0.50 per site selection voter), we could not have afforded to pursue this registration process. Due to the various objections and negotiations, it proved to be a much more expensive project than we originally expected.

In January 2016, we received our uncontested EU mark registration for WORLDCON; and in March 2016, we received our EU mark registration for the Hugo Award logo (but not for HUGO AWARD itself).

There were several groups that opposed registration of the HUGO AWARD mark for various reasons having to do with overlap in their name with “Hugo” in different ways. After sometimes protracted negotiations through our solicitors, we were able to modify

⁶ Glenn Glazer resigned at the end of 2015 and Mike Willmoth was appointed in Glenn’s place.

our registration applications so that all groups withdrew their objections and opposition to our registration on HUGO AWARD. So, sometime later this year we should receive the registration on HUGO AWARD to go with our existing registrations on WORLDCON and the Hugo Award logo.

Note regarding “Brexit”: Our UK solicitors have stated generally to their clients, including us, that the impact of the “Brexit” upon service marks registered in the EU is unknown, and that it is one of the many things that will have to be negotiated between the UK and the EU should the UK actually withdraw from the European Union. Until such time as such a withdrawal happens, it is business as usual, and EU-wide service mark registration applies within the UK.

Other Business:

1. **August 2015:** George Mitchell, who had been hosting the Worldcon.org, NASFiC.org, and WSFS.org web sites for many years, appeared before the WSFS Business Meeting at Sasquan asking if WSFS could move the sites to new servers. The MPC discharged the Worldcon Website Working Group (which had tidied up the domain registration making such moves to new servers easier) and assigned the task of both moving the sites and redesigning them to the Hugo Awards Marketing Committee, which already was responsible for managing the Hugo Awards web site.

After Sasquan concluded, the Mark Protection Committee was contacted by someone trying to create dissention regarding the use of our marks at Sasquan. We did not respond because the use of the WSFS marks by or in connection with a Worldcon is automatically an authorized use.

2. **September 2015:** Sasquan generously presented Worldcon Intellectual Property with a check for \$10,500 in order to allow the MPC to continue its effort to obtain trademark status for its marks in the EU.

Due to our pursuit of trademarks in the EU, we started to be contact by various scammers claiming to have received trademark applications by others and asking whether we’d authorized these applications. Our policy is to ignore these email requests.

3. **October 2015:** After a website crash, the Hugo Winner logos for 2015 (and several subsequent years) were recovered thanks to René Walling. Additionally a winner-logo question was added to the FAQ on www.HugoAwards.org.

Later that month, the MPC was contacted by Duane Brewster regarding his creation of four possible WSFS logos for the WSFS website. However, the MPC was unable to reach a consensus and let the matter drop.

4. **November 2015:** The MPC was contacted by David Steffen regarding an anthology of works from the longer list of stories nominated by Hugo voters that he was considering. He planned to call the anthology, *The Long List Anthology* and wondered how acceptable it might be to use the Hugo name in an explanatory sub-title. Since

the contents of the book would be genuine, non-adulterated Hugo-nominated fiction, the MPC had no objection.

Also in late November, Sasquan made a \$1,000 donation to TheHugoAward.org in support of the website and extra hosting bandwidth for the CoverItLive show at MidAmeriCon II.

5. **December 2015:** Jason Lorr, one of the producers of *Orphan Black*, asked the MPC if it might use its Hugo Award in a scene for an upcoming episode. The MPC pointed out that they didn't need the permission because they'd won the award; it is theirs to do with as they please. However, the MPC did ask to be informed as to when the episode is scheduled to air so that it could be publicized the Hugo Awards website.

Also in December, Steven Silver asked if the Jovian Awards were anything the MPC might be interested in. They didn't take the Hugos' name in vain, but apparently they were created and sent to the five individuals whose works came in second to No Award at Spokane. Since there was no infringement on our mark, the MPC took no action.

6. **January 2016:** As part of the recommendations made by the 2014 WSFS Meeting, WIP was instructed to take over the MPC banking functions when convenient to do so. Driving in Indiana in January, Scott Dennis was able to close the old MPC bank account there, and all WIP banking was consolidated in our account with US Bank in California.
7. **February 2016:** We received an email informing us that Milan Jaram was claiming to be a 2015 Hugo nominee for Best Fan Artist and Best Professional Artist. We responded that someone can be a "Hugo Award nominee" with a single nomination (even from him/herself). That was why we deprecated the term "Hugo Award nominee" and began using "finalist" instead.

