

2014 WSFS BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES
LONCON 3, THE 2013 WORLDCON
Friday August 15, Saturday August 16, and Sunday, August 17, 2014

All meetings were held in Capital Suite 11 of the ExCeL London Docklands in London, England. Donald E. Eastlake III presided over all three sessions of the Business Meeting. The Officers were:

Presiding Officer:	Donald E. Eastlake III
Secretary:	Linda Deneroff
Timekeeper:	Jill Eastlake
Assistant Timekeeper:	Jesi Pershing
Videographer:	Lisa Hayes

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

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

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

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

Preliminary Business Meeting, Friday, August 15, 2014

The meeting was called to order at 10:19 a.m. The business meeting staff consisted of Donald E. Eastlake III, Presiding Officer; Linda Deneroff, Secretary; Jill Eastlake, Timekeeper; Lisa Hayes, Videographer.

1. BUSINESS PASSED ON FROM LONESTARCON 3

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

1.1 Short Title: Two-Thirds Is Good Enough, Part 1

Moved: to amend Section 3.4.3 of the Constitution by replacing “three fourths (3/4)” with “two thirds (2/3)”.

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

1.2 Short title: Two-Thirds Is Good Enough, Part 2

Moved: to amend Section 3.4.2 of the Constitution by replacing “(3/4)” with “two thirds (2/3)”.

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

1.3 Short Title: A Matter of Trust

Moved, to strike out Article 1, Subsection 1.5.3:

~~**1.5.3:** Electronic distribution of publications, if offered, shall be opt-in.~~

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

1.4 Short Title: WSFS Accountability Act of 2013

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution for the purpose of adding a requirement that all financial reports submitted include information about the organization that sponsored the original event by adding words as follows:

2.9.5: All financial reports shall include the convention’s name, mailing address and other contact information, including the name of the person certifying and submitting the report and, if applicable, the name of the convention’s parent organization, its tax-exempt status, the location of incorporation, its address, website, email and other contact information, and the names and titles of its current officers.

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

1.5 Short Title: Best Fan Artist

Moved, to amend Best Fan Artist as follows:

3.3.16: Best Fan Artist.

An artist or cartoonist whose work has appeared through publication in semiprozines or fanzines or through other public, non-professional, display (including at a convention or conventions) during the previous calendar year.

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

1.6 Short Title: In the Zone

Moved, to remove zone restrictions on memberships to the Mark Protection Committee ("MPC") by deleting Sections 1.8.2 and 1.8.5 from the Constitution, as shown:

~~1.8.2: No more than three elected members may represent any single North American region, as defined in Section 1.8.5. Each elected member shall represent the region (if any) in which the member resided at the time they were elected.~~

~~1.8.5: To ensure equitable distribution of representation, North America is divided into three (3) regions as follows:~~

~~(1) Western: Baja California, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Saskatchewan, and all states, provinces, and territories westward including Hawaii, Alaska, the Yukon, and the Northwest Territories.~~

~~(2) Central: Central America, the islands of the Caribbean, Mexico (except as above), and all states, provinces, and territories between the Western and Eastern regions.~~

~~(3) Eastern: Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, New York, Quebec, and all states, provinces, and territories eastward including the District of Columbia, St. Pierre et Miquelon, Bermuda, and the Bahamas.~~

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

1.7 Short Title: We Don't Need Another HEROW

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution for the purpose of making permanent the Hugo Award Rest of World Eligibility Extension, by ~~striking out and~~ adding words as follows:

1. Amend Section 3.4:¹

3.4.1: Unless otherwise specified, Hugo Awards are given for work in the field of science fiction or fantasy appearing for the first time during the previous calendar year.

3.4.2: A work originally appearing in a language other than English shall also be eligible for the year in which it is first issued in English translation.

3.4.3: ~~The Business Meeting may by a 3/4 vote provide that~~ Works originally published outside the United States of America and first published in the United States of America in the ~~current~~ previous calendar year shall also be eligible for Hugo Awards ~~given in the following year.~~

3.4.4: A work shall not be eligible if in a prior year it received sufficient nominations to appear on the final award ballot.

Debate time was set at 5 minutes. [Please click here to jump to Saturday's discussion.](#)

2. NEW BUSINESS

2.1 Constitutional Amendments

Items under this heading have not yet received first passage and will become part of the constitution only if passed at Loncon 3 and ratified at Sasquan. 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.

2.1.1 Short Title: Popular Ratification

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

¹ The numbering of Constitution items 3.4.x in the above amendment parallels those used in the Constitution before the 2013 Business Meeting, but is now incorrect. The 2013 Business Meeting renumbered 3.4.1 and 3.4.4 to be 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 and appropriately renumbered the remaining 3.4.x. Therefore, in the current Constitution, these sections appear as 3.2.1, 3.4.1, 3.4.2 and 3.2.2 respectively.

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

Section 6.6: Amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 6.7: Commencement.

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

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

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

Section 6.3: Electronic Voting. Nothing in this Constitution shall be interpreted to prohibit conducting Hugo Awards nominating and voting, ratification elections for pending Constitutional amendments, and Site

Selection voting by electronic means, except that conducting Site Selection by electronic means shall require the unanimous agreement of the current Worldcon committee and all bidding committees who have filed before the ballot deadline. Valid paper ballots delivered by any means shall always be acceptable. This section shall not be interpreted to require that such elections be conducted electronically, nor shall it be interpreted to allow remote participation or proxy voting at the Business Meeting.

3. *Amend Standing Rule 1.3 to remove references to the Business Meeting ratifying Constitutional Amendments and to administer the provisions of Section 6.6:*

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

Provided that,

1. This proposal shall not take effect unless passed by the 2014 WSFS Business Meeting, ratified by the 2015 WSFS Business Meeting, and re-ratified by the members of the 2016 Worldcon, voting by the mechanism described in this proposal.
2. If re-ratified by the members of the 2016 Worldcon, this amendment shall first affect any constitutional amendments that receive first passage at the 2017 WSFS Business Meeting.
3. If rejected by the members of the 2016 Worldcon, this proposal shall be null and the constitutional amendment process in force before this proposal was introduced shall remain in force.
4. Section 3 of this proposal shall not become a part of the Standing Rules unless the constitutional amendment is ratified.
5. Any constitutional amendments that receive first passage through the end of the 2016 WSFS Business Meeting shall be subject to ratification by the subsequent year's WSFS Business Meeting, including any amendments passed at the 2016 WSFS Business Meeting, which shall be subject to ratification by the 2017 WSFS Business Meeting.

Commentary: The WSFS Business Meeting has been the sole location for the amendment of the WSFS Constitution since the creation of the current Constitution. All amendments must originate in, be debated at, and be both approved and ratified at the WSFS Business Meeting, with only those members present in person eligible to vote.

This proposal would continue to have constitutional amendments originate within the Business Meeting, and only those persons present in person at the Business Meeting could vote upon the initial passage of constitutional amendments. However, instead of submitting proposals to the following year's Business Meeting for ratification, it would instead submit the proposals to a vote of the entire membership of the following Worldcon. Any members of the Worldcon who would otherwise be eligible to cast a site selection ballot, including attending and supporting members, could vote. (Obviously, they would not have to pay the Site Selection Advance Supporting Membership fee to vote on the ratification of constitutional amendments.)

This proposal allows greater participation in the governance of the Society by the members who are unable to attend the Business Meeting, while retaining the virtues of debate and refinement of proposals in person during the original debate of those proposals. It also parallels the evolution of Worldcon Site Selection. At one time, Worldcon sites were selected by the Business Meeting, with only those members attending the meeting in person eligible to vote. This system later evolved to allow the non-attending members to participate in the selection of sites, with the Business Meeting retaining its jurisdiction in the case of a deadlocked or disputed election, or one in which None of the Above wins. The evolution of Site Selection voting has substantially increased participation in the Site Selection process.

Currently, there are many members of WSFS who have an active and abiding interest in the governance of the Society who cannot, for various reasons, attend the Business Meeting. This includes both supporting members and attending members who are not able to attend the Meeting. A common and growing criticism of our current governance structure is that a significant number of members pay membership dues in the Society but have no meaningful stake in the organization's governance. The proponents of this proposal think that allowing the non-attending members to participate in the ratification stage would improve the legitimacy of the Society's governance by allowing a greater proportion of the Society's members to have a voice in the organization's rule-making process.

In addition to issues of perceived legitimacy, there is the matter of agenda congestion. Following a particularly active year for the WSFS Business Meeting, the agenda at the next Worldcon becomes laden with a number of items of Business Passed On. If these issues pending ratification are sufficiently contentious, they can crowd out all further new proposals, for the prevailing current attitude of the Business Meeting tends toward avoiding the need for an additional session after the three hours provided for the Main Business Meeting, including any substantive debate following the announcement of Site Selection results. These factors encourage the broad – some say overly broad – use of Objection to Consideration, along with a tendency toward approving woefully short debate times for serious motions. A Business Meeting freed from its need to rehash Business Passed On could both spend an appropriate amount of time debating serious motions and be relieved of its anxiety of running over to an extra session. Furthermore, persons who are regular Worldcon members but who rarely manage to have the resources to attend could be confident both in their ability to submit business to the

meeting and the chance to vote up or down on it before its final passage or defeat. We would both improve upon our current process by allowing more serious consideration of new business and expand the franchise to the WSFS membership at large.

This proposal is similar to the mechanism that many US states use for the amendment of their state constitutions, in that the legislature passes constitutional amendments, but the citizens must ratify any changes by popular vote.

About the Individual Provisions

6.6.1: Amendments would no longer be subjected to scope-reduction at the ratification stage. They would be subjected to a straight up/down vote by the membership of the following Worldcon. Each constitutional amendment given first passage at a Worldcon would be voted upon separately by the members of the following Worldcon. (That is, if there were proposals 1, 2, 3, and 4, you could vote against 1, for 2 and 3, and against 4. You would not be required to accept or reject the entire slate of pending amendments as a group.)

6.6.2: This means that if you could vote on Site Selection (after paying an Advance Supporting Membership), you can vote on Pending Constitutional Amendments without paying such a fee. This proposal does not attempt to otherwise legislate what voting rights a member has; it only makes them parallel with those of Site Selection.

6.6.3: The intent of this provision is that the Worldcon administering the election shall make a ballot available to all members in the same way that they currently administer Site Selection. Voting would be available by mail and at the convention. Members could deliver ballots cast by other members, just as they currently deliver Site Selection ballots for other members. Administrative details not explicitly addressed here, including electronic voting, would be the responsibility of the individual Worldcon.

6.6.4: It is reasonable to require that written arguments for and against ratification of pending amendments be submitted for inclusion with other voter material. Rather than further encumber the Constitution with detailed provisions, this proposal would authorize the Business Meeting to manage the process through the Standing Rules, as such rules are primarily administrative in nature.

6.6.5: Only Yes and No votes count. Blank and illegible ballots shall not count. There is no minimum vote requirement. If two people vote yes, one votes no, 80 people cast blank ballots, and 150 cast ballots with “Who cares?” written on them, the proposal is ratified 2-1, with none of the other ballots counting toward the total.

6.6.6: The intent is that Ratification Voting shall be open at least the same times as Site Selection. While the results of the election shall be presented to the Business Meeting, there is no reason they can't be announced as soon as they have been counted, nor should a procedural irregularity such as neglecting to present the results to the Meeting affect the actual result. The Business Meeting cannot overturn the results of a ratification election; however, it can pass new Constitutional amendments that themselves would be subject to ratification the following year.

6.6.7 and 6.6.8: These clauses, currently part of Section 6.7, are combined with the rest of Section 6.6 in this proposal so that all rules regarding Constitutional amendments are in the same section of the Constitution. This renumbering makes no substantive change to the provisions currently in Section 6.7.

6.3: This explicitly includes ratification elections within the same scope as other elections conducted by the Worldcon. Worldcons could conduct ratification elections electronically, just as most recent Worldcons have conducted Hugo Awards voting electronically; however, they would not be compelled to do so.

Rule 1.3: This is an administrative provision dealing with the scheduling of the announcement of ratification vote results, as well as a housekeeping change removing references to ratification from the rule. Normally, standing rule amendments take effect after only a single vote; however, inasmuch as this rule would be meaningless without the constitutional amendment authorizing it, the rule includes additional provisions requiring that it “go along for the ride” with the Constitutional amendment and not apply should the amendment fail of ratification.

About the Ratification Process and Transition Provisions

Any change to the amendment process of a governing document is by its nature complex. This proposal would not only require that it be ratified by the existing system (passed by the 2014 WSFS Business Meeting and ratified by the 2015 WSFS Business Meeting), but that it also be submitted to a popular vote of the members of the 2016 Worldcon. Should the proposal be ratified by the 2015 WSFS Business Meeting, its provisions would, in effect, be stayed until after the proposal is ratified by a popular vote under its own mechanism.

Until this proposal passes all three hurdles (two Business Meetings and a popular vote), it would not be in effect, and the existing constitutional amendment process would remain in effect. If it passes all three hurdles, it would take effect at the end of the 2016 Worldcon. Anything first passed by the 2016 Business Meeting would still be subject to a ratification vote by the 2017 Business Meeting under the older rules, but anything passed by the 2017 Business Meeting (other than ratification votes of business from the previous year) would be subject to popular ratification.

Although this proposal includes the authorization of Standing Rules to administer written arguments for and against pending Constitutional amendments, the proponents of this proposal think it better to defer discussion of such administrative rules until after the initial ratification of the proposal, for adoption at the Business Meeting held at the Worldcon whose members vote on the ratification of the proposal.

Moved by: Kevin Standlee, Warren Buff

Co-Sponsors: Kendall P. Bullen, Christopher Carson, Robin Cookson, Christopher Garcia, Glenn Glazer, Lisa Deutsch Harrigan, Michael Lee, Farah Mendlesohn, Ronald Oakes, John O’Halloran, Kevin Roche, Randy Smith, Kathryn Yeager.

Debate time was set at 12 minutes.

Discussion: Kevin Standlee, the maker of the motion, suggested meeting as a quasi-committee of the whole in order to answer technical questions, due to the complexity of the motion. After the quasi-committee of the whole rose, Ben Yalow made a motion to commit this amendment to a committee that would report back next year with a perfected “two plus one” amendment to the Constitution. Mr. Standlee suggested that the committee consist of himself and Mr. Yalow. Joshua Kronengold objected to the motion to commit to a committee, asking “do we really need to make it harder to amend the Constitution?” Seth Breibart said there are possibilities other than 1 +1 or 2+1 that ought to be considered. Martin Easterbrook felt that extending ratification to three years is too long. Katie Rask agreed that it would take three years to pass, but with a committee to report next year, it becomes four years, extending this process and making it more complicated and harder for people to participate. Leslie Turak was concerned that there is no way to perfect an amendment in the current proposal and preferred referring the motion to a committee. Colin Harris said he would prefer to debate the issue at this meeting and then, if necessary, refer to committee. Joshua Kronengold made a motion to remove the specific purpose of looking at “2 + 1” and replacing it with a general referral to committee to report back next year.

After a brief review of Standing Rule 1.2, however, it was determined that the motion (to refer to a committee to report back in a year) was out of order at the Preliminary Business Meeting. (A committee created at a Preliminary Meeting cannot report back later than the Main Meeting.)