Also in February we were again notified that the Indian Colonoscopy Worldcon was using the website, <http://worldcon2016.com/>. They are in India, where we have never held a Worldcon, have no legal protection, and where there are no plans to hold a Worldcon in the foreseeable future. We continue to do nothing but monitor the situation. However, Don Eastlake pointed out that we need to have documentary evidence that we have put them on notice that they are infringing. He suggested sending them a written letter, preferably by International Registered mail return receipt requested, carefully not putting "Worldcon" in the return address to maximize their probability of accepting the mail, pointing out that we have the senior mark, registered in many countries, etc., and demanding they stop. Once we actually have solid documentary evidence of contacting them, we could then initiate proceedings to have the worldcon2016.com domain name taken away from them. (They seem to be registered through GoDaddy. The name seems not to be actually registered by the conference but by the company that did their website.) Kevin agreed to send the letter.

At around the same time, Andy Porter informed the MPC that a Swedish group was using the term “Hugo Prize”. Using Google Translate, Kevin determined that this appears to be a new name for an existing award that has been around for 30 years. The MPC decided to hold off on any action until we get our EU mark registration over the hump, and then perhaps we could ask them to change their name to the Theorell Prize (the award being named for Hugo Theorell) to reduce any potential confusion.

8. **March 2016:** The MPC was again informed, this time from Mike Glycer, of another possible infringement by a FOX-TV sports reporter in Charlotte handing out a green creature and calling it “The Hugo” award. Kevin wrote him a polite letter requesting him to cease.

Also in March, Sean Wallace of Prime Books asked the MPC to again grant him a license for an anthology containing a selection of Hugo Awards and Nebula Awards winners from *Asimov’s SF*. The license was issued in early April.

9. **April 2016:** On behalf of MidAmeriCon II, Dave McCarty inquired if their graphic artists could alter the Hugo Award logo to change the color to fit the template they wanted to use for slides when they made the announcement of the Hugo finalists. We pointed out that the way in which that the proposed changes were a violation of our published usage guidelines two different ways, with the logo color distorted and the logo elements rearranged. MidAmeriCon II elected to not include the Hugo Award logo in their slides.

Also in April, Linda put together a proposed ten-year budget for MPC/WIP. Discussion of a long-term planning budget continued throughout the year; however, the committee deferred any specific action, including possibly requesting WSFS sanction to increase the “traditional donation” by which Worldcons fund the MPC’s operations, until next year.

10. **May 2016:** A company called Kustom-tees-4-u tried to sell tee-shirts with “Worldcon is my Superbowl” imprinted on it (as well as similar shirts using the names of other conventions). Since they also infringed on the NFL, we decided to let their highly paid lawyers handle it, and, indeed, the site no longer offers such shirts for sale.
11. **June 2016:** After ten years’ worth of attempts, the WSFS/Worldcon/NASFiC websites were redesigned and their hosting migrated to pair.com and the mailing lists reconstituted. Maintenance of these sites (and the Hugo Awards web site) is currently the responsibility of the Hugo Awards Marketing Committee.

At the end of June, Chuck Tingle, a Hugo Award finalist, advertised a tee-shirt for sale. While the shirt itself made no mention of any of our marks, the description the website read “Please enjoy this hugo award nomination commorative [sic] t-shirt.” However, the MPC took no action because it was merely descriptive.

Mark Protection Committee/WIP Financial Report – 1 July 2015 through 30 June 2016

	Income	Expense Paid by MPC/WIP	Balance Checking Accounts
Cash on hand as of 1 July 2015			\$6,758.78
Deposit July 15, 2015 LoneStarCon 3 pledge and adj to bank fees	\$1813.61		\$8,572.39
Cover it Live 8-6-15		\$149.00	\$8,423.39
Reimbursements at Sasquan (Standlee, others): Website/hosting cost		\$381.15	\$8,042.24
Reimbursements at Sasquan (Standlee, others): Bank fees, Misc.		\$25.95	\$8,016.29
Sasquan Funding for WIP Deposit 9-8-15	\$10,500.00		\$18,516.29
Cover it Live 9-2-15		\$151.00	\$18,365.29
Deposit 11-25-15 Sasquan Grant	\$1,000.00		\$19,365.29
Wire 11-9-15 British Solicitors for Trademark work		1,655.25	\$17,710.04
California Sec of State filing 12-23-15		\$20.00	\$17,690.04
Wire 12-14-15 British Solicitors for Trademark work		\$1,500.00	16,190.04\$
Wire Fee 12-17-15		\$46.00	\$16,144.04
Wire Fee 1-15-16		\$46.00	\$16,098.04
Wire 2-5-16 British Solicitors for Trademark work		\$4,500.00	\$11,598.04
Wire Fee 3-14-16		\$46.00	\$11,552.04
Pair Networks 5-9-16 Website		\$65.69	\$11,486.35
Pair Networks 6-2-16 Website		\$39.31	\$11,447.04
Wire 6-2-16 British Solicitors for Trademark work		\$3,750.00	\$7,697.04
Balance of our cash accounts as of 30 June 2016			\$7,697.04

Notes:

-) **Note 1:** The amounts paid to the British Solicitors, Clarke Willmott LLC, were paid in British Pounds. Amounts shown are after conversion to US Dollars via wire transfers at U S Bank.
-) **Note 2:** The committee changed its fiscal year for reporting to end June 30 as of the last report. This report is for a 12-month period.

The committee thanks Sasquan for its generosity in supporting our efforts financially well beyond its mandated contribution requirement.

**Hugo Award Marketing Committee Report to Mark Protection Committee
September 2015 – July 2016**

The Hugo Awards Marketing Committee (“HAMC”) members are Dave McCarty (Chair), Craig Miller, Cheryl Morgan, Mark Olson, and Kevin Standlee. HAMC is established by the WSFS Mark Protection Committee, and its chair and members are appointed by the MPC annually.

The HAMC continues to work with Worldcon committees to support the marketing of the Hugo Awards, to handle inquiries from the press regarding the Awards as needed, and to maintain TheHugoAwards.org, including maintaining the list of past finalists and winners, and archiving the “Section 3.11.4” reports of nomination and voting information issued by Hugo Award administrators. The HAMC also provides the live text-based coverage via CoverItLive of the Hugo Awards Ceremony. (This is not the streaming video coverage, which, when provided, is at the expense of the hosting Worldcon.) The cost of the CoverItLive coverage (around \$150/year) is paid by the MPC, sometimes with grants obtained from elsewhere.

This year, the HAMC also took on the task of managing the WSFS-owned websites Worldcon.org, NASFiC.org, and WSFS.org. We moved all three sites from the previous location provided by George Mitchell to the commercial site at Pair.com. We took this opportunity to redesign the sites so that they share a general resemblance to each other and to TheHugoAwards.org. All four sites (including the Hugo Awards site) now use the same platform (WordPress), and the administrative “keys” are in multiple hands to minimize the chance of the sites being “frozen” for long periods due to lack of available people to maintain them. We thank George Mitchell for his many years of service to WSFS hosting the sites, and Chaz Baden and Donald Eastlake III for their work maintaining those sites in the past.

APPENDIX 2 REPORT OF THE YA AWARD STUDY COMMITTEE

EXHIBIT 1: THE HUGO VS. THE CAMPBELL

The Campbell and WSFS

In 1973, the Campbell Award was created to honor John W. Campbell (1910-1971), the editor of the *Analog Science Fiction and Fact* magazine for over 30 years. The Campbell wasn't a WSFS Award, but from the beginning it was presented at Worldcon. It was allowed on the Hugo Award ballot as an exception and is mentioned briefly in the WSFS Constitution.

Prior to 1980, individual Worldcons were allowed to include additional non-Hugo awards on the ballot (such as the short-lived Gandalf award). The Noreascon II Business Meeting in 1980 amended the Constitution to prohibit any award from the ballot except the thereafter constitutionally approved Hugo and the Campbell.

For a non-Hugo award to be permitted on the Hugo ballot, it must be approved by the Business Meeting and amended to the Constitution. Such an award does not need to follow the Hugo methodology to qualify.

Administration of the Awards

Features of the Hugo Best Novel:

-) Rules for awarding the Hugo determined by Members of WSFS
-) Ballot administered by the current Worldcon and Hugo Administration Committee
-) Selection and nomination: previous, current, and following Worldcon members nominate; only current members vote
-) Each Worldcon funds the trophy creation and base design, and designates someone to present the award
-) All nominees receive a pin and the winner receives a Hugo trophy with base
-) Awarded for a science fiction or fantasy story of forty thousand (40,000) words or more
-) 'Dual Eligibility' not allowed in the literature categories; a work cannot be nominated for more than one literature Hugo, due to the word count divisions

Features of the John W. Campbell Award for Best Writer:

-) Sponsored by the publisher of *Analog*, currently Dell Magazine (i.e., not a WSFS Award)
-) Rules for awarding the Campbell determined by the award sponsor
-) Ballot administered by the current Worldcon and Hugo Administration Committee, in the same manner as the Hugo

-) Selection and nomination: previous, current, and following Worldcon members nominate; only current members vote
-) Sponsor funds the award plaque and designates someone to present the award
-) All nominees receive a pin and the winner receives a plaque
-) Awarded to an author, a new SF writer whose first work was published in a professional publication in the previous two years
-) “Dual eligibility” allowed; an author can be nominated for the Campbell and their work can be nominated for a Hugo

Main Differences Between the Awards

The main features highlighted by the above comparison are:

-) Sponsorship and Funding
-) Ballot Administration and Award Presentation
-) Selection and Nomination Process
-) Recipient and Category
-) Dual Eligibility
-) Award Trophy/Plaque and Nominee Pin

With respect to a YA Award, these issues are addressed further in Exhibit 2.

EXHIBIT 2: YOUNG ADULT AWARD CONSIDERATIONS (BASED ON EXHIBIT 1)

Sponsorship and Funding

The Campbell Award continues to have a non-WSFS sponsor due to the historical features of its creation in 1973. Consultation with members of the Hugo Committees has indicated that no sponsor would be required if the award was established by WSFS rule. It would be a WSFS-sponsored award and the rules would be set by a vote of WSFS at the BM (and thus added to the Constitution). A WSFS-sponsored award would be paid for by Worldcons.