Seth Breibart then made a motion to commit the amendment to a committee to report back at the Main Meeting on Saturday, which was seconded. With no debate, and by a show of hands this motion passed. (Before the end of the Preliminary Meeting, the Business Meeting chair appointed Kevin Standlee (chair), Ben Yalow, Mark Olson, Seth Breibart, Glenn Glazer, and Warren Buff as members of the “Arithmetic Committee” to report back on Saturday.)

Debate time for the main meeting was set at 24 minutes. [Please click here to jump to Saturday’s discussion.](#)

2.1.2 Short Title: Hugo Nominating for NASFiC Members

Moved, to extend the right to nominate for the Hugo Awards to members of all WSFS-sanctioned conventions, including NASFiC, held in the previous, current, and immediately following calendar year, 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 and any member of any convention sanctioned by WSFS in Article 4 held in the immediately preceding, current, or immediately following calendar year, ~~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.

Moved by: Tammy Coxen, Jeffrey Beeler, Seth Breidbart, Lisa Hayes, Christopher Hensley, David Gallaher, Michael Lee, Helen Montgomery, Kevin Nickerson, Steven Silver, Steve Staton, Pablo Vasquez III

Commentary: Currently, members of the NASFiC are members of a convention whose selection is regulated by WSFS, but who exercise nearly none of the rights of members of the Worldcon, WSFS's "senior" convention, with the exception of the rarely-possible case where a NASFiC selects the site of a subsequent NASFiC.

Because of its suitability for smaller markets that do not have the facilities or concentration of people necessary to bid for or run a Worldcon, NASFiCs have great potential to be a pathway for exposing new fans to WSFS, Worldcons, and international fandom. NASFiCs also play an important skill building role in running bids and in operating more complex organizational structures than many regional conventions. However, under the current model, there is limited formal connection to WSFS. Extending limited WSFS rights to NASFiC members would give those members a pathway for building engagement with WSFS and the Worldcon, ultimately strengthening the Worldcon.

This proposal would extend to NASFiC members the same right to nominate (but not to vote on the final ballot) for the Hugo Awards currently exercised by members of the immediately past and future Worldcons. As with the existing nominating rights for previous and subsequent Worldcon members, these rights would not extend to voting on the final Hugo ballot, nor could any individual exercise multiple voting rights by being a member of more than one of the (potentially) six WSFS-sanctioned conventions held during the three-year period centered on the current Worldcon.

Rather than explicitly add references to NASFiC, this amendment strikes all references to specifically named conventions and instead refers to the members of all of the conventions that WSFS sanctions in Article 4 of the Constitution. While this currently includes only Worldcon and NASFiC, this general reference reduces the need to further modify this section of the constitution should WSFS begin or cease sanctioning of other conventions.

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

2.1.3 Short Title: A Story by Any Other Name

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

By inserting a new section after existing 3.2.5:

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

And amending section 3.2.5:

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

Commentary: this motion is primarily intended to address the handling of audiobooks within the four written fiction categories, although it will also formalise the existing understanding that electronically published stories should be considered *pari passu* with those published in physical format.

1. Online discussion has highlighted two distinct and opposing views on “simple” audiobooks (i.e. readings with no explicit dramatic element). Some feel strongly that audio is just another valid delivery mechanism for written words, while others feel that any reading is inherently dramatic and that audiobooks must automatically be placed in BDP. Both views are valid expressions of individuals’ subjective experience – a democratic test is needed to establish the majority view.

2. Some are concerned that this change will create a grey area between the written and BDP categories. We believe that voters can distinguish a dramatic interpretation from a simple reading, and that they will select the appropriate category according to whether they are voting for the text or for the performance.

3. The Hugos have historically given significant weight to the views of the voters and nominees when considering category assignments within the hard category boundaries in the Constitution – examples include *The Wheel of Time*, *Game of Thrones Season 1*, and *Wicked Girls*. Using this mechanism to resolve borderline cases in future (where an audiobook received votes in both BDP and story categories) would be in keeping with existing practice.

4. Considering simple audiobooks as another valid way to publish a text will bring the Hugo Awards into line with other awards (e.g. the Locus and Bram Stoker Awards); and with the standard industry treatment of rights and first publication dates.

5. The change to section 3.2.5 will extend this clause to cover Best Graphic Story (an anomaly at present) and remove the reference to the word “written” which some have interpreted as excluding audiobooks, and could hence appear to be in conflict with the new clause 3.2.6.

Proposed by: Colin Harris

Seconded by: Mary Robinette Kowal

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

2.1.4 Short Title: Performers Are Fans Too

Moved, to amend Article 3 of the WSFS Constitution to add a new category for the best fan performer or performance group, by amending as follows:

By inserting a new section:

3.3.X: Best Fan Performer. A performing artist in any medium whose work has appeared at conventions or through other public, non-professional display during the previous calendar year.

Provided that unless this amendment is re-ratified by the 2019 Business Meeting, Section 3.3.X shall be repealed; and

Provided further that the question of re-ratification shall automatically be placed on the agenda of the 2019 Business Meeting, with any constitutional amendments awaiting ratification.

Commentary: Fan performance has a long tradition in Fandom as old and storied as fan conventions themselves. Early conventions had filksongs (which, like fan writing, predate the convention), masquerades, and fannish plays. But fan performance has never had a Hugo; justifiably so, as the nature of performance is audiovisual, and until recently, it was unreasonable to expect a significant fraction of fandom to have experienced the same performances or even performers – it was prohibitively expensive to record performances, and even more expensive to distribute those performances. This is no longer the case. Your average fan now carries the means, in the form of a smart phone (often among other devices), to record and distribute AV performances at no effective cost and little difficulty, or to, at any time, appreciate others' distributed performances. Due to this changing technology, not to mention changes in the composition of fandom, performance has become increasingly relevant and universal to the fannish experience. Far more than ever before, our lives are enriched by the same filks, masquerade presentations, plays, Hugo presentations, fan videos, panels, and other performances, and those performers and performances are, due to webcasting, available to a far greater fraction of fandom. More, even when the same performance is not witnessed by enough of fandom to justify an award, gifted and dedicated performers are often noticeable and recognizable across broad swaths of fandom.

This award would reward and encourage excellence in fan performance - and provide validation and inclusion to fans whose fan activity is largely performance-based, rather than written or visual-art centered.

Proposed by: Joshua Kronengold

Seconded by: Warren Buff and Aurora Celeste

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

3. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MOTIONS

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

3.1 Permanent Committees

3.1.1 Mark Protection Committee (Including Nominations for MPC)

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

The MPC met on Thursday, August 14, at the ExCeL London Docklands in London, England, at Loncon 3.

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

- **Elected 2011, term ending in 2014:** Linda Deneroff (West), Dave McCarty (Central); Warren Buff (East)
- **Elected 2012, term ending in 2015:** Stephen Boucher (RoTW); Scott Dennis (Central) and Donald Eastlake III (East);
- **Elected 2013, term ending in 2016:** Ben Yalow (East), Kevin Standlee (West), and Tim Illingworth (Central);
- **Worldcon Representatives:**
 - Chicon 7 – Sandra Levy (until 2014)
 - LoneStarCon 3 – Randall Shephard (until 2015)
 - Loncon 3 – Paul Dormer (until 2016)
 - Detcon 1 – Deb Geisler (until 2016)
 - Sasquan – Glenn Glazer (until 2017)
- **Officers of the Mark Protection Committee**
 - Chair: Kevin Standlee
 - Secretary: Linda Deneroff
 - Treasurer: Scott Dennis
 - Agent for Canada: Adrienne Seel

The members whose terms of office expired at this Worldcon are: Warren Buff (East), Dave McCarty (Central), and Linda Deneroff (West). Due to zone residency restrictions, we can elect at most one person from any zone or up to three people from

the Rest of the World, but not more than three people overall. Write-in votes are allowed, but write-in candidates must also submit their consent to election by the close of balloting. Nomination acceptance forms were available at the head table staff.

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

The Worldcon Website Working Group (WWWG) is chaired by Mike Scott and has a variable membership. This is a subcommittee of the Mark Protection Committee, and their report is made to the MPC.

Recommendations: The Mark Protection Committee recommends passage of the following resolution:

3.1.1.1 Short Title: WIPT Good

Resolved, That the WSFS Business Meeting recommends that the Mark Protection Committee establish a Worldcon Intellectual Property Trust (“WIPT”) to act as a legal entity for holding title to WSFS’s service marks, such entity to be under the control of the Mark Protection Committee.

Commentary: The WSFS service marks (“Worldcon,” “Hugo Award,” etc.) are registered in the U.S. to the World Science Fiction Society, an unincorporated society. While the United States Patent & Trademark Office (“USPTO”) is willing to issue mark registrations to unincorporated associations, the equivalent bodies in most other countries that have hosted Worldcons are unwilling to do so. They will issue registrations only to individuals or to legal entities such as trusts, corporations, and the like.

The policy of the MPC has been for many years to attempt to register WSFS’s marks in any country that has hosted more than one Worldcon (U.S., United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia). If we consider the European Union to be a single entity for the purpose of this policy, it would also be in the list, and would of course include the UK.

However, none of these countries except the U.S. will recognize the unincorporated WSFS as an entity that can actually hold title to service marks.

Our U.S. and UK legal counsels have recommended that we establish a legal trust (which can be in the U.S.) under the control of the WSFS MPC, and that this trust be the legal entity that holds title to the WSFS marks. All members of the MPC would be trustees of this entity, whose sole purpose would be to hold title to the WSFS marks on behalf of WSFS-sanctioned conventions (Worldcon and NASFIC).

The MPC has historically appointed individuals or legal entities in non-U.S. countries (generally non-profit corporations that have run Worldcons in those countries) to act as the MPC’s agent in those countries. Under this historical precedent, the MPC could appoint individuals to hold WSFS’s service marks on our behalf, indemnifying those

individuals for any expenses incurred as our agent. On the other hand, establishing a permanent legal entity would probably be a more stable long-term solution to the issue.

The MPC is sensitive to concerns about the Committee creating permanent legal entities, and therefore asks for the Business Meeting's advice before it takes further action toward protecting WSFS's marks in countries outside of the U.S.

Debate time was set at 8 minutes.

Discussion: Kevin Standlee reiterated that the Mark Protection Committee is the only committee directly chartered by the WSFS Constitution. It is responsible for managing the intellectual property of WSFS; specifically, the service marks for "Worldcon", "Hugo Award" and the like. Rather than restating anything in the MPC report to the WSFS Business Meeting (see Appendix 1), Mr. Standlee spoke specifically regarding its biggest issue this year: specifically that, in conjunction with Loncon 3, and with the very valuable and timely assistance of two past Worldcon-running organizations, CanSmof (Anticipation) and SCIFI (LACon IV), it fought off a very significant threat to the Hugo Award for "Best Fancast" by an organization called Fancaster. Much of the work went on quietly and those details can be found in the MPC report. Fancaster is attempting to monetize fan-produced podcasts, primarily in sports but also sells some sort of product using the term Fancaster. Fancaster sent a cease-and-desist order letter to Loncon 3 claiming it has an EU service mark on the word "Fancaster" and therefore Loncon must immediately cease and desist presenting a Hugo Award for Best Fancast. Loncon 3 contacted the MPC, which is effectively a co-litigant to the extent this is legal, and engaged solicitors here in the UK, while the MPC worked with its U.S. attorney, Esther Horwich. After a lot of phone calls, emails and research, the advice of counsel was that Fancaster's claim is not a good one and that before the demand letter from Fancaster expired, Loncon 3, on their behalf and on behalf of the MPC, responded by saying, effectively, that we did not believe they had a valid claim, and we are not going to stop giving out a Best Fancast award.

Neither the MPC nor Loncon 3 has heard back from Fancaster since then. But just getting to that point cost over £8,000 (approximately US\$15,000) in UK legal fees and a couple of thousand dollars in U.S. legal fees. The U.S. legal fees were paid by the Mark Protection Committee's general fund. Loncon 3 paid the entire amount of their traditional donation to WSFS (something normally paid *after* the convention is over). In addition, they paid the entire £1,400 VAT. That left slightly more than US\$10,000. In addition to the couple of hundred dollars from the MPC general fund, CanSmof donated C\$5,000 and SCIFI donated US\$5,000 to pay the remainder of the bill. This money does not show up in the SCIFI report attached to these minutes because (a) it was paid after the end of the fiscal year and (b) the donation was made mostly from non-Worldcon SCIFI funds. The MPC is also grateful that AussieCon 4 also gave MPC a large donation when they closed their books (see the 2013 MPC report) or the MPC would have very little left in its account. Also, subsequent to the financial report in Appendix 1, we also received a \$3,750 donation from LonestarCon 3, and that's been very helpful as well.

There is no way the MPC could have supported this effort without the timely efforts of various Worldcon committees, but this points out another issue. The MPC believes that to date we have accomplished what we set out to do, to protect our Best Fancast Hugo award (and Hugo Awards as a whole), and any further action is in abeyance unless Fancaster elects to proceed against us. But we believe it is important for WSFS to revisit the funding mechanism for the MPC, which has not changed since 1984, and the MPC intends to spend this next year preparing a ten-year projected budget for presentation to next year's business meeting. Because our costs run over approximately a ten-year cycle, due to variously renewal fees on our service marks, and we want to begin the process of registering our marks EU-wide.

Currently, the only country in which the MPC has trademark registration is the U.S. The U.S. Patent and Trademark office, somewhat reluctantly, is prepared to deal with unincorporated associations. WSFS policy is to register marks in countries based on the number of Worldcons held in them, and the EU is our second highest priority. But none of these countries will deal with an unincorporated association. We either have to find individual human beings to act as agents, or we have to create a legal entity that can be recognized by them. The MPC is asking for guidance from the Business Meeting and has therefore introduced a resolution, called WIPT Good, to recommend that the MPC create a trust to protect our marks in the European Union and elsewhere, not just the UK.

At the conclusion of Mr. Standlee's report, David Lally, the board chairman of the European Science Fiction Society, graciously offered to personally fund half the cost (i.e., £4,500) of covering our trademarks in the EU, subject to the formation of this proposed trust.

Seth Breibart asked about the tax status of the proposed trust, and Mr. Standlee replied that the MPC has not yet researched all the details. The implementation details are beyond the scope of this motion, but it would be U.S. legal entity, and the MPC would work with Esther Horwich in its creation.

The chair clarified that passage of WIPT would in effect be simply establishing the sense of the Business Meeting for the Mark Protection Committee.

Steve Cooper, the co-chair of Loncon 3, explained why Loncon itself is not prepared to continue as a corporation. The high cost of maintaining the corporation is prohibitive, and therefore he was in favor of the resolution.

Upon a show of hands, the resolution passed unanimously.

Mark Olson then inquired as to the best expectation from the lawyers regarding future litigation. Mr. Standlee responded that one of the British attorneys had attended the MPC meeting and told the MPC that, if it wished to proceed, the next step would be to start an invalidity action against Fancaster's EU service mark. However, this would cost a substantial amount of money that the MPC does not currently have. And, again, it would require a legal entity to initiate the action. The MPC has not fully explored all

its options at this time; it first wanted guidance from the Business Meeting. However, the solicitor and our U.S. counsel both agree that a U.S. legal entity can hold title to European trademarks, and the trustees of the trust could be the members of the MPC.