Ballot Administration and Award Presentation

As a WSFS-sponsored award, administration of the ballot and presentation of the award would be managed by each year’s Worldcon and the Hugo Award committee members.

Selection and Nomination Process

As a WSFS-sponsored award, nominations would be determined by the previous, current, and following year’s Worldcon members. The current Worldcon members would vote on the final ballot.

Recipient and Category

Currently, the text-based literature awards presented by the Worldcon Membership follow two organizational methods, awarded to: 1) work (categorized by length, the Hugos), and 2) author (categorized by time in the field, the Campbell). A YA Award would offer a third variation, presented to work (organized by age group).

YA/Teen Lit Definitions

Creating a Campbell-like award decreases the need for a strict definition of YA. As demonstrated by the 2015 YA Hugo Committee Report, attempts to define YA/teen lit produce extremely varied results, emphasizing intended audience, publishing categories and merchandizing, age of the protagonist, or elements internal to the narrative. A number of awards have chosen not to provide a definition.

Given the concern that we not recognize the same work as a finalist in more than one Hugo category, a Hugo category for YA would require that a constitutional amendment either distinguish YA from the existing fiction categories, or force authors/Hugo administrators to choose which of the two categories was most appropriate. With a Campbell-like award, the administrative need for an explicit definition is no longer necessary.

Finally, it is often argued that constitutional provisions function best when they leave room for the discretion of individual Worldcons, as well as changing times and interpretations. After deliberation, the committee concluded that it is preferable to keep references to teen/YA literature as general as possible.

Word Count

Although a minority argued for word limits to the award, the majority consensus was that a word count criteria was not necessary for a non-Hugo award. The original Hugo awards did not feature a defined word count, although word count divisions became criteria of the Hugo fiction literature categories following codification in the 1960s. Although those codifications were related to publishing norms at the time, the recent trends in industry, especially with respect to teen/YA literature, do not coincide with those earlier categories.

According to industry observers, teen lit/YA is one of the most flexible categories with respect to word count, encompassing an extremely wide range. (As word count examples: *The Giver* 43,617, *Froi of the Exiles* 163,701, and *Deathly Hallows* 198,227.) This variety is a strong argument for not using strict word count criteria. Because teen/YA lit is such a flexible category, an effective award should reflect that reality.

Dual Eligibility

As with the Campbell Award, a book nominated for a YA Award could also be nominated for a Hugo Award or Campbell Award, as these awards each have different criteria. As already established under the current rules, finalists have the opportunity to decline their nomination before the list is published.

Award Trophy/Plaque and Nominee Pin

The design and physical manifestation of the award itself is dependent on the designated name of the award. See Exhibit 3.

EXHIBIT 3: NAMING AN AWARD AND DESIGNING A TROPHY/PLAQUE

Naming an Award

If an award proposal should pass the Business Meeting, the next step would be to establish a name for the award. The Committee spent quite a bit of time debating this issue over the course of the past year. We determined that it needed greater study, preferably by the (re)formation of a Committee.

The naming of the award ultimately proved to be an incredibly complicated matter. While many YA awards have been named after people, others bear names referencing things or ideas. Regardless of which direction we took, the Committee found itself grappling with legal consequences, copyright matters, social ramifications, and the wide-ranging experiences of young readers. Moreover, we felt that it was important to be aware that some authors/symbols might bias nominators towards specific genres.

Although we discussed naming the award after certain influential authors, the Committee was inclined towards a thing, symbol, or other idea that was especially evocative. We hoped to capture the transformative, transportational, and captivating power of books for young people. It became clear that this complex and delicate matter was beyond the scope of this year's committee, and should be a separate matter if an award is passed.

We propose, therefore, the creation of a separate committee, should this year's award proposal pass, to solicit and evaluate name ideas and thoroughly research all the options. We therefore left the name blank in this vote's proposal, with the provision that filling in the blank would not be considered a greater change and could be done as part of the ratification process.

Award Appearance

The Committee briefly addressed the issue of an award appearance, researching the logistics and financial issues surrounding the creation of a trophy, statuette, or plaque (not all included here). The costs associated with the award itself include the trophy/plaque and engraving (with lapel pin and ribbons). As mentioned in Exhibit 1, the Campbell Award plaque is funded by the publisher of *Analog*, while each year's Worldcon covers the Hugo rockets. Hugo trophies usually cost in the neighborhood of \$200-400 for the rocket and its base. A plaque costs around \$60-80. The initial design of the award and its selection must also be taken into account.

The appearance of the proposed award cannot be established until the name of the award is approved. It seems best that the costs and time needed to solicit a design be postponed until the award is (potentially) passed and ratified.

APPENDIX 3
REPORT OF THE SERIES HUGO COMMITTEE
August 2015 –July 2016

Members: Warren Buff (chair), Jared Dashoff, Todd Dashoff, Eric Flint, Chris Gerrib, Tim Illingworth, Joshua Kronengold, Bill Lawhorn, Michael Lee, Simon Litten, Farah Mendlesohn, Mark Olson, Steve Saffel, Pablo Vazquez, Peter de Weerd, Clark Wierda

The Series Hugo Committee has studied the issue of whether and how to add a Hugo Award recognizing storytelling in the form of a series of stories, and has come to a consensus on a recommendation for a new category. This report will close with a motion to add that category and adjust other rules to account for such a change.

Our Approach

We began with last year's proposal, which was tuned to reflect the market realities of a trilogy written on a new writer contract (three volumes of around 80K words each) while being broadly worded to allow series of less typical forms to compete (say, a series composed primarily of shorter fiction). While we don't expect a modern award to often feature the same mix of story types as the 1966 one-off category, we preserved the possibility. In order to account for the likely scenario that Hugo-worthy series would compete with each other (with an all-time great losing out to another), then continue publishing, the proposal included a clause to allow a series to become eligible again after a prior nomination by producing the initial word-count of 240K again, across at least two further installments. Under no circumstances, however, was a previous winner to receive new eligibility. Due to a full schedule, the proposal did not receive debate last year, and was instead referred to committee.

We considered four initial questions:

1. What is a series? Is it stories published/promoted as series? Stories tied together by characters or setting? Can it be written by multiple authors?
2. What about subseries? This is, for lack of a better turn of phrase, the "Discworld Problem".
3. Do we want a Hugo? Maybe we want a Campbell system like the YA award? Maybe we want a juried prize?
4. When can a series win a Hugo?

We dispensed with #3 quickly, settling on an attempt to write a Hugo category. We don't believe WSFS would be interested in sponsoring a juried award, and the issues with defining a boundary for YA that make a Campbell-like solution so appealing aren't problematic for series. We can easily define an objective boundary for when eligibility begins on a series, and have provided what we believe is a viable definition for such a category here. We had some discussion on the subject of attempting a person-type award

(Best Series Writer) or an award to recognize individual installments in a series (Best Installment), though neither of these gained sufficient traction to work into a full proposal.

We also rather quickly settled the question of multiple wins (implied in #4) – no series should be eligible after it has won. This does, however, interact with the subseries issue, and has the same general solution: let the voters decide (and the same general approach, with some word-count and volume-count requirements, informs the answer to the first question). A series could win, and then another series, set in the same world, might be nominated, but this would be dependent on the voters feeling they were sufficiently distinct to nominate the new material without reference to the old. We also recognized that attempting to verify completeness with regard to series is both a fool’s errand and would likely require flying in the face of the way series are written and enjoyed. A supposedly completed series might be expanded later, and some series aren’t really intended to conclude, possibly not even with the original creator’s death. Instead, the category is meant to evaluate series as they exist in the year of consideration.

The inconsistency between the reference to “its last appearance on the final ballot” in 3.3.X and the reference to “received sufficient nominations to appear on the final ballot” in 3.2.2 is deliberate. We wanted to write the category such that an author could decline a nomination of a series and later accept one after the series has been expanded without having to worry about word and volume counts. For instance, if a series is nominated after book 4, when the author knows that book 5 will end the series and be more representative, the author could safely decline nomination without worrying about a potential disqualification under 3.2.2. This is already accounted for to a degree under 3.2.5, but we mean for it to unambiguously allow an expanded series to be eligible when earlier versions did not appear on the ballot (whereas the interaction of 3.2.2, 3.2.5, and 3.9.1 might be subject to some interpretation based on timing), and for a substantially expanded series (with multiple new volumes and a high enough new word count to qualify as a series in the first place) to be eligible regardless of a previous appearance on the final ballot.

Points of Divergence

The most contentious part of the proposal, within the committee’s discussions, has been the word-count requirement. While the current length proposed reflects a typical trilogy of adult novels (and covers nearly all recent YA series), it does fail when it comes to the eligibility of Middle Grades work, which would sometimes fail to reach the 240K mark even with four books. Potentially, the Business Meeting might choose to reduce the word-count, or explicitly tie it to the length requirement of the Best Novel category. The latter proposal was the most strongly supported minority position within the committee, but we felt it might serve to prejudice voters even more strongly towards series composed exclusively of novels, when there are noteworthy series composed of shorter works being published today. In this proposal, “volume” is taken to mean any story published

separately from the others in a series. Hence, a trilogy of novels, an extremely long novel and two shorter pieces, a pair of long novels and a novella, or a larger number of shorter pieces might make up the requisite three volumes (and total word count) - or even a set of stories greatly exceeding the length and number requirements (a condition which we can foresee as being quite frequent in the earlier years of such an award).