Nominations: The Chair opened nominations for the expiring positions of the MPC. Kevin Standlee moved to re-nominate the existing members – Linda Deneroff (West), Dave McCarty (Central); Warren Buff (East). (Sandra Levy’s appointment by Chicon 7 would also expire at the end of the Business Meeting and would be replaced by whomever the 2016 Worldcon appointed.) John Coxon also was nominated; Warren Buff declined the nomination. Nominees had until 5 p.m. on Friday to accept their nominations.

3.2 Committees Appointed Annually

3.2.1 Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

The Nitpicking and Flyspecking Committee members for 2013-2014 are Kevin Standlee (Chair), Jared Dashoff, Linda Deneroff, Donald Eastlake and Tim Illingworth. The committee is willing to serve for another year. The authority of this committee stems from:

Standing Rule 7.7: Nitpicking and Flyspecking Committee

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

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

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

Recommendations: The Committee recommends passage of the following resolutions:

3.2.1.1 Short Title: Allowing Postpone Indefinitely

Moved, to modify existing Standing Rule 5.3 to allow the motion to Postpone Indefinitely in its debatable form, but only at the Preliminary Business Meeting, and to require a 2/3 vote to postpone a motion indefinitely.

Rule 5.3: Postpone Indefinitely. The motion to Postpone Indefinitely shall not be allowed at the Main Business Meeting, but shall be allowed at the Preliminary Business Meeting. This motion shall have four (4) minutes of debate time and shall require a two-thirds (2/3) vote for adoption.

Proposed by: Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

Commentary: The motion to Postpone Indefinitely effectively kills a proposal for the remainder of that year’s Business Meeting. (The proposal can be re-introduced at a future Worldcon.) In standard parliamentary procedure, this motion requires a majority and can be made at any time no other motion attached to a main motion is pending. WSFS has generally banned this motion for reasons having to do with allowing members who have exhausted their right of debate to take an additional shot at a motion. However, Postpone Indefinitely has a potential use at the Preliminary Business Meeting to allow the meeting to control its own agenda without having to use the parliamentary sledgehammer of Objection to Consideration. Allowing Postpone Indefinitely to be introduced in a limited form with a short amount of debate time to be used for the purpose of debating the question, “Should we discuss the main proposal at the Main Meeting” would allow both proponents and opponents of the *consideration* of a proposal a brief opportunity to make their cases. The NPFSC thinks that Objection to Consideration is overused, being applied to merely unpopular proposals rather than those that could be seen as embarrassing or harmful to the Society to be discussed. Giving the meeting a tool to control the Main Meeting agenda while still giving proponents an opportunity to make a case for the consideration of their proposals would make the Meeting seem less intimidating to newcomers. This proposal is related to the proposal below to modify the motion to Object to Consideration.

3.2.1.2 Short Title: OTC Voting Requirement

Moved, to increase the required number of votes to kill an item of new business by Objection to Consideration by adding a new standing rule:

Rule 5.x: Objection to Consideration. An Objection to Consideration shall require a three-fourths (3/4) vote to kill a motion without debate.

Proposed by: Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

Commentary: WSFS regularly uses the incidental motion Object to Consideration, mostly at the Preliminary Business Meeting, and primarily as a device of killing, without debate, new constitutional amendments when they are first introduced. (An OTC cannot be lodged against constitutional amendments previously passed and awaiting ratification.) This motion can only be made immediately after a proposal comes to the floor for the first time, and has priority over others who want to speak to the motion. Consequently, it has tended to be made rather forcefully. This can come to a shock to new attendees, because while OTC is defined in *Robert’s Rules of Order*, it is obscure and rarely used in most organizations. The NPSFC proposes (above, item 1) using a variation of Postpone Indefinitely as an “agenda sweeper,” and raising the threshold on OTC to three-fourths in order to discourage its casual use.

Discussion: Kevin Standlee asked for unanimous consent to consider the above two items as a single entity. One would raise the raise the vote necessary for objection to consideration from two-thirds to three-fourths; and the other would be to allow the motion to postpone indefinitely (*i.e.*, kill a motion for the duration of the current Worldcon) at the Preliminary Business Meeting, which technically is not allowed under the WSFS rules at this time. This motion would also allow four minutes of debate time

on whether the motion should be considered and would require a two-thirds vote to kill the motion without further debate and would be used to suppress motions or new business at the Preliminary Business meeting without using Objection to Consideration.

Without any objection, these two motions were considered as a single item. See below for the combined discussion. Mr. Standlee then continued to speak in favor of these motions: Objection to Consideration has its uses, but the committee felt that it has been overused by WSFS because the Business Meeting has tied its hands procedurally when it comes to suppressing motions. Few motions are so vile that they need to be killed without any debate at all. The committee felt that a maker of a motion should have the opportunity to explain why he or she believes it should be considered. Then someone else should have the opportunity to explain why it shouldn't be considered, after which the vote could be taken on whether to sustain or kill the motion.

Debate time was set at 8 minutes.

Chris Hensley favored the combined motion because new attendees would not feel shut out of the business meeting if it passed.

Colin Harris thought the amendment a good one but he made a motion that the debate time in the amendment be extended to 6 minutes. Ben Yalow spoke against the extension of the debate time, believing that in a short preliminary meeting too much time would be taken up. He felt four minutes was sufficient to argue whether a motion was worth or not worth discussing; anything longer would take too much time away from the rest of the agenda. Terry Neill felt the convention organizers are perfectly capable of asking for a longer time slot if the agenda was as large as the current one. Seth Breibart said if you can't convince someone in two minutes that a proposal is even worth talking about, then three minutes won't help. Upon a show of hands, the amendment to the motion failed.

The chair of the Business Meeting attempted to clarify by saying that both motions would change two-thirds to three-fourths² in their respective sections, and that this change would take effect at the end of this Business Meeting, unless by special vote the Business Meeting decided to have it take effect immediately. Subsequently, the unamended concatenated motion passed by a show of hands. Kevin Standlee then made a motion to suspend the rules and have this rule change to the standing rules take effect immediately, which was seconded. Again by a show of hands, this motion passed with more than two-thirds in favor.

3.2.1.3 Short Title: Hugo Finalists

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

² However, Section 3.2.1.1 refers to two-thirds, not three-fourths.

Section 3.7: Nominations.

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

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

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

Section 3.9: Notification and Acceptance.

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

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

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

Section 3.10: Voting.

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

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

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

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

3.10.5: Voters shall indicate the order of their preference for the ~~nominees~~-finalists in each category.

Section 3.11: Tallying of Votes.

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

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

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

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

Proposed by: Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

Commentary: Although long-standing tradition has considered the works or people appearing on the final Hugo Award ballot to be “nominees,” an increasingly large number of people are now referring to any works or people receiving any nominations at all (even just one nomination vote) as “nominees,” and there is an increasing confusion in terminology. This year’s Worldcon has deliberately decided to call the works/people appearing on the Hugo Award ballot “finalists” rather than “nominees” in order to avoid the ambiguity. The NPFSC recommends that WSFS explicitly adopt this terminology in order to eliminate the ambiguity between “nominee” meaning “person or work receiving one or more nomination votes” and “person or work appearing on the final Hugo Award ballot.”

Discussion: Mr. Standlee began the discussion by explaining that one of the other duties of this committee is to attempt to codify the usages of WSFS. In recent years there has been an increase in the number of people who, upon receiving one nomination in the process, are calling themselves “Hugo nominees,” contrary to the traditional usage of the term by WSFS, and there has been a great deal of resentment and pushback on the part of those calling themselves a nominee. Loncon 3 and other recent Worldcons have taken to using the term “finalist” for those who appear on the shortlist of nominations. This constitutional amendment would change the term “nominee” to “finalist” in the Constitution, formalizing the reference.

Leslie Turek proposed an amendment to strike the last two changes in section 3.11.4, (changing “candidate” to “nominee”). She felt that changing “candidate” to “nominee” in that clause only gives in to the misinterpretation and she preferred to remove that change. After it seconded, there was no debate, and upon a show of hands, those revisions were removed. The original language is reflected below.

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.

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

This completed the Nitpicking & Flyspecking report.

Kent Bloom then proposed a new resolution to the Business Meeting. While in the interest of efficiency he did not object to this committee’s motions, he felt that they were outside the scope of the committee. Thus, he made the following motion:

Short Title: Direction to NPFSC

Resolved, that that the Business Meeting requests that the Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee not submit substantive changes to the rules because the purpose of the committee is to keep records and to make sure our permanent codification is done.

Discussion: While this would not prevent any member of the committee (or combination of members) from making such suggestions, it avoids making them as privileged motions. As a point of information, the chair clarified that this is simply a request and, like any other committee, the Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee can still make motions. Ben Yalow then asked if it would in order to amend “request” to “direct”. However the vote had been called, so no further action was taken. Mark Olson then asked, in the interest of making this as self-referential as possible, if a motion to postpone indefinitely was in order.

After the laughter died down, the vote was taken. Upon a serpentine vote, the motion was defeated, with 32 in favor of the motion and 39 opposed.

The Business Meeting recessed for five minutes, and WSFS Business meeting attendee ribbons, which had just arrived, were handed out.

3.2.2 Worldcon Runners Guide Editorial Committee

The Worldcon Runners' Guide Editorial Committee members for the past year were Mike Willmoth (Chair), Bill Taylor, John Hertz, Sharon Sbarsky, Alex Von Thorn and Marah Searle-Kovacevic. Over the last year the Worldcon Runners Guide Committee continued to make incremental updates to the guide online. Recent additions involve adding bidding information to assist those groups interested in bidding for future Worldcons. Many of the committee members are involved with Loncon 3 as well as Sasquan and other future bids. We shall continue to work on the guide in the coming year, adding our knowledge and expertise for the benefit of the global community.

Discussion: Mike Willmoth reported that incremental changes were made to the online guide this year. Most of them involved the bidding process, which didn't exist in the Guide before. It's been slow progress, with gradual improvements, and he asked that anyone interested in joining the committee should contact him. There were no questions.

3.2.3 Hugo Eligibility Rest of the World (HEROW) Committee

The HEROW Committee members for the past year were: Perianne Lurie (Chair), Vince Docherty, Tim Illingworth, Jim Mann, Pat McMurray, Cheryl Morgan, Mark Olson, Sharon Sbarsky, Alex von Thorn, and Ben Yalow. Ms. Lurie resigned during year and appointed Ben Yalow as chair. (Colin Harris resigned in a previous year, but the error was only caught recently and has been corrected here.)

The committee reports the following two resolutions, with provisos:

3.2.3.1 Short Title: We Might Need Another HEROW

Moved, to extend the HEROW committee for another year, with membership appointed by the Chair of the Business Meeting, and with the chair of the HEROW committee authorized to add members.

Provided that, should the Constitutional amendment entitled "We Don't Need Another HEROW" pass, then this resolution shall be automatically rescinded, and no committee appointed.

Discussion: As an introduction to this motion, Ben Yalow, the interim chair of the committee, explained that if the Constitutional amendment is ratified at the main Business Meeting this year, the HEROW Committee will go away, but the motion proposed here is necessary in case the ratification of the amendment fails. Upon a show of hands, the motion passed. Without debate, the vote was taken and passed unanimously.

3.2.3.2 Short Title: This Year's Model

Moved, to extend eligibility for all works that are allowed by a resolution under the following sections of the WSFS Constitution:

3.4.3: The Business Meeting may by a 3/4 vote provide that works originally published outside the United States of America and first published in the United States of America in the current year shall also be eligible for Hugo Awards given in the following year.

3.4.4: A work shall not be eligible if in a prior year it received sufficient nominations to appear on the final award ballot.

This motion extends eligibility for the Hugo Award; therefore, it requires a 3/4 vote.

Provided that, should the Constitutional amendment entitled "We Don't Need Another HEROW" pass, then this resolution shall be automatically rescinded.

Discussion: Again, Ben Yalow explained that this was the annual extension motion, and that if the Constitutional amendment up for ratification this year is passed at the main Business Meeting, then the HEROW Committee will go away, but the motion proposed here is necessary in case the ratification should fail.

Seth Breibart believed that, while it is unlikely, should the constitutional amendment be amended so only some items are eligible, then the motion that for this year extends all of them would not be moot. Therefore, he made a motion to remove the paragraph beginning "*Provided that*" (in this motion only), since it either has no effect or it extends eligibility. Without objection this amendment passed, and the "*Provided that*" section was removed.

Winton Matthews questioned the numbering scheme of this motion as it differed from that in the Constitution. Ben Yalow clarified that last year's Business Meeting authorized the Secretary to renumber sections, and all the extension resolutions were moved into one section. Since this was a strictly a renumbering, it did not need to be ratified by the Business Meeting, but we had to adjust all the motions to point to the correct renumbered section, and we missed one. It has been corrected in these minutes.

With no objections, then the motion passed on a show of hands.

A motion was made to reconsider 3.2.3.1 (We Might Need Another HEROW), but the motion failed.

3.2.4 Formalization of Long List Entries (FOLLE) Committee

The Long List Committee has continued to curate the Long List of Worldcons and Long List of Hugos. This year has seen a bit more than the usual activity. Besides the normal updating of recent Worldcons, we have updated attendance figures for Chicon II and Solacon based on newly discovered contemporary documents and added a missing hotel for ConFederation. We have also done some maintenance on the Long List of NASFiCs.

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

The current membership of the Long List Committee is: Mark Olson (Chair), Craig Miller, David G. Grubbs, Joe Siclari, Kent Bloom, Colin Harris, Richard Lynch, Kevin Standlee, Tim Illingworth, and Ben Yalow

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

Discussion: Mark Olson felt the report spoke for itself but asked for questions. Joni Dashoff asked if “Solacon” was a typo for “Nolacon.” Mark responded that the name was indeed “Solacon.” Without any further questions and without objection, the chair of the Business Meeting directed the committee to continue for another year.

3.3 Temporary Committees

3.3.1 YA Hugo Committee

This new committee was chaired through Loncon 3 by Dave McCarty. The members were Jodie Baker, Adam Beaton, Warren Buff, Johnny Carruthers, Martin Easterbrook, Chris Garcia, Helen Gbala, Patrick Nielsen Hayden, Tim Illingworth, Farah Mendelsohn, Sue “Twilight” Mohn, Helen Montgomery, Cheryl Morgan, Kate Secor, Kevin Standlee, Adam Tesh, Peter De Weerd, Tehani Wessely, Clark Wierda, Lew Wolkoff, Aurora Celeste, and Dina Krause. The Chair has the power to appoint additional members.

The committee failed to move forward this year. The fault for that was solely the chairman’s; it should not be construed as any lack of value or interest in the topic. The committee asks to be continued with a different chairman for next year. All the names of the volunteers at LoneStarCon 3, as well as those who volunteered during the year, are available to be passed along to the new chairman.

Discussion: Dave McCarty apologized and took responsibility for the failure of the committee to move forward this year. He asked that the committee be continued. There were many people who came up to him during the year and said they wanted to be included. He asked that the committee be continued for another year, with a different chair, and he will pass along the names of those people who have indicated an interest to be on the committee. He was asked how many people under the ages of 18 and/or 25 have asked to be on the committee, but he did not have the data. He suspected there was no one under the age of 18 and possibly as many as five who are under age 25 who have indicated an interest to be on the committee.

By unanimous consent this committee was continued for another year, with a new chair to be announced before the conclusion of Sunday’s meeting.