That length also serves us well in the quest to balance the fresh eligibility requirements. Doing away with a length and volumes requirement entirely, or setting them too low, would run the risk of the category being dominated by repeat contenders from year to year. Setting it too high, particularly by using a multiple of the existing length of the series as the requirement, would result in long-running series only getting a single shot at the new category. Fundamentally, we are addressing the question of when an expanded work is a new work. Previously, the general rule of thumb was to consider a work new when its length was expanded such that it fit into a new category. But this is new territory, and it likely needs new standards.

In the interest of striking a balance, we chose to stick with the original proposal's requirements for fresh eligibility. Some series will have the ability to be nominated frequently, but only those on the most frenetic publishing schedules. Ultimately, this conflict arises because series are, by their nature, not precisely a good fit with the "work" style categories (all of which are discrete and completed when they are nominated and are meant to be judged in their entirety) and the "entity" style categories (all of which are meant to be judged on their annual output alone, even if this fails in practice). We mean for a series to be judged in its entirety as of the year of eligibility, even though it is potentially a continuing, incomplete work. Thus, we have proposed a set of rules that strike the balance by being somewhat more complex than either the work or entity categories.

The largest change we have made to the proposal before the meeting last year was to simplify the procedures for dealing with the subseries issue. The language proposed for this section (3.8.X) mirrored the language proposed last year as "Multiple Nominations". As the meeting, at the request of experienced Hugo administrators, chose to amend that proposal, the language for section 3.8.X has been changed to match it. The question of whether and when subseries are eligible is addressed to a large degree in the category definition itself: we require that a series be "published as a single series with a unifying plot, characters, or setting". In general, this requirement should discourage the invention of ever more numerous subseries by casual literary critics. While it is possible that an author might publish multiple series set within a single world (and is, in fact, somewhat common), these will typically bear a degree of distinction from each other by their choice of focal events and characters; if the events or characters of one story are integral to the action or meaning of another, it is likely that they are the same series. The precise distinction of this point must be left to the judgment of the nominators, but it should be clear that a single volume may not be nominated as part of more than one series in a given year, nor win as part of more than one series ever. To that end, when fans disagree

on whether a set or subset of works composes a series, only the more-supported position should be recognized on the final ballot.

We have also refined the initial definition of a series. Where last year's proposal called for "a work of science fiction or fantasy, published as a single series with a unifying plot, characters, or setting", this year's proposal has been revised to call for "a multi-volume science fiction or fantasy story, unified by elements such as plot, characters, setting, and presentation". The change is meant to downplay the role of the publisher in determining what makes a series, while still calling attention to the publisher's efforts as the series "presentation". The unity of title, cover design, marketing materials, and so forth that publishers assign to series is helpful in finding series, but not a key requirement for a set of potentially related volumes to be one. The order of the unifying elements is deliberate, as they are in the order of likelihood to indicate a series. A continuous plot between volumes nearly guarantees it, without being a strict requirement, and will almost certainly entail shared characters or setting. In the absence of such a plot, however, shared characters can be a strong indicator of a series, as might be the case with superhero stories. Setting is a bit weaker, still, as an indicator, but might be particularly indicative of shared world series. We have chosen "and" as our conjunction deliberately, as series will nearly always have at least two of these unifying elements.

The Case for a Best Series Hugo

The committee feels that the contemporary publishing field favors series fiction, and that the lack of a category to recognize series represents a serious disconnect between the Hugo Awards and the market. Looking at Best Novel finalists over the past decade or so, series novels represent a majority of the nominees, yet only a handful of the winners, with later installments particularly disadvantaged. Clearly, the Hugo nominators feel that high-quality work is being done in series novels, yet the Hugo voters have a taste for stand-alone novels, or at least novels that can be approached without any background. This represents a change from earlier eras, when the publishing field was smaller and readers tended to be able to consume a higher proportion of it. In decades past, series novels managed to hold their own against stand-alones, even dominating the Best Novel category at times. In spite of this, fans still felt a need to hold a one-off Hugo for Best All-Time Series in 1966. Bringing back a Best Series category as a regular award would help us adjust to changes in both the market and our critical tastes.

One of the most common tests applied to potential new categories is to examine whether at least 10 Hugo-worthy examples per year exist. Looking to the Locus long-lists (to get a deeper feel for the field), around 55% of the novels in the SF and Fantasy categories come from series, with around 30% representing a novel late enough in the series to qualify for nomination under our proposal, or an average of about 13 per year. Furthermore, some of the most popular series did not place a novel on the Locus lists (reasons might include a lack of overlap between series readers and award voters, or a

gap between perception of the book *as a novel* and the series as a whole). Considering the likely additions of the popular series and the occasional series in a format other than novel-length installments, it is safe to say that 10-15 series per year could qualify for the proposed category at a sufficient level of quality to represent the Hugo Awards well, with at least a third of those series being beyond their third book. The category would likely still see its share of well-received trilogies without becoming a “Best Trilogy” category by default. With this in mind, we feel that the publishing field provides sufficient high-quality material to justify the category, while its marketing apparatus promotes quality series in such a way that fans are likely to be able to reach some degree of consensus when nominating in the category.