3.3.2 WSFS Membership Types and Rates Committee

This new committee had been chaired by Colin Harris, but he stepped down during the year, and no new chair was appointed. Other members of this committee are: Eemeli Aro, Adam Beaton, Gary Blog, Kent Bloom, Warren Buff, Donald Eastlake 3, Martin Easterbrook, Janice Gelb, Kevin Hewitt, Tim Illingworth, Kevin Maroney, Patrick Nielsen Hayden, Mary Kay Kare, Priscilla Olson, Mark Olson, Howard Rosenblatt, Kevin Standlee, Ian Stockdale, Adam Tesh, and Leslie Turek. The Chair has the power to appoint additional members.

With one abstention, the members of the WSFS Membership Committee adopted the following report:

Value the Vote. This proved to be a broad and complex issue, so we focused on the one point of concern that most agreed on and decided to propose the minimum change that would satisfy that concern.

3.3.2.1 Short Title: WSFS Membership Types and Rates

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

1.5.x: No Worldcon Committee shall sell a membership which includes any WSFS voting rights for less than cost of the Supporting Membership required by Section 4.2.1 for Site Selection for that Worldcon.

Discussion: Kevin Standlee reported that, in the absence of a chair, the committee discussed the issue in a freeform way and concentrated on the smallest change that would be acceptable to the committee members.

Joni Dashoff enquired if this committee is hampered by the fact that the selection time for the voting fee is February of the calendar year for the seated convention. However, the chair of the Business Meeting explained that this motion is intended to restrict Worldcon committees, and the restriction is based on the supporting membership fee that was used in the selection of that Worldcon, so that by the time they are a Worldcon the supporting membership fee used in their selection was long ago determined. Ms. Dashoff and others felt that needed to be clarified in the motion. Mr. Standlee felt that since the Business Meeting chair has issued this guidance, there would be legislative history in the minutes for future reference and interpretation.

Members of the Business Meeting made various wording changes to the motion, but the Business Meeting chair suggested that the committee come up with a more precisely worded motion and report back to the Business Meeting at the Saturday session. This suggestion was seconded, and adopted without objection.

Mark Olson pointed out that there were many other ideas that this committee discussed and that deserve more attention, he made the following motion:

Short Title: WSFS Membership Types and Rates Continued

Moved, that a committee be established to report back next year after further discuss and, hopefully with further resolution of the WSFS Membership Types and Rates.

The motion was seconded. An amendment was moved that this new committee look into the cost of printed and electronic methods of communication and how that factors into membership rates. This too was seconded. An attempt to Object to Consideration was ruled out of order and a discussion of this amendment ensued.

Debate time was set at 4 minutes.

Ron Oakes felt that the amendment to the motion overspecified the Business Meeting's direction to the committee. The committee knows what it has to consider. Martin Easterbrook noted that a lot of people would like to bring down the price of a supporting membership. The key issue is whether you can supply just electronic publications at a different rate. People outside this meeting need to know this is being addressed. Glenn Glazer felt the cost of publications was irrelevant. The point of a supporting membership is not what you get out of it; it is to support the convention. You are making a donation. However, Andrew Adams felt the cost was relevant, particularly if the price the convention pays for something is more than what is donated to the convention.

Colin Harris felt it is up to the various Worldcons to set their rate structures, and the Worldcon committees do not need specific direction. We should not go down the road of prescribing what the rate structure should be. Mark Olson also thought this amendment is irrelevant, and he suggested that anyone concerned about this should join the committee. This type of committee works best when all points of view are represented. Passing or defeating this amendment won't make any real difference.

After a question by Winton Matthews, the chair of the Business Meeting clarified that currently under discussion was an amendment to factor in the cost of publications to the charter of the general committee that will report back next year.

Ben Yalow spoke against the motion. With or without the Easterbrook amendment, the committee can consider prices, supporting membership costs, printed publication, etc. This amendment only clutters up the motion.

Kevin Standlee raised a point of order, asking if the motion 3.2.2.1 had been referred to committee to report back on Saturday. He also asked if there was a motion on the floor with a pending amendment attached to it to continue the previously constituted committee and possibly amend its charter. The chair clarified that it wasn't clear if it was to be the same committee as the past year's or a new committee with the same purpose. Mr. Standlee asked for clarification that that had nothing to do with the amendment that was passed on to the Saturday meeting. The chair so clarified, and so Mr. Standlee then called the question, which was roundly seconded, and no one wished to speak to any of the pending motions.

A motion to close debate on the amendment to expand the charter of the committee to report back next year was moved and passed. Upon a show of hands the amendment failed.

Upon another show of hands, the motion to continue the committee passed, and the chair of the Business Meeting asked for volunteers to serve on the committee and said he would announce the appointments to the committee at the Sunday session.

(Before the end of the Preliminary Meeting the Business Meeting chair appointed Warren Buff (chair), Kevin Standlee, Ben Yalow, Mark Olson, Seth Breibart, Glenn Glazer, and Leslie Turek as members of the “Selling Votes” temporary committee to report back on Saturday.)

Saturday’s debate time was set at 8 minutes. [Please click here to jump to Saturday’s discussion.](#)

4. WORLDCON REPORTS

4.1 Past Worldcons & NASFiC

4.1.1 Millennium Philcon (2001)

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

Expenses – August 1, 2013 through July 31, 2014

Total Expenses	\$0.00
----------------	--------

Surplus Balance August 11, 2013	\$45,216.36
---------------------------------	-------------

Expenses Paid August 1, 2013 through July 31, 2014	\$0.00
--	--------

Surplus Distributions August 1, 2013 through July 31, 2014	<u>\$0.00</u>
--	---------------

Surplus Balance August 1, 2014	\$45,216.36
--------------------------------	-------------

1. A donation was made during the past year on behalf of MilPhil to LoneStarCon 3 in the amount of \$471.94.
2. An additional donation on behalf of MilPhil was made to the MPC in the amount of \$400.
3. Independent counsel is negotiating on behalf of the committee with the IRS, but no resolution has been achieved yet. It remains the committee's intention to donate any funds remaining after resolution to valid 501(c)(3) organizations or their equivalent.

No one from the convention was present to speak. John Pomeranz asked for the names of the members of the Millennium Philcon Board of Directors, but no one in the room knew the answer. The person who knows the answer was not yet at the convention but would be at the Business Meeting on Saturday. Mr. Pomeranz then asked if there were some appropriate way for the Business Meeting to instruct or appoint others to the board so the legal issues can be resolved: would it be in order on Saturday to appoint a committee to explore the WSFS's legal options to break this logjam?

[Please click here to jump to an addendum in Saturday's session.](#)

4.1.2 L.A. con IV (2006)

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

LACON IV Funds			7/16/13
DATE	ACCOUNT	DESCRIP	AMOUNT
9/1/2006	Opening		\$75,000.00
9/8/2006	Rotsler Award	2006 Winner	(300.00)
2/3/2007	LACon Masque Photo Exhibit	display expenses	(27.71)
2/3/2007	LACon Masque Photo Exhibit	display expenses	(21.08)
4/25/2007	Worldcon History	Worldcon History	(20.00)
5/17/2007	Worldcon History	Worldcon History	(913.00)
6/14/2007	Donations – TAFF	report published	(100.00)
6/24/2007	Octavia Butler Fund		(1,500.00)
6/30/2007	Worldcon History	Worldcon history	(45.00)
8/20/2007	Donations	Nippon Worldcon – Hugo Party	(5,000.00)
10/1/2007	Donations	ISL	(3,000.00)
10/28/2007	Rotsler Award	2007 Winner	(300.00)
12/9/2007	Local Fandom	LASFS Storage Shed Rental	(935.00)
2/18/2008	Local Fandom	Cell Phone Booster	(327.00)
3/17/2008	Local Fandom	Cell Phone Booster	(150.00)
3/17/2008	Local Fandom	Master Card Machines	(1,685.00)
5/2/2008	Donations – TAFF	con report	(62.77)
5/9/2008	Projects – Photos		(468.71)
5/21/2008	Donations – TAFF	Report	(500.00)
6/18/2008	Misc.	memory for computer	(69.00)
6/18/2008	Projects – Photos		(106.09)
7/13/2008	Projects – Photos		(205.68)
7/13/2008	Donations	Seattle Worldcon	(500.00)
7/13/2008	Worldcon History		(1,429.00)
8/21/2008	Projects – Photos		(254.39)
11/20/2008	Donations	Nippon	(10,000.00)
10/2/2008	Projects – Photos		(207.84)
12/4/2008	Projects – Photos		(339.43)
12/4/2008	Worldcon History		(17.30)
12/23/2008	Worldcon History		(17.30)
2/3/2009	Donations	Eaton Conference	(1,500.00)
2/3/2009	Storage	SCIFI Shed	(3,223.00)
2/27/2009	Donations	Shed rent	(935.00)
2/27/2009	Donations	75 th Anniversary	(500.00)
3/14/2009	Admin	Paper for large printer	(75.96)
3/17/2009	Equipment	Large cutter	(311.00)

DATE	ACCOUNT	DESCRIP	AMOUNT
4/15/2009	Donations – DUFF	Duff Report	(500.00)
5/4/2009	Projects – Photos	Moffatt picture transfer	(308.51)
5/19/2009	Donations – TAFF	2005 TAFF Report	(500.00)
7/14/2009	Projects	Hugo Award Contest	(500.00)
7/16/2009	Projects	Worldcon History	(16.00)
9/17/2009	Projects	reg; wc history	(512.80)
11/4/2009	Donations	Archive fanzines at Riverside	(2,500.00)
11/19/2009	Projects	Registration	(175.00)
11/24/2009	Rotsler Award	Plaque	(66.80)
11/24/2009	Rotsler Award	Honor	(300.00)
12/7/2009	Projects	Registration	(1,700.00)
10/10/2009	Projects	Con Registration	(1,700.00)
12/10/2009	Projects	Registration	(1,700.00)
12/17/2009	Projects	Registration	(500.00)
1/22/2010	Projects	Registration	(1,521.80)
2/1/2010	Storage		(3,223.00)
2/1/2010	Projects	WC History	(35.00)
4/14/2010	Donations – GUFF	2004	(500.00)
8/7/2010	Donations – GUFF	2009	(500.00)
8/13/2010	Projects	Art show update	(92.00)
8/16/2010	Projects	Art show update	(153.00)
8/21/2010	Projects	Art show update	(685.00)
2/8/2011	Donations	UCR - Eaton Conference	(1,500.00)
2/8/2011	Storage	LASFS	(120.00)
2/8/2011	Storage	LASFS	(510.00)
2/8/2011	Storage	WC History	(292.00)
2/8/2011	Storage	WC History	(2,930.00)
2/8/2011	Storage	WC History	3,225.00
5/2/2011	Donations	RCFI	(1,000.00)
6/12/2011	Storage	WC History	(255.00)
6/12/2011	Equipment	Reg system	(300.00)
8/31/2011	Storage	LASFS Library	(170.00)
8/31/2011	Projects	Registration printer	(100.00)
11/27/2011	Projects	Loscon donation	(860.00)
11/28/2011	Projects	Printers for Art Show	(400.00)
11/28/2011	Projects	Credit card machine	(400.00)
12/12/2011	Rotsler Award	Shiffman	(300.00)
2/8/2012	Projects	Shredder	(70.00)
2/20/2012	Projects	Paper & Ink	(487.55)
7/6/2012	Projects	WSFS Banner restoration	(375.00)
12/2/2012	Equipment	Phones	(450.00)
12/20/2012	Rotsler Award		(300.00)

DATE	ACCOUNT	DESCRIP	AMOUNT
12/20/2012	Rotsler Award	Plaque	(160.00)
12/27/2012	Equipment	Radios	(6,000.00)
3/20/2013	Projects	UCR - Eaton Conf	(2,500.00)
4/02/2013	Projects	Outreach Project	(1,000.00)
6/15/2013	Equipment	extension cords, TV	(500.00)
7/12/2013	Equipment	exten cords holders	(59.00)
7/16/2013	Equipment	repeater, license	(3349.70)
7/16/2013	Equipment	payback from Anime, Galli	1200.00
12/18/2013	Rotsler Award		(300.00)
1/31/2014	Good of Fandom	Japan Bailout \$\$\$\$	(1500.00)
4/7/2014	Equipment	VHS/DVD & supplies	(210.00)
3/10/2014	Projects	Rotsler Award – plaque	(130.00)
Total			\$161.58

Glenn Glazer reported on behalf of Elayne Pelz and SCIFI that the small balance shown in this report was before SCIFI made its donation to the Mark Protection Committee and that all funds have been expended. Kevin Standlee asked the Business Meeting to thank SCIFI for its generous donation to the MPC and moved that the Business Meeting unanimously declare this report to be considered LACon IV's final report. This motion was seconded and passed without objection.

4.1.3 Nippon (2007)

Inasmuch as Nippon 2007 has reported a net loss, it has no obligation to make further reports to the Business Meeting under the WSFS Constitution, and it did not issue a report this year. They are only required to report on a surplus.

[Please click here to jump to an addendum in Saturday's session.](#)

4.1.4 Anticipation (2009)

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

Financial Report

Cansmof, Inc.

For the period August 1, 2013 to July 31, 2014

Opening Balance	\$81,523.77
Administrative Fees	\$499.44
Grants:	
CSFFA (Auroras Awards)	\$200.00
Worldcon staff travel grant	\$500.00
Smofcon Travel Grant 1	\$500.00
Smofcon Travel Grant 2	\$500.00
Grant to Costume Con	\$2,000.00
Grant to Nippon2007	\$13,500.00
Grant to Loncon 3	\$10,000.00
Total expenses	\$27,699.44
Balance on July 31, 2014	\$58,824.33

Note 1: All amounts in Canadian dollars

Note 2: Cansmof, a federally incorporated Canadian not for profit corporation, may be reached by mail at

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

or by e-mail at cansmof@gmail.com

The current Board of Cansmof Inc., consists of (in alphabetical order): Robbie Bourget, Terry Fong, Eugene Heller, Diane Lacey, Dawn McKechnie, Linda Ross-Mansfield, Kevin Standlee and René Walling

René Walling also noted the similar discrepancy to that of LACon IV, in that this report was prepared before Cansmof made its \$5,000 donation to the MPC. There was an additional oversight in not reporting its \$1,400 grant to Detcon, and both will be noted on next year's report. There is approximately \$50,000 left in CanSmof's account.

4.1.5 Renovation (2011)



Renovation

The 69th World Science Fiction Convention
Reno, Nevada USA ★ August 17–21, 2011

This is the fifth Financial Report of Renovation, the 69th Worldcon, to the WSFS Business Meeting, covering all activities through June 30, 2014.

Distribution of Renovation Surplus

Clayton Memorial Medical Fund (in the name of Jay Lake, the Renovation Hugo co-MC) (Dedicated to helping Pacific Northwest Writers facing medical emergencies)	\$ 5,000
Loncon 3 (A grant to help support their music night programming)	5,000
ASFA (Association of Science Fiction & Fantasy Artists (A grant to help support their scholarship program for Spectrum	5,000
University of California-Riverside Eaton Collection (in the name of Bruce Pelz, who started many of us on the path to running conventions)	4,000
Westercon 69 (2016, in Portland OR) (<i>sponsoring special guest Charles Stross</i>)	4,000
University of Wyoming's Launchpad Astronomy Workshop (Astronomy educational workshop for writers)	3,500
WSFS Mark Protection Committee	<u>500</u>
Total Final Grants	27,000
Total Grants	<u>\$159,501</u>

The remainder, currently approximately \$2,600, will be transferred to Oregon Science Fiction Conventions, Inc. and used to cover the costs of closing the Reno Convention Fandom corporation and archiving the Renovation web site.

Our goal is to close the bank account and dissolve the corporation by the end of 2014. (Yes, we also said that last year, but this time we mean it.)

John Lorentz, Renovation Finance Head
July 19, 2014

Colin Harris noted that Renovation has essentially cleared its donations and declared that its small balance of remaining funds will be distributed to the Oregon Science Fiction Conventions, Inc. and made the following motion:

Moved, to forgive Renovation from having to file a report next year.

This motion was seconded and passed without objection. Therefore, this is Renovation's final report.

4.1.6 Chicon 7



Chicon 7

Financial Statement

August 1, 2013 through July 31, 2014

	Beginning Balance:		\$130,948.16
Income			
Memberships		(\$150.00)	
Dealers / Art Show		\$120.00	
<i>Art Show Sales Commission</i>	\$120.00		
Sales Tax Received from Merch Sales		(\$6,797.63)	
	Total Income		(\$6,827.63)
Expenditures			
Corporation Costs			
Post Con		(\$480.00)	
<i>Reimbursements</i>	(\$480.00)		
Grants			
BWAWA, Inc		(\$8,500.00)	
Driving the Future, Inc. NASFiC		(\$6,400.00)	
International Costumers Guild		(\$1,000.00)	
ISFiC Press		(\$7,000.00)	
London 2014		(\$12,905.00)	
<i>Pass-a-Long Funds</i>	(\$10,700.00)		
<i>Bench Sponsorship</i>	(\$2,205.00)		
LoneStarCon3		(\$750.00)	
<i>Childrens Programming Shipping</i>	(\$750.00)		
Sasquan 2015		(\$30,700.00)	
<i>Pass-a-Long Funds</i>	(\$30,700.00)		
Worldcon Heritage Organization		(\$5,000.00)	
Corporation Costs		(\$125.00)	
Other Bank Fees		(\$359.05)	
Office Expenses / P.O. Box Rental		(\$124.00)	
IT Support		(\$171.21)	
Internet Services Hosting, etc.	(\$171.21)		

<i>IT Hardware Purchased</i>	(\$480.00)	
Events Division		(\$39,890.45)
Dances		
<i>ASCAP</i>	(\$384.18)	
Total Expense:		(\$73,898.44)
Remaining Surplus:		\$50,222.09

Joyce Lloyd, Treasurer Chicon 7, and Dave McCarty, Chicon 7

Dave McCarty reported that Chicon has expended over half its surplus funds and that it expects to expend the rest of the money in the next year or two before closing its books.

4.1.7 LoneStarCon 3



Profit & Loss

	Total
Income	
410000 MEMBERSHIPS	\$0.00
410100 Voting Fees (from Renovation)	\$45,150.00
Total 410200 Renovation - JUN 2012	\$99,277.13
Total 410300 1 May 2012 to 30 Sept 2012	\$340.00
Total 410400 1 OCT 2012 to DEC 2012	\$129,182.03
Total 410500 JAN 2013 - APR 2013	\$339,231.54
410600 1 Aug 2013 to End of Pre-Reg	\$47,528.00
410700 Walk-Ins At-Con	\$79,950.00
Total 410000 MEMBERSHIPS	\$740,658.70
Total 420000 CHAIR'S OFFICE / FINANCE	\$23,560.30
Total 430000 DEALERS/ART SHOW	\$49,007.55
430600 ASFA contrib. to Suite / Chesley	\$4,270.36
Total 440000 SERVICES/FINANCE	\$11,980.00
Total 450000 FACILITIES	\$25,633.75
Total 460000 ADVERTISING	\$6,535.00
Total 470000 GRANTS, LOANS AND TIED SPONSORS	\$78,853.75
Total Income	\$940,499.41
Gross Income	\$940,499.41
Expenses	
Total 610100 GENERAL EXPENSES	\$8,972.20
610105 Advertising/Promotional	\$68.00
Total 610200 PRE-CON	\$6,295.56
Total 610300 AT-CON	\$7,877.79
Total 610400 POST-CON	\$109,033.20

610501 Charitable Contributions	\$2,200.00
610502 Sasquan Pass Along Funds	\$20,000.00
610503 Loncon (2014)	\$20,000.00
<hr/>	
Total 610000 CHAIR'S OFFICE	\$174,446.75
Total 620000 FINANCE DIVISION	\$29,151.58
Total 630000 WSFS DIVISION	\$14,553.48
640000 FACILITIES DIVISION	\$863.60
Total 640100 CONVENTION CENTER – HIRE	\$47,100.00
Total 640200 CONVENTION CENTER - CORE SERVICES	\$233.90
Total 640300 CONVENTION CENTER – LOGISTICS	\$3,420.00
Total 640500 FACILITIES – Rivercenter	\$28,472.02
Total 640700 OTHER	\$1,802.04
<hr/>	
Total 640000 FACILITIES DIVISION	\$81,891.56
650100 DECORATOR	\$73,187.20
650101 Exhibits Banners	\$1,378.57
650120 Paid Security	\$9,784.72
Total 650200 FIXED EXHIBITS	\$9,738.50
Total 650300 ART SHOW	\$8,924.36
Total 650400 DEALERS	\$205.41
<hr/>	
Total 650000 EXHIBITS DIVISION	\$103,218.76
Total 660000 PROGRAM DIVISION	\$34,084.95
Total 670000 TECH DIVISION	\$126,644.31
Total 675000 EVENTS DIVISION	\$18,340.19
Total 680000 SERVICES DIVISION	\$74,517.87
Total 680200 IT SUPPORT	\$10,332.35
Total 690000 PUBLICATIONS DIVISION	\$72,699.92
Total 700000 HOSPITALITY & PROMOTIONS DIVISION	\$15,122.59
<hr/>	
799999 UNALLOCATED EXPENSE	\$942.86
<hr/>	
Total Expenses	\$755,947.17
Net Operating Income	\$184,552.24
Total Other Income	\$911.57
Net Other Income	\$911.57
Net Income	\$185,463.81

LoneStarCon 3 – Additional Expected Expenses

Money available after all outstanding checks have cleared:	185,463.81
Money in Paypal for Membership Refunds:	3,760.00
<hr/>	
Money available after all outstanding checks have cleared:	181,703.81
Less Additional Membership Reimbursements still to be paid:	1,640.00
Less Additional Expenses (Hero Gifts and Misc Expenses)	14,000.00
Less WSFS Dues	3,795.00
Less estimated Staff Expense reimbursements:	50,000.00
Subtotal:	112,268.81
<hr/>	

Pass Along Funds Paid to Loncon:	20,000.00
Pass Along Funds Paid to Sasquan:	20,000.00
Estimated Profit from LSC3:	152,268.81

Bill Parker reported that LoneStarCon 3 has started its pass-along distributions, with donations to Loncon 3 and to Sasquan and will donate funds to whoever wins the 2016 Worldcon. Mark Olson felt that LoneStarCon was underfunding its pass-along funds and while it was too late for Loncon 3 he asked if LoneStarCon 3 was planning on making an additional payment to Sasquan. Mr. Parker responded that while they plan to make further payments, they first need to finish paying expenses. He believes most of the expenses have been covered at this point but others are still pending.

Ben Yalow noted that there was roughly \$65,000 of additional expenses still pending, once membership reimbursements have been paid. That would leave three additional payments of \$20,000 to will expend those funds. Mr. Parker responded that the membership reimbursements were made after this report was submitted. Warren Buff said that half of the \$152,000 on the report's bottom line would leave closer to \$75,000, but Mr. Parker responded that while the first two \$20,000 payments have already been made, the third one has not. If LoneStarCon's expenses are not as high as expected, there would be additional payments made to all three Worldcons, bringing a total of approximately \$23-25,000 to each Worldcon.

Colin Harris pointed out as a general comment that he felt it was better for a worldcon to overpay a pass-along fund while it can still be used rather than be too conservative in its donations. Martin Easterbrook noted that the financial report lists "sponsors" and asked if a list of the LoneStarCon 3 sponsors was available. Mr. Parker said there was such a list and he would see if it could be placed on the LoneStarCon website. Dave McCarty noted that it appeared that the largest portion of sponsorship came from the three prior Worldcons.

4.1.8 Detcon1



Income and Expenses to Date (as of August 10, 2014)

INCOME

Transfer from Bid	\$3,863.33
Voting Fees	\$15,381.83
Memberships	\$64,060.00
Dealers fees (tables & services)	\$8,220.00
Art show sales & fees	\$11,206.50
Artist Alley fees	\$180.00
Merchandise sales (t-shirts, patches)	\$2,354.64
Baseball and planetarium ticket sales	\$860.00
Fees from Mobie users	\$1,050.00
Advertising sales	\$4,201.00
Chicon 7 Grant	\$6,400.00
CanSMOF Grant	\$1,400.00
LoneStarCon 3 Grant	\$2,200.00
Reception sponsorship from SFWA	\$2,000.00
FANtastic Detroit Fund donations	\$1,457.48
Misc Donations	\$336.50
INCOME TOTAL	\$125,171.28

EXPENSES

Chair's Office

Committee meetings	\$331.94
Travel/expenses support	\$400.00
Mark Protection Committee dues	
Reimbursements	

Finance

Credit card/Paypal fees/Square fees	\$2,147.81
Corporation costs	\$30.00
Other bank fees	\$39.00
Currency exchange	\$75.86
PO box rental/office expenses	\$57.17
Liability insurance	\$198.11

<i>Member Services</i>	
Registration Materials	\$1,668.24
Consuite/hospitality	\$5,286.28
Room party prizes	\$201.92
Ribbons	\$894.02
Volunteer meals	\$366.20
Mobie hire	\$1,462.80
 <i>Facilities</i>	
Marriott (space, catering, tech & security)	\$30,179.77
Marriott (hotel room)	\$3,502.90
Attrition on Courtyard	\$3,474.68
 <i>Ops Division</i>	
Truck rental and expenses	\$2,749.72
Office supplies	\$955.11
 <i>Exhibits Division</i>	
Art Show expenses (setup and return mailing)	\$903.96
Artist sales payment (estimated)	\$1,338.70
Fan Gallery shipping (estimated)	
Fanzine lounge (supplies and suite rental)	\$931.55
 <i>Program Division</i>	
Guests of Honor/Special Guests	\$7,355.76
Programming supplies	\$301.67
 <i>Events Division</i>	
Masquerade	\$66.45
YA Award ceremony	\$270.60
YA award design and fabrication	\$500.00
Dances	\$1,595.00
Tigers tickets	\$667.00
Planetarium tickets	\$145.00
Planetarium bus ride	\$327.00
ASCAP, BMI, MPLC licenses	\$250.00
 <i>Publications Division</i>	
PR1 (Dec 2013)	\$1,079.94
PR2 (April 2014)	\$1,290.02
PR3 (July 2014)	\$166.55
Souvenir Book, program guide, other at-con	\$6,121.45

Newsletter	\$948.95
Re-printing souvenir books (estimated)	
Post con mailing of souvenir books (estimated)	
<i>Promotions Division</i>	
Web/IT	\$234.68
Convention activities	\$2,347.09
Promotional Materials (shirts)	\$2,505.80
Promotional Materials (other)	\$1,209.08
Outbound advertising	\$538.87
EXPENSES TOTAL	\$85,116.65
NET INCOME	\$40,054.63

Estimated Remaining Expenses

Mark protection committee dues	\$443.00
Reimbursements	\$18,000.00
Artist sales payment (estimated)	\$8,161.30
Fan Gallery shipping (estimated)	\$300.00
ASCAP, BMI, MPLC licenses	\$271.00
Re-printing souvenir books (estimated)	\$1700.00
Post con mailing of souvenir books (estimated)	\$600.00
TOTAL	\$29,475.30

Anticipated Surplus

After remaining expenses are paid we anticipate a surplus of \$10,579.33 (will change based on actual cost of estimated expenses).

Submitted by Don Wenzel, Detcon1 Treasurer and Tammy Coxen, Detcon1 Chair
August 13, 2014

Tammy Coxon noted that Detcon 1 had been held only slightly more than a month earlier and reported that it was anticipating a surplus of approximately \$10,000. Priscilla Olson congratulated Detcon 1 on a speedy and efficient report, over and above the fiscal responsibility requirement.

4.2 Seated Worldcons

4.2.1 Loncon 3



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

FINANCIAL STATEMENT - AS OF 30 JUNE 2014

HMRC Exchange Rates (i)	US dollar	1.6938
	Euro	1.2480

Income

Voting Fee (converted to UK£)	£23,083.78
Passalong Funds (Renovation)	£16,678.99
Passalong Funds (Chicon 7)	£18,794.14
Passalong Funds-(LoneStarCon 3)	£5,869.87
Passalong Funds-(AussieCon 4)	£3,058.31
Bid Passalong	£80,767.84
Membership Income	£497,741.84
Sponsorship	£12,070.10
Net VAT Receipts (ii)	£16,777.47
Dealers' Zone (tables)	£21,128.93
Art Show (Hanging Fees)	£3,422.91
Publication Advertising	£11,308.45
Merchandise Sales Commission	£391.35
Photo Competition	£150.00
Art Show Case Sales	£4,025.00
Balancing Transfer (iii)	£4,070.14
Total income	£719,339.12

Expenditures

Chairs Discretionary	£2,131.67
Guest of Honour	£8,400.88
Hugo Losers Party	£3,696.46

Staff & Committee Weekends	£5,537.80
Membership Forms & Expenses	£1,126.39
Membership Refunds	£1,106.00
Web Hosting	£702.90
Credit Card Charges	£15,999.78
Accountant Fees	£4,104.90
General Insurance	£5,765.50
Bank & Corporate Charges	£202.93
Net VAT Payments (ii)	£16,257.21
Convention Facilities	£316,444.15
Progress Reports	£18,421.54
Retro Hugo Booklet	£1,713.69
Advertising	£13,295.40
Promotions	£8,284.93
At-Con IT	£1,794.90
Programme	£1,196.06
Art Show	£3,969.15
Exhibits Expenses	£330.89
Shipping & Storage	£2,767.76
Hospitality Expenses	£129.99
Audio/Video Tech	£1,876.00
Furnishings	£26,800.00
Performances	£7,379.86
Bid Party Expenses	£2,937.64
Balancing Transfer (iii)	£5,923.49
Total Expenditure	£478,297.87
Net (Income - Expenditure):	£241,041.25

Bank Accounts

	GBP	USD	EUR
Euro Account			€3,971.15
PayPal Accounts	£59,869.39	\$52,653.77	
UK Cheque Account	£126,658.16		
UK in 2014 Account	£1,836.13		
US Agent Account		\$5,980.23	
Chicon voting account		\$17,351.00	
	£175,331.54	\$75,985.00	€3,971.15
Total: Bank Accounts (Local Currency)	£188,363.68	\$75,985.00	€3,971.15
USD Bank Accounts (Nominal GBP)	£44,860.67		
Euro Bank Accounts (Nominal GBP)	£3,182.01		
Total Bank Accounts (Nominal GBP)	£236,406.36		
Unbanked Cash	£2.00	\$174.00	€100.00
Unbanked Cheques	£405.00		
Total Unbanked (Local Currency)	£407.00	\$174.00	€100.00
USD Unbanked (Nominal GDP)	£102.73		

Euro Unbanked (Nominal GDP)	£80.13
Total Unbanked (Nominal GDP)	£589.86
Tabs (v)	£858.00
Historic Currency Corrections (vi)	£4,606.00
Total Balance:	£240,744.22
Reconciliation balance:	£297.03
Total Reconciled Balance	£241,041.25

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

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

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

(iv) The variations in exchange rates means that foreign monies spent appear to change in value as exchange rates change, and the exchange rate realised in these exchanges will be significantly different from that used by the HMRC. This entry approximates the effect of historic variable exchange rates.