Conclusion and Proposal

In our discussions, we have approached the topic from the perspectives of writers, editors, academics, Hugo administrators, and fans who read series with varying degrees of enjoyment. This proposal does not represent everyone’s ideal take on how to recognize series, but instead the most viable compromise position we could reach, and we recommend its passage.

Minority Report by Chris Gerrib

One of the committee members, Eric Flint, has quite properly described the 40,000 word definition of “Best Novel” as “an archaeological relic from a completely different era in publishing.” The minority is concerned that, in years to come, our definition of “Best Series” consisting of 240,000 words will be similarly viewed as a relic. The minority note that, with the increase in independent and electronic publishing, acceptable word count for a novel is again in flux.

We would suggest that the best course of action would be to rely on the existing Hugo definition of “novel” (40,000 words). If and when the WSFS decides that definition needs to be updated, an established process for such an update exists.

Moved, that the proposal contained in the report should be modified as follows (changes in bold):

3.3.X Best Series. A work of science fiction or fantasy, published as a single series with a unifying ~~A multi-volume science fiction or fantasy story, unified by elements such as plot, characters, or setting, and presentation,~~ appearing in at least three (3) ~~volumes consisting of a total of at least 240,000 words~~ novels as defined in 3.3.1 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 upon the publication, since it qualified for its last appearance on the final ballot and by the end of the previous calendar year, of at least two (2) additional novels as defined in 3.3.1 ~~volumes consisting of a total~~

~~of at least 240,000 words~~, and further provided it has not won under 3.3.X before.

Minority Report by Joshua Kronengold

While the committee has identified a substantial problem in the award—that it is hostile to series, which have become a backbone of the field (a restriction that is roundly ignored by the membership, but only inconsistently), a minority believes that creating a specific “series award” is unnecessary, and only corrects the imbalance for the specific case of very-long series of very long novels, which is common now, rather than generally. As such, we propose the following amendment which attempts to deal with the issues (that series are expressly verboten from being nominated except as individual works or completed epics; that while works can become re-eligible as part of larger works, this only happens when changing categories, and finally that the “Best Novel” category is far too broad to cover both very long works like series and novel, to the detriment of both) on their own, rather than wrap them up in a specific exception.

Moved, that the proposal contained in the report should be modified by substitution, replacing it with the following:

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** or **deleting** words as follows:

1. Modify existing Section 3.2.2 as follows:

3.2.2: A work shall not be eligible if in a prior year it (or a substantial subset of same) received sufficient nominations to appear on the final award ballot, unless it is included with at least enough material that has not yet appeared on a Hugo final award ballot such that the new material is enough to make the minimum length for the nominated category, or half the minimum length if it has not yet been nominated under its current category.

2. Modify 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~~ or as part of a larger work considered as ending with the volume(s) published in the year of eligibility.

3. Modify existing Section 3.2.5 as follows:

3.2.5 In the written fiction story categories (3.3.1-3.3.4X 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.

4. Insert the following section after existing Section 3.3.4:

3.3.X Best Tome. A work of science fiction or fantasy, consisting of a total of at least 240,000 words.

5. Insert the following before existing Section 3.8.3:

3.8.X For nominations of works under Section 3.3.X, if a work is eligible in multiple forms (by itself, and/or as part of one or more larger works) and if multiple relevant works receive sufficient nominations to appear on the final ballot, only the version which received more nominations shall appear.

Minority Report by Mark Olson

I do not believe that adding a Series Hugo is desirable, but if the WSFS BM decides otherwise, I believe that the committee's motion is a workable, well-thought-through implementation and is definitely preferable to any of the alternatives I have heard proposed. Accordingly, I will vote against amendments to the committee's proposal, but I will also vote against it being adopted.

APPENDIX 4
2 PAGE SUMMARY OF EPH COMMPARISON

EPH Ballot Results On 2016 Hugo Race

Category	Ballot Slots Changed	Long List Spots Changed
Novel	0	1
Novella	0	0
Novelette	1	0
Short Story	2	0
Related Work	2	0
Graphic Story	3	0
Editor (Short)	0	0
Editor (Long)	1	0
Professional Artist	2	0
Semiprozine	0	1
Fanzine	0	0
Fancast	2	0
Fan Writer	2	0
Fan Artist	0	1
John W. Campbell Award	1	1
Total	16	4

EPH Ballot Results On 1941 Hugo Race

Category	Ballot Slots Changed	Long List Spots Changed
Novel	0	2
Novella	0	0
Novelette	1	1
Short Story	2	1
Graphic Story	3	0
Editor (Short)	0	0
Professional Artist	0	2
Fanzine	0	0
Fan Artist	0	0
John W. Campbell Award	0	0
Total	0	6

The full 51 page report can be found at https://midamericon2.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/EPH_Analysis_For-MidAmeriCon.pdf

APPENDIX 5

MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

[Click here for the discussion of EPH.](#)

The Committee of the Whole was set for ten minutes, with Tim Illingworth, presiding.