(v) Amounts paid by people not yet reimbursed.

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.

Steve Cooper reported that there were 5,441 warm bodies on site, and over 10,003 members total.

Secretary's Note: Some duplicate sponsorship income lines in the agenda have been removed from the minutes.

4.2.2 Sasquan



SASQUAN 2014 WSFC INCOME STMT BY YEAR

	<u>Dec 31, 13</u>	<u>Jun 30, 14</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Income			
4010100 · Voting Income			
4010101 · Voting Fees	53,640.00	0.00	53,640.00
Total 4010100 · Voting Income	<u>53,640.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>53,640.00</u>
4010201 · Holding Spot	41,800.00	99.49	41,899.49
4010202 · Membership Sales - Before con			
4010203 · Membership Full	28,000.00	12,970.00	40,970.00
4010204 · Membership-Vote/Sup to Attend	4,900.00	2,460.00	7,360.00
4010205 · Member-Vote/Sup&Pre to Attend	1,200.00	400.00	1,600.00
4010206 · Young Adult Attending	270.00	180.00	450.00
4010207 · Young Adult-Vote to Attending	50.00	0.00	50.00
4010208 · Child Attending	360.00	300.00	660.00
4010210 · Membership Reimbursement	0.00	-170.00	-170.00
4010241 · Family Membership	0.00	870.00	870.00
4010242 · Supporting Membership	1,320.00	1,640.00	2,960.00
4010202 · Membership Sales - Before con – Other	0.00	53,296.47	53,296.47
Total 4010202 · Membership Sales - Before con	<u>36,100.00</u>	<u>71,946.47</u>	<u>108,046.47</u>
4020000 · Chair's Office / Finance			
4020200 · Bank Interest Income	0.08	0.00	0.08
4020400 · Misc. Donations	0.00	49.00	49.00
Total 4020000 · Chair's Office / Finance	<u>0.08</u>	<u>49.00</u>	<u>49.08</u>
4060000 · Advertising & Publications			
4060100 · Progress Reports	0.00	350.00	350.00
Total 4060000 · Advertising & Publications	<u>0.00</u>	<u>350.00</u>	<u>350.00</u>
4070000 · Grants, Loans and Other			
4070100 · Chicago Pass Along	30,700.00	0.00	30,700.00
4070200 · San Antonio Pass Along	0.00	10,000.00	10,000.00
Total 4070000 · Grants, Loans and Other	<u>30,700.00</u>	<u>10,000.00</u>	<u>40,700.00</u>
Total Income	<u>162,240.08</u>	<u>82,444.96</u>	<u>244,685.04</u>

Gross Profit	162,240.08	82,444.96	244,685.04
Expense			
6010000 · Chair's Office			
6010100 · General Expenses			
6010101 · Committee Meetings	0.00	498.48	498.48
Total 6010100 · General Expenses	0.00	498.48	498.48
Total 6010000 · Chair's Office	0.00	498.48	498.48
6060000 · Finance Division			
6060100 · Credit Card Fees	1,393.98	650.54	2,044.52
6060200 · Paypal Fees	1,115.78	1,144.20	2,259.98
6060500 · Other Bank Fees	74.34	37.00	111.34
6060800 · Office Expenses/PO Box Rental	0.00	206.00	206.00
6061100 · US Bulk Mail Imprint Fees	0.00	19.99	19.99
6061200 · At Con Registration			
6061202 · At Con Treasury	0.00	321.37	321.37
Total 6061200 · At Con Registration	0.00	321.37	321.37
6061300 · Office Supplies	0.00	66.26	66.26
Total 6060000 · Finance Division	2,584.10	2,445.36	5,029.46
6080000 · Promotions & Publicity Division			
6080100 · Advertising (Outbound)			
6080101 · Fan Advertising	0.00	540.00	540.00
Total 6080100 · Advertising (Outbound)	0.00	540.00	540.00
6080300 · Promotional Materials			
6080303 · Bookmarks, Posters, Post Cards, etc.	0.00	116.75	116.75
6080305 · Table Kits	0.00	79.00	79.00
Total 6080300 · Promotional Materials	0.00	195.75	195.75
Total 6080000 · Promotions & Publicity Division	0.00	735.75	735.75
6090000 · Publications Division			
6090200 · PR1			
6090201 · PR1- Printing Costs	0.00	4,856.04	4,856.04
6090202 · PR1- Mailing Costs	0.00	1,431.57	1,431.57
Total 6090200 · PR1	0.00	6,287.61	6,287.61
Total 6090000 · Publications Division	0.00	6,287.61	6,287.61
6150000 · IT Division			
6150100 · IT Support			
6150102 · Internet Services (Hosting etc)	0.00	23.98	23.98
Total 6150100 · IT Support	0.00	23.98	23.98
Total 6150000 · IT Division	0.00	23.98	23.98
Total Expense	2,584.10	9,991.18	12,575.28
Net Income	159,655.98	72,453.78	232,109.76

Glenn Glazer was asked what a “holding spot” was. He did not know but said he would find out and report back on Saturday. Jill Eastlake believed it to be a quirk of QuickBooks. Glenn also noted that LoneStarCon 3 reported that they gave \$20,000 to Sasquan; Sasquan listed the grant as \$10,000, but he believed that that might simply have been a timing issue.

[Please click here to see an addendum in Saturday's session.](#)

Without objection, the meeting adjourned at 12:48 PM on Friday.

Main Business Meeting, Saturday, August 16, 2014

The meeting was called to order at 10:11 a.m. The business meeting staff consisted of Donald E. Eastlake III, Presiding Officer; Linda Deneroff, Secretary; Jill Eastlake, Timekeeper; Lisa Hayes, Videographer; and Jesi Pershing, Assistant Timekeeper.

1. BUSINESS PASSED ON FROM LONESTARCON 3

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

1.1 Short Title: Two-Thirds Is Good Enough, Part 1

[Please click here to jump to the text of the motion.](#) Debate time was set at 2 minutes.

Discussion: Mark Olson asked for some context for this motion. Kevin Standlee explained that currently Section 3.4.3 requires a three-fourths vote to extend the eligibility of a work if it received only limited distribution in the current year. This amendment replaces the three-fourths majority with a two-thirds majority vote. There were no other speeches, and with a show of hands in favor of the amendment, it passed and will take effect at the end of Loncon 3.

1.2 Short title: Two-Thirds Is Good Enough, Part 2

[Please click here to jump to the text of the motion.](#) Debate time was set at 2 minutes.

Discussion: Discussion: Kevin Standlee explained that currently Section 3.4.2 requires a three-fourths vote to extend eligibility for works that were originally published outside the United States and then first published in the U.S. in the current year. This amendment replaces the three-fourths majority with a two-thirds majority vote. There were no other speeches, with a show of hands in favor of the amendment, it passed and will take effect at the end of Loncon 3.

1.3 Short Title: A Matter of Trust

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

Discussion: *This amendment if ratified, removes the requirement to opt in for electronic publications.* Kent Bloom spoke against the amendment, believing it was still too premature to remove the opt-in option since not everyone has electronic access, and they might not know that they need to opt in for printed publications if they don't know that they need to do that. He felt the cost was negligible cost to keep electronic publications opt-in in fairness to those who do not have electronic access.

Warren Buff spoke in favor of the motion. Having just been involved in the first two progress reports for Sasquan, he said over 500 progress reports were sent out to those who did not want to electronic copies (many of them overseas), at a cost of \$2,500 in postage that could have been spent elsewhere. However, Rick Kovalcik does not trust Worldcons to continue to send out paper publications to those who do not have access to the internet. He believed it would be much harder for someone like Filthy Pierre, who does not have internet access, to obtain printed materials if this motion passed. He felt this was another form of access issue, and a very bad idea. Andrew Adams spoke in favor of the amendment, saying this motion removed some micromanagement from the Constitution of one particular small area, and it's not the way we do things generally. There are many ways for a Worldcon to screw up, and we'll deal with any issues that may arise.

Lisa Hayes spoke against the motion. She originally made the proposal to save money for the Worldcon. Her intent was that the Worldcon could charge people for the printed publications. But do not cut off people without internet access who need the printed publications. Joshua Kronengold felt that a convention will know if someone needs a paper copy. If they do not have an email address for an individual, that individual will need a paper copy.

In a serpentine vote, the amendment passed, with 53 in favor and 26 opposed to the amendment, and it will take effect at the end of Loncon 3.

1.4 Short Title: WSFS Accountability Act of 2013

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

Discussion: *This amendment requires certain information to be included with the submission of a Worldcon's or NASFiC's financial report. With no discussion and/or objection, the amendment was ratified and will take effect at the end of Loncon 3.*

1.5 Short Title: Best Fan Artist

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

Discussion: *This amendment adds some words to the specification of Best Fan Artist. With no discussion and/or objection, the amendment was ratified and will take effect at the end of Loncon 3.*

1.6 Short Title: In the Zone

[Please click here to jump to the text of the motion.](#) Debate time was set at 2 minutes.

Discussion: *This amendment would remove regional residence restrictions on elected members of the Mark Protection Committee. Kevin Standlee asked if the regional*

restrictions would still apply to the election at Loncon 3. The chair of the Business Meeting answered that they would since this amendment would not take effect till after the convention. (The question was actually moot, since there are only three candidates.) Glenn Glazer spoke in favor the motion since there is no reason to split up the U.S. when we do not split up the rest of the world into separate zones. We should elect the most competent people to the Mark Protection Committee, wherever they happen to be. Rick Kovalcik believed there is virtue in having “feet on the street,” but Ben Yalow pointed out that with the internet, geographical restrictions are moot and there is no need for a regional split. Kevin Standlee spoke against this motion because, despite the fact that the Worldcon has become more worldly, the U.S. still dominates the governing of the World Science Fiction Society. And, since the U.S. is not a one amorphous mass, there is still a need for the geographical split. The “Rest of the World” has the privilege of no quota; such members can fill all nine positions. With a show of hands, this amendment passed and will take effect at the end of Loncon 3.

1.7 Short Title: We Don’t Need Another HEROW

[Please click here to jump to the text of the motion.](#) Debate time was set at 5 minutes.

Discussion: *This makes the Hugo Award Rest of World Eligibility Extension permanent and eliminates entirely the need for a vote. With no discussion and/or objection, the amendment was ratified and will take effect at the end of Loncon 3. Additionally, with this amendment, the HEROW Committee was disbanded. In effect, with this amendment, agenda items 1.1 and 3.2.3 of this agenda became moot.*

2. NEW BUSINESS

2.1 Constitutional Amendments

Items under this heading have not yet received first passage and will become part of the constitution only if passed at Loncon 3 and ratified at Sasquan.

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

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

The item here is submitted by the Arithmetic Committee as an amendment by substitution for the original (Friday’s) Item 2.2.1:

Moved, to modify the existing constitutional amendment process so that proposed amendments passed by a WSFS Business Meeting and ratified by the following Business Meeting must be ratified by a vote of the members of the following Worldcon; to provide for special handling of the ratification of this

proposal; and to provide for the transition between ratification systems, by ~~striking out~~ and adding words as follows:

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

Section 6.6: Amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 6.7: Commencement.

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

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

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

Section 6.3: Electronic Voting. Nothing in this Constitution shall be interpreted to prohibit conducting Hugo Awards nominating and voting, ratification elections for pending Constitutional amendments, and Site Selection voting by electronic means, except that conducting Site Selection by electronic means shall require the unanimous agreement of the current Worldcon committee and all bidding committees who have filed before the ballot deadline. Valid paper ballots delivered by any means shall always be acceptable. This section shall not be interpreted to require that such elections be conducted electronically, nor shall it be interpreted to allow remote participation or proxy voting at the Business Meeting.

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

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

Provided that,

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

Debate time was set at 24 minutes.

Discussion: The chair asked if there were any objection to substituting this version of the amendment in lieu of the prior amendment. Geoff Thorpe felt that taking three years to ratify a procedure is too long, and we should stick to the original amendment. Kevin Standlee, a proponent of the original amendment, spoke in favor of the substitution for two reasons. He felt that changing a constitution is supposed to be difficult and generally no amendment is so urgent that it can't wait one more year; and he was willing to accept this new amendment for the greater good. Perianne Lurie did not see a need to go to the business meeting twice before sending an item to the membership, but Ben Yalow felt we need the extra time to potentially fix an amendment that is not quite right. If we go to the "1+1" system, we lose that ability,

and therefore the “2+1” amendment is superior. Jack Foy felt that the “2+1” solution loses the feature of the original amendment that removes the second vote from the business meeting and give it to the membership.

The question was called on the amendment by substitution and passed by a show of hands. Then the “two plus one” amendment by substitution passed and thus itself came up came for discussion.

Kevin Standlee spoke in favor of the substituted amendment. The key element, he felt is that there are thousands of members of WSFS who cannot attend a Worldcon, and while he was not in favor of remote participation or proxies, he felt that the entire membership of the convention should have at least some voice in WSFS’ affairs. This amendment would derail the legitimate criticism of WSFS’s process, whereby only about 200 people control the governance. Adopting this motion does no harm and enfranchises a significant portion of the members of our organization.

Joshua Kronengold felt that we don’t need to make amendments harder to pass. He also felt we don’t need to put trivial items in our Constitution. We don’t need to expend effort in politicians educating our populace on these things; we only need to put important items before our constituents and waste everybody’s time. Perky Raj Khangure (“PRK”) questioned whether we as a group are actually able to identify what will be a contentious issue before it explodes.

Dave McCarty believed the best feature of WSFS, as far as he was concerned, is that it is a representative democracy that doesn’t choose who those representatives are; it’s a self-selected group composed of anyone who cares enough to “go through the burden of being at this meeting” earns their voice, and he finds great value in their voice, even if he disagrees with them. We make the effort to attend. He values those who care enough to show up at the meeting and discharge their franchise.

Warren Buff felt that the voice of supporting members or of those who are working on the convention and cannot attend the meeting is no less important to the society. It’s not that they don’t care. This amendment will increase their involvement in the Worldcon. He wants then to know they are a part of the Worldcon, and when they have the chance to become attending members, they will. He felt this is a good long-term marketing ploy.

Mark Olson said when he discussed the original amendment with others, they said it was the end of the Worldcon as we know it as well as other uncomplimentary things. He felt this amended motion fixes the serious issues he was concerned about. With this amendment, his only concern is that we might be perceived as saying we ourselves are not to be trusted. He believed the Business Meeting is the best group – “we take the trouble to turn up” – and we shouldn’t be running ourselves down.

Lisa Hayes agreed that people should show up for the meeting, but that we are all in this together, and we should open it up to all WSFS members. Many people cannot,

for a variety of reasons, attend the meetings at different times, though they have in the past done so, and enfranchising everyone in WSFS is one of the most important things we can do to move forward as a society.

Tim Szczesuil objected to the amendment based on information. Those not attending the meetings do not get to hear the debate. He felt those who attend the business meeting give careful consideration to the items discussed there; outside of the meeting, who knows what consideration is given to the issues. Some people will just check a box or ignore it altogether. For a more significant result, we should just maintain the status quo.

Chris Hensley asked why should members of WSFS trust us if we don't trust them? We think that we know better than them and that we're more informed and that we're the ones that should make the decisions. He didn't accept that. We have to trust the WSFS body, and he gives them a lot more credit than others do.

Rick Kovalcik said that what we essentially have here is a town meeting, and town meetings work very well. He was concerned that the final ratification by the WSFS body would simply become a rubber stamp popularity contest and not worth anything – “kind of like some Hugos are just becoming a popularity contest”. If we want to solve the problem of people who are working on the convention, we should allow proxy voting.

Perianne Lurie felt we like to pretend WSFS is a society when in fact it's a bunch of people who come to the business meeting and then give lip service to everyone else being a member. This amendment will actually make the WSFS members true WSFS members, and they will have a say in the governance of the Society.

Kent Bloom discussed the costs of this amendment. Which will impose one more burden on Worldcons; they have to write up the material; publish it, mail it, and they have to staff the process. We're short on volunteers every year, and he felt this amendment was a waste of time and energy to impose on a Worldcon.

By a show of hands, the debate was extended by two minutes.

Glenn Glazer spoke in favor of the amendment, saying that when we talk about people not being able to attend the meeting, it's because real lives are interfering. It's not just the cost of the membership; it costs a lot of money to travel to Worldcon. If we believe in equal democracy for everyone, then we should support this amendment.

Leslie Turek pointed out that we've seen many examples of issues hitting Twitter and exploding in a way that isn't rational, where people only see sound bites and not context, and she was concerned about how decisions would be made. She felt we haven't yet learned how to use social media in a responsible way, and so she was against this amendment.

Ben Yalow was unconvinced that this amendment will have the benefits that its proponents have mentioned, but since it contains a sunset clause, we can try it. He didn't believe it would do massive harm in the few years it will be in existence before it must be re-ratified.

Jonathan Sneed believed that public votes mean public campaigning and public debates, and this may erode our cohesiveness.

A motion to further extend debate failed, and the vote on the amendment was taken by serpentine vote. With 52 in favor and 39 opposed, the amendment passed and will be passed on to Sasquan for ratification.

2.1.2 Short Title: Hugo Nominating for NASFiC Members

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

Discussion: *This motion would give NASFiC members the right to nominate in the Hugo Awards.* Tammy Coxen, as maker of the motion, began the discussion by giving the two main reasons she proposed it: (1) NASFiCs are selected by WSFS, and subject to the rules and regulations of WSFS, but it has none of the benefits, which is an inequitable situation. Currently past and future Worldcons hold nomination rights, so it would not be a huge stretch to extend such to the NASFiC. (2) Doing so would be a great marketing tool for attracting members to WSFS and the Worldcon. What's needed, however, is an avenue to carry over to Worldcon. Voting rights would give them a reason to engage and remind them that WSFS exists, which would have a long-term benefit for the Worldcon in terms of greater Worldcon participation.

Perianne Lurie said the Hugo Awards are given by members of WSFS. Either we should make NASFiC members full members of WSFS, or we should not give them some but not all of the privileges of membership.

Kevin Standlee pointed out we've already given some but not all of WSFS voting rights to people who are not actually members of WSFS; e.g., members of the previous Worldcon and of the next Worldcon. This is only a natural extension of any convention that WSFS sanctions (though currently that's only Worldcon and NASFiC). As long as this organization sanctions NASFiCs, he believed we should extend the same courtesy we give previous and following Worldcons.

Judith Bemis worried that by giving this right to NASFiC we would be opening the door for the possibility of giving such privileges to other countries' national conventions.

A motion to extend debate by two minutes failed.

G. Patrick Molloy noted one has only to attend a Worldcon once every three years in order to retain nomination rights, and that if you cannot take an interest in Worldcon to join once every three years, you have no business nominating Hugos.

Perky Raj Khangure (“PRK”) felt that nominating Hugo awards is a privilege and should be open to everyone equally, including other national conventions.

Dave McCarty said it is already brutally hard to merge three different databases that don’t agree with each other. Adding a fourth adds a magnitude of difficulty.

Kent Bloom had two words: “Con Diego.”

Perianne Lurie said that future and past members of Worldcons were at least WSFS members, and that NASFiC members never were.

Geoff Thorpe pointed out that WSFS is a world society, but it’s dominated by Americans, and this motion only increases domination by Americans and must be resisted.

With a show of hands, the constitutional amendment failed.

Before the start of the next item, Mary Robinette Kowal took a point of privilege of the assembly to explain how to use the counterbalancing microphone, for which she received a round of applause and the gratitude of the Business Meeting Secretary.

2.1.3 Short Title: A Story by Any Other Name

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

Discussion: *This motion clarifies Hugo fiction, regardless of format.* Colin Harris said the intent of this motion was clear. For a significant number of people, an audio book, the main subject of this motion, is inherently a dramatic presentation. For others, it’s a story and should be judged as fiction. This motion was not to say one group is right or wrong. An audio book should be recognized as a story where the voters choose to say they think it’s a story. One of our guiding principles is that the administrators listen to the wishes of the voters unless there’s an explicit reason not to. Going forward, he would like to see voters say “I think this work is a story,” and put it in a story category, or “I think this is a performance,” and put it in the Best Dramatic Presentation category. He added that sometimes we like consolidation, but if an audio book receives nominations in both Best Novel and BDP, the administrators would not be able to consolidate the votes because the nominations are for different things, similar to a television episode being nominated versus an entire season being nominated. For something like Best Novel, however, if a story comes out in print and audio, the administrators don’t know the difference when the item is nominated in the Best Novel category. If people are recognizing a performance, they are recognizing

the dramatic content and not the story. And, as in the past, if a movie is made of a book in a different year, both are eligible.

Chris Hensley made a motion to amend a work nominated under these rules:

Moved, that a fiction category cannot also be nominated in a nonfiction category in the same calendar year.

Ben Yalow reiterated that what this amendment states is that an audio book may or may not be inherently different, depending on the will of the voters. Since we do not do consolidation, if this amendment were passed as written, as a Hugo administrator, he would absolutely permit both the audio book and the written work to be separately nominated if both of them got sufficient nominations. Both [sets of nominations] would have to be eligible because this wording makes it clear that they are two different works. When asked if only an audio book was issued and was nominated in a written and a dramatic category, Mr. Yalow responded that under the wording of this amendment, if enough nominators to make the ballot claimed that the rendition is a dramatic presentation and enough of another group of nominators to make the ballot claimed that the text was a story, then it would still be eligible in both categories.

Mr. Hensley's amendment to the motion was seconded. He explained his motion further: A Hugo tradition is that works don't get nominated in two categories in one year. This motion would make this amendment work like any other Hugo. He felt it was important to have this motion function in the same way. Someone asked if there was a written work and six months later an audio book of the work came out, under this rule would it be considered the same work. Mr. Hensley felt that it would not be considered the same work.

Mary Robinette Kowal, speaking against the amendment, said that if we were talking about a book and a movie that came out in the same year, we would let them both be eligible because those are two very different works, and she believed that the number of cases in which an audio book is going to be the best dramatic presentation that someone has heard all year is going to be very few, and if it is the best dramatic presentation and the best written work of fiction, we should let the voters nominate that.

Warren Buff agreed that the story itself is separate from the presentation of the story, as made clear in the original motion, and he believed the amendment to be folly.

Andrew Adams pointed out that if an audio book came out in a second year, it would be eligible, but if it came out in the same year as the original written work, it would not be eligible, and he felt that was not right.

The vote on the amendment to the motion failed.

Kent Bloom felt that the main motion is trying to correct a problem that is inherently not correctible and not the appropriate thing for the Business Meeting to do. Based on past history, he felt the Business Meeting should adopt a resolution suggesting that in the future the words of the current Constitution are to be interpreted by Hugo Administrators in a particular way. However he did not want to suggest a resolution by substitution.

A motion to extend debate time by two minutes failed.

By a show of hands, the original constitutional amendment was approved and will be passed on to Sasquan for ratification.

2.1.4 Short Title: Performers Are Fans Too

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

Discussion: Joshua Kronengold said we have an opportunity to expand the core idea that fan performance for other fans is just as valuable as fan writing, fan art and fanzines. Arguments against this motion include that costumers and filkers have their own awards, that full-time musicians would be eligible, that nearly everyone would be eligible, and that the category is simply too broad. But he doesn't have an issue with a category having too many items people want to nominate. It's having too small a category that is usually the issue. Eligibility is not a flaw; it's a feature. He trusts the voters to know the difference between fan and pro writing, fan and pro art; they should be able to tell the difference between different types of performances. Someone being able to support him- or herself with fan work doesn't mean it's not fan work; it means we really like it. The difference between Joshua and Leslie Fish or Tom Smith is far smaller than the difference between them and Disney or the BBC. Additionally, fanzine writers, movie makers, television producers, podcasters, comic creators and novelists all have their own awards.

Perianne Lurie, while sympathetic to recognition of fan performances, was not in favor of another award for a person rather than a specific work. However, the Best Artist award didn't work because people were not familiar enough with the individual works. People are familiar enough with individual performances that that could be a category but she felt there were too many performers that have followers who will nominate them for anything and that this is a broken category.

Ben Yalow said in general he hated reputation Hugo Awards. When we have an award for a work, we can decide how good it is. When we have an award for a performer or artist, we end up with people winning Hugos based on a single work that was published once as compared to an entire body of work, because that artist was a really great artist and they happened to publish one lousy painting – except it was actually an interior work. It is difficult to judge fan performers or any other kind of

performer or any other kind of work where you are judging by a body of work, particularly when you can't find a way to show or differentiate what work was done in a particular year. Hugos should only be given for works done in a given year. At least with artists, we can now make them show what work was generated in that year. He reiterated that he hated reputation; he wanted the Hugo to be for work in a given year.

Kyoku Ogushi pointed out that fans can now record performances and upload them to the Internet. We can see fan performances from all over the world, and the time/date is clear so we will know when the performance was made.

Glenn Glazer first echoed Ben Yalow's comments. Unlike many legal documents, we do not have pages and pages of definitions in the WSFS Constitution, and it's folly to try. Similarly, performance is a type of art, and if we want to honor them, they belong in the fan art category. But he felt that this new category is so specialized and tiny in its scope that it lacks the broadness of the other categories. Additionally, he said he might have supported it if it were Best Performance rather than Best Performer.

Warren Buff then made a motion to amend by substitution that would read:

A performance in any medium that has appeared at a convention or conventions or through other public, non-professional display during the previous calendar year.

A motion to extend debate by 6 minutes was made and passed by a show of hands.

Perky Raj Khangure ("PRK") asked the difference between this amendment (Best Performance) and Best Dramatic Presentation. Mr. Buff replied that it's about where it appears. This is explicitly for our community; there is not a sharp line between Best Dramatic Presentation and fan performance, but there have been very few instances of fan performance being nominated in Best Dramatic Presentation.

Some asked if there were a possibility of a fan artist being nominated in this category, but the chair of the Business Meeting clarified that such an artist could only be nominated if an artist were painting in real time, in which case it could be considered a performance.

Ben Yalow asked if, under our currently definition of professional versus fan, where no payment is involved, a You Tube video by the Rolling Stones be eligible as Best Fan Performance? Jesi Pershing, a You Tube expert, replied that there are several ways to monetize videos on You Tube, and most of those are clear from watching the video. For example, if a video has "pre-roll", it would probably not be eligible for a fan performance because it's making advertising money. There are other ways as well, and they are pretty clear.

Mr. Buff said the intent of the motion was to specifically exclude monetized performances.

A motion to extend debate time by 2 minutes was seconded, but failed.

By a show of hands, the vote to accept the motion by substitution passed.

A motion to extend debate time by 4 minutes on the new motion was defeated.

With no further debate, the question was call on the constitutional amendment, and by a show of hands, the motion failed.

3. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MOTIONS

3.1 Permanent Committees

3.1.1 Mark Protection Committee

3.1.1.1 Election of Members

Warren Buff (East), Dave McCarty (Central), Linda Deneroff (West) and John Coxon (Rest of World) were nominated to the Mark Protection Committee. Warren Buff declined his nomination. With three slots and three nominations a motion was made and seconded to suspend the rules and elect the three remaining candidates by acclamation. Warren Buff received a round of applause for his previous service to the MPC.

3.2 Committees Appointed Annually

3.2.1 Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

3.2.1.3 Short Title: Hugo Finalists

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

Discussion: Kevin Standlee reiterated that the battle on defining “nominee” as someone who made the short list has effectively been lost in the popular field, and he therefore proposed that we “go with the flow” and change our terminology to something that is easier to defend in the practical sense.

Dave McCarty, on the other hand, said it might be just his cranky nature, but some ideas are just dumb, and people who think they are a nominee because they got one nomination are dumb, and he refuses to yield to stupid people.

Mark Olson felt that we use the term “nominee” in an unusual way, and he felt that changing the terminology is a useful step that would have no effect whatsoever.

Perianne Lurie thought out that people have common knowledge of what nominee means. The Academy Awards nominees, for example, are not people who somebody suggests should get nominated; they are the finalists. She felt we should let people know when they are being stupid.

Ron Oakes felt the confusion between nominee and finalist is fairly common. Two years ago, when he first set up the database to handle the Hugo Award nomination process, he foolishly named the entries that people submitted as “nominee.” So even someone who’s a part of our community can make that mistake, and he felt clarifying the distinction was a good idea.

By a show of hands, the amendment passed and will be passed on to Sasquan for ratification.

3.2.3 Hugo Eligibility Rest of the World (HEROW) Committee

With the passage of agenda item 1.7 (“We Don’t Need Another HEROW”), this committee was disbanded, and all members, past and present, were thanked for their services.

3.3 Temporary Committees

3.3.2 Report of the “Selling Votes” Committee

The Committee reported back to the Business Meeting and recommended the following substitution for the originally proposed item 3.3.2.1.

3.3.2.1 Short Title: WSFS Membership Types and Rates

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

1.5.x: No Worldcon Committee shall sell a membership that includes any WSFS voting rights for less than the cost of the Supporting Membership required by Section 4.2 in the selection of that Worldcon.

Commentary: This means that you can’t sell a membership that includes any WSFS voting rights for less than the cost of the Advance Supporting Membership (“Voting Fee”) charged for the election of that Worldcon. It does not prohibit Worldcons from giving memberships including voting rights to their Guests of Honor.

[Please click here to see the original discussion.](#) *Debate time was set at 8 minutes.*

Discussion: *The Business Meeting chair noted that only four words were changed in this substituted amendment.* Warren Buff felt that this text clears up what supporting membership rate is being discussed. The reference to 4.2.1 was changed to 4.2 because there is text in 4.2.2 is also relevant with regard to this amendment, and guests of honor will still receive free memberships with full voting rights because

they are an important part of the community. The Selling Votes committee left it as an option that a Worldcon committee may give away other memberships at their discretion.