Dave McCarty reiterated Ms. Paulk's question: how much effort did he think was involved on the Hugo administration team to work with EPH. He said that if you had blind faith in computer systems, it wouldn't be very hard. If you want to check anything, however, it would take more time than the administrators have. And it's not to check everything; that's to check anything. His initial report took months to produce because of all the checking; the current report was not checked as extensively, and he had to trust that everything was done correctly. And that made him uncomfortable.

Mr. Lynch then re-asked his question: did Mr. McCarty think EPH was a good idea. Mr. McCarty responded that he did not think this was a good idea. It's opaque. The only way to check that the administrators have done their job correctly is to get access to the raw data, which is never released to anyone (except for this testing). However, he tried his best to be very helpful to Mr. Quinn. He did so because this is an interesting voting system, and he hoped his personal feelings did affect his assistance.

Mr. Olson asked if there were significant differences on last year's nominees and winners between the original system and under EPH. Mr. McCarty responded that there were differences, but the significance depends on the individual voters. He believes that EPH was slightly more effective this year than last year, but he felt that the slating behavior was actually stronger last year than this year. In other words, EPH was more effective this year against weaker slating. And it wasn't innately predictable as to when it would be strongly effective and when it wouldn't.

Nathanael Nerode, who has studied voting theory as a hobbyist, asked to see the Fancast category. The current system the Hugos use to select finalists has a couple of issues in theory, one of which is bloc voting, because it's extremely susceptible to slates. There is a lot of literature on how to make a system in which a slate cannot dominate a list. It's called the representative committee problem in the literature: You're trying to generate a list, and you don't want a small fraction to be able to fill the entire list. Systems that don't allow a small fraction to fill the list are called proportional systems or semi-proportional systems. The current system is not proportional; EPH is proportional. He didn't know if it was the best proportional system, but no slate would be able to fill the ballot.

Mr. McCarty agreed that EPH is a proportional system. However, the end result of the proportional system would be that our small, perverse minority of 10 to 15 percent – possibly 20 percent, but more likely 10 to 15 – would still going to control, on average, 80 percent of the ballots, and he felt that that meant putting in a lot in for a little benefit. Mr. Nerode disputed that. He felt it meant they would control 20 to 50 percent, and he felt the Fancast category demonstrated that.

Rachael Acks asked how difficult would it be to explain the way the system is run to potential voters, and what would that do to the faith of the voters in the system. Mr. McCarty felt he could not speak to that because he is not a public relations person, but he thought it would be “a little difficult”.

Dave Wallace, on the other hand, noted that in the information session that was held earlier in the week, he was able to boil the essence of the system down to one slide. He felt EPH was a little more complicated than what we currently use, but the key parts of the system can be explained in a very few number of lines.

Rick Kovalcik disagreed. He has a computer science degree and disagreed with Mr. Wallace. He asked Mr. McCarty what he thought EPH would do to the Dramatic Presentation categories. Mr. McCarty responded that he thought the Dramatic Presentation categories would be most consistently the thing that’s changed most often. Mr. Quinn disagreed, and Mr. McCarty did not have any data to back up his statement.

Ari Goldstein asked if Mr. McCarty had found any errors or problems when he went through the old data sets, and, and if so, how significant were they when run through the computers?

Mr. McCarty explained that EPH relies heavily on canonicalization. For EPH to work correctly, everything that’s germane has to be 100% canonicalized. Effectively it’s run only against the top 20 finalists because everything below was noise. But for the Top 20, one has to find every variation of an answer that should be included, because the difference of plus one vote or minus one vote can materially affect what’s eliminated. Under the current system, plus/minus one vote most frequently does not change their position on the long list, so the Hugo administration team generally leaves that alone. Therefore, there was a lot of clean up to do in order to run the simulation. That said, the Hugo administrative team does that during the course of the nomination process. So that specific thing not a legitimate reason to say it can’t be done. The work load is more, but not impossible, and it doesn’t happen at crunch time. That happens when you have leisure over the months of people voting.

With the time limit expired, the Committee of the Whole rose and reported to the main meeting.

APPENDIX 6
HOW TO JOIN THE SMOFS MAILING LIST

If you are interested in joining the SMOFs mailing list, please go to:

<http://listsmgt.sflovers.org/mailman/listinfo/smofs>

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.

The info page says:

“If you are subscribing and think 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 step as it will decrease the delay in getting you added. You may say you attended the WSFS Business Meeting at MidAmeriCon II as your background information if you wish.