Without objection, the amendment by substitution was accepted.

Kevin Standlee pointed out that NASFiCs, under certain circumstances, can hold an election for another NASFiC, and therefore he moved to generalize amendment to remove references to Worldcon, as follows:

3.3.2. Short Title: Membership Types and Rates

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

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

The amendment by substitution was then seconded and discussion resumed.

In answer to a question, Mr. Standlee explained that this applies to the selection of a convention. If a voting fee applies to a NASFiC it would be the voting fee applied to the selection of that NASFiC; if it were a Worldcon, it would be the voting fee associated with the selection of that Worldcon.

Colin Harris spoke against the amendment, concerned about its potential side effects. If the Business Meeting at some point were to revisit voting rights for NASFiC, potentially with a \$40 supporting fee for the Worldcon and a \$20 supporting fee for NASFiC, someone who wanted to vote in the Hugos could buy a NASFiC membership and vote. Therefore, he preferred the earlier version of the amendment.

By a show of hands, the vote on the amendment by substitution passed.

Joshua Kronengold spoke against this motion because this amendment would prohibit Worldcons from offering memberships with full voting rights to unwaged and other poverty-associated persons.

Upon a show of hands, the final amendment passed and will be passed on to Sasquan for ratification.

4.2 Seated Worldcons

4.2.2 Sasquan

Glenn Glazer was asked at the Friday meeting about the “holding spot” shown on the financial report. He received a clarification and reported that it’s a placeholder for funds that have yet to be matched up with Square and/or PayPal payments and then subsequently placed in the appropriate accounting categories.

[Please click here to see the report from Friday’s session.](#)

4.1 Past Worldcons & NASFiC

4.1.1 Millennium Philcon (2001)

[Please click here to see the report from Friday's session.](#)

John Pomeranz reported the results of a conversation he had with Todd Dashoff regarding the concerns Mr. Pomeranz raised at the Friday meeting about Phanadelphia Corporation, the parent corporation of the Millennium Philcon. Mr. Dashoff still serves on the board of the corporation, and Mr. Pomeranz will be taking steps outside the context of this meeting to address his concerns regarding the corporation. He will then be in touch with the corporations that are still extant for past and future U.S. 501(c)(3) Worldcons to engage them in an effort to address these concerns as well. Mr. Dashoff will provide Mr. Pomeranz with additional information. At this time he is seeking no action by the Business Meeting in regard to these matters. The Business Meeting then thanked Mr. Pomeranz for his efforts.

4.1.3 Nippon (2007)

Andrew Adams – speaking unofficially as an individual – said the 2013 report to the business meeting was made to correct errors from earlier reports. The 2013 report was the final report because it showed a loss. The funds gathered from overseas individuals and Worldcons were passed through to Nippon 2007, the debt to the Yokohama Convention Centre has been paid in full, and other Japanese fans have promised to pay off the balance of the debt.

[Please click here to see the report from Friday's session.](#)

6. OTHER BUSINESS

6.1 Committee Appointments

The Chair made the following WSFS Business Committee appointments. Unless otherwise stated, the first named member is the Committee Chair. Other appointments were made at the Sunday session. *[Please click here to see those appointments.](#)*

6.1.1 Worldcon Runners' Guide Editorial Committee

This committee will continue unchanged. The members are Mike Willmoth (Chair), Bill Taylor, John Hertz, Sharon Sbarsky, Alex von Thorn and Marah Searle-Kovacevic. The Chair has the power to appoint additional members.

6.1.2 Formalization of Long List Entries (FOLLE) Committee

This committee will continue unchanged. The members are Mark Olson (Chair), Craig Miller, David G. Grubbs, Joe Siclari, Kent Bloom, Colin Harris, Richard

Lynch, Kevin Standlee, Tim Illingworth, and Ben Yalow. The Chair has the power to appoint additional members.

6.1.3 Hugo Eligibility Rest of the World (HEROW) Committee

This committee was disbanded, with a round of applause for all HEROW members, past and present, for their service. Ben Yalow thanked everyone who helped make the committee go away.

Dave Lally raised a constitutional question regarding the definition of “North America” and was advised that anything north of South America is considered North America. There is no major sf fandom activity in Mexico, and Canada has its own national science fiction convention, but the United States (and its territories and possessions) has no national convention. Therefore, he proposed that NASFiC consider changing its name to USFiC, and he left that to everyone to think about.

Without objection, the meeting adjourned at 12:35 PM on Saturday.

Main Business Meeting, Sunday, August 17, 2014

The meeting was called to order at 10:06 a.m. The business meeting staff consisted of Donald E. Eastlake III, Presiding Officer; Jill Eastlake, Timekeeper; Lisa Hayes, Videographer; and Jesi Pershing, Assistant Timekeeper. The emergency holographic secretary, Kevin Standlee, kindly stepped in for Linda Deneroff, who was called away due to an emergency.

5. SITE SELECTION BUSINESS

5.1 Report of the 2016 Worldcon Site Selection and Presentation by Winners

Bob Mackintosh, the Site Selection administrator, announced the Site Selection results as follows: There were 778 valid ballots, of which 22 indicated no preference, leaving 756 with preferences. Thus, 379 votes were required to win the election.

FIRST BALLOT	Mail-in	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	TOTAL	
Kansas City	79	126	181	265	651	WINNER
Beijing	9	12	14	35	70	
Invalid ballots	2	4	2	5	13	
Helsinki	0	5	0	1	6	
None of the Above	0	0	0	4	4	
Christmas in Boston 2020	0	1	0	1	2	
Boston in 16	0	1	0	0	1	
Copper Harbor, Michigan	0	0	0	1	1	
Helsinki 2017	0	0	0	1	1	
Hell, Norway	0	0	0	1	1	
Mancham	0	0	0	1	1	
Mariehamn ³	0	0	0	1	1	
Minneapolis in 73	0	0	0	1	1	
Sitka, Alaska	0	1	0	0	1	
Three Legs Town, Ohio	0	0	0	1	1	
Xerpes 2010	0	1	0	0	1	
Total with Preference	90	151	197	318	756	
Needed to Win					379	

³ The site selection administration believed this to be the same place, but it was spelled differently on the ballot, and thus indicated separately here.

FIRST BALLOT	Mail-in	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	TOTAL	
No Preference	2	6	7	7	22	
Total valid votes	92	157	204	325	778	

By unanimous consent, the ballots were ordered destroyed.

Jeff Orth, Ruth Lichtwardt, and Diane Lacey then made a presentation for Kansas City. Toastmaster Pat Cadigan revealed the convention’s logo for MidAmeriCon II and presented an introductory video. The Guests of Honor are Kinuko Y. Craft, Patrick and Teresa Nielsen Hayden, Tamora Pierce, and Michael Swanwick, and the convention will be held August 17-21, 2016.

The MidAmeriCon II website is www.MidAmeriCon2.org. Its hotels are 1 to 2 blocks from the convention center with outdoor walking; the hotels not connected to convention center. The weather is comparable to Texas, but not quite as hot and humid. There will be barbecue of all types. There are many restaurants, that also serve vegetarian and vegan meals.

Bill Parker of LoneStarCon 3 congratulated MidAmeriCon II on their victory and then presented them with a \$20,000 pass-along funds check.

MidAmeriCon II also announced they were going to hold a Victory Party that night (with barbecue).

With that, the meeting recessed for five minutes at 10:25 a.m. and reconvened shortly thereafter.

5.2 Question time for the Seated Worldcons and NASFiC

5.2.1 Sasquan (Worldcon in 2015)

Sally Woehrle, Glenn Glazer, and Mike Willmoth of Sasquan announced that the website for the Housing Bureau would open on September 16, 2014, for hotel room reservations. To request a party room, send an email to parties@sasquan.org. To specifically request a suite, write to suites@sasquan.org. (Those wanting suites must make reservation in The Davenport first, then write to parties/suites to get moved to a party room/suite.) Information about party suites will be on web site shortly.

The convention center will close when the convention wants it to close. It is expected that parties will start at 9 p.m., but the Convention Center will still be open at that time. Major events, such as the Hugo Awards ceremony and the Masquerade, will be in the Convention Center and will probably run until about midnight. General programming is expected to end between 9-10 p.m., and late-night programming, gaming, filking, is scheduled for the Doubletree.

The con suite is also scheduled to be in Doubletree. Only the parties are currently scheduled to take place in The Davenport. The con suite will keep late-night hours, comparable to the parties.

A Sasquan Listens panel was scheduled to take place after Closing Ceremonies was announced for Capitol Suite 13. Sasquan is looking for feedback on what worked well.

5.3 Question time for the Future Worldcons and NASFiC

5.3.1 Bids for Worldcon in 2017

5.3.1.1 DC

Warren Buff and Michael Nelson reported that DC is bidding for August 16-20, 2017. The hotel is convenient to Washington Metro, and is 1½ miles from (or 3 Metro stops to) the Mall. All Metro stops have elevators and are wheelchair-accessible. The hotel is in a nice residential neighborhood, and the restaurants serve both local residents and hotel guests, and have long hours. Supermarkets are not far away.

5.3.1.2 Helsinki

Emeeli Aro represented the bid. 2017 will be Finland's 100th anniversary of independence, and the country will have many celebrations. Restaurants in Helsinki are pretty cool. There are nonstop flights to Helsinki from "everywhere in Europe" and many other major destinations. However, the only direct flight from U.S. is from New York. From the U.S., most flights are via London, Amsterdam, or other European gateway cities. The proposed dates are Wednesday, 9 August-through Sunday, 13 August 2017. The hotel prices will be as affordable as they can make them. There is a lot of hotel capacity in the city, and rates start from €80, VAT inclusive. (Finland is on the Euro.)

5.3.1.3 Japan

Kyoku Ogushi and other members of the Nippon in 2017 bid were present, as was a representative from their Convention Center in Chizoka at the foot of Mt. Fuji. The proposed dates are August 24-28, 2017. Chizoka is about a one-hour train ride from Tokyo Station (connecting from Haneda or from Narita Airports through Tokyo). The presentation touted the sites attractions, shopping, and food. Some hotels in the city have Onsens. However, there are no close restaurants, other than the café in the convention center. But trains run approximately every 30 minutes, from about 5 a.m. to 11 p.m., and there are many restaurants one stop away on train line. All hotels are also one stop away on the train line, and there are 20 hotels around that one-stop-away station.

5.3.1.4 Montreal

Janie Shea represented the Montreal bid, and was joined by a representative of the Montreal Convention Center. The proposed dates are for the Canadian/U.S. Labor Day weekend (Thursday, August 31 through Monday, September 4, 2017). Five of their hotels are directly across the street from the convention center; others are within 2 or 3 blocks away. A grocery store is a five-minute walk away. Montreal Airport is 20 minutes away and connects to the city center by taxi (about \$40) or by shuttle bus (\$9). There will be greeters at the airport. Montreal is served directly from many European and U.S. cities. There are hundreds of restaurants near the convention center, and some inside the center on the lower-level public areas. There will not be a fireworks competition as there was the last time Worldcon was held in Montreal, but 2017 the 375th anniversary of the founding of Montreal, 150th anniversary of Canadian Confederation and the 50th Anniversary of Expo '67, and there will be plenty of celebrations around the city.

5.3.2 Bids for Worldcon in 2018

5.3.2.1 New Orleans

There was no representative present.

5.3.2.2 San Jose

Andrew Trembley, representing San Francisco Science Fiction Conventions, Inc. ("SCIFI") for the San Jose in 2018 bid, reported that the bid will use the same facilities as the Worldcon in 2002, but the previous hole in the ground that was next door at that time is now a 22-storey Marriott hotel; additionally there is now also a large ballroom extension where the former city library used to be. There are many restaurants 2-3 blocks away (so don't be discouraged by not seeing anything immediately across street). Hotel rates start from around \$149, and there are about 2,000 rooms in the projected room block at the Hilton and the Marriott. The bid plans to have major events in the convention center expansion space, not in the hall across street, which was used in 2002. Since the Convention has expanded with a state-of-the-art huge ballroom, there are no plans to use the Civic Auditorium (used in 2002 for the Hugos and Masquerade).

The San Jose Airport is about four miles away from the convention center, and there is a free bus to the light rail, which stops right in front of convention center. From San Francisco International Airport is about 30 miles away; BART, heavy rail and light rail will get you close to the Convention Center. There is a payment system, called Clipper, similar to London's Oyster Card, which can be used on any of these transportation systems. Oakland International Airport is also about 30 miles away, and by 2017 there may be a BART extension to connect to other transport to San Jose. The bid will also look at discounted transportation services.

5.3.3 Bids for Worldcon in 2019

5.3.3.1 Dublin

James Bacon took questions, one of which was about a rule that never existed that prohibited Worldcons from being outside the U.S. too often. There are hotels within a 10-minute walk (850 metres) with 1,200 bedrooms available. The closest hotel is about 230 metres from the convention centre, and the convention centre is less than a mile from the heart of the city. There is a tram stop near the convention center, and trams with stop at Convention Center run at night until about 12:30 a.m. The great thing about the convention centre is when you rent it, it comes with tech service, hosts, security, and a floor manager. Dublin is a far smaller city than London, and the bid does not expect its convention to be as large as Loncon 3. The bid anticipates there will be 4,000-5,000 attendees.

5.3.4 Bids for Worldcon in Future Years

5.3.4.1 New Zealand in 2020

Norman Cates introduced the members of the bid committee. Things are in flux a bit; the convention's venue in Auckland is going to to expand, but they have not announced their plans yet. Another potential site is in Wellington. The committee is looking for people to help to run the convention, assuming the bid wins. The bid members then presented a short video and encourage presupports. They anticipate the convention will play host to 1,000-2,000 people, based on Aussiecon 4 attendance. They addressed questions about hotel rooms near the expected facilities. Tourist New Zealand is behind the bid 100%.

5.3.4.2 Dallas in 2021

Tim Miller invited everyone to Dallas/Fort Worth in 2021 for a Worldcon that will have the best beef-based barbecue in the world. You can fly from almost any major city in the world to Dallas with one or fewer stops. They do not have a particular weekend in mind at this point, but the preferred dates are akin to Loncon's dates because schools in Dallas start the week before Labor Day.

5.3.4.3 Chicago in 2022

Dave McCarty reported that Chicago is bidding to host the Richard J. Daley World Science Fiction Convention in 2022. It is highly unlikely to be held in the Hyatt Hotel. Chicago has a pretty good transportation system. The city is laid out like the spokes of a wheel, and the train system covers that well. There is a good bus system as well. Aside from New York City, it probably has the best public transportation in the U.S.

5.3.4.4 Paris in 2023

The Paris bid made an introductory presentation for their bid, tentatively to be at Disneyland Paris-based facilities, which are about 40 minutes outside Paris and ten minutes from the Charles de Gaulle Airport on the TVG train. As of November 2014, there will be no Disney characters in the hotels or in the Disney Village, where the convention would be held, so there should not be a problem with hall costumes. There are actually two convention centers, about a five-minute walk from each other. The Disney facilities are multi-lingual. They anticipate about 3,000 people attending, but if the number should appear to be larger, they have the space to grow. While the bid committee does not have a lot of Worldcon experience, they have Eurocon experience. Currently they are a small bid committee, but the convention is nine years out, and they have seven more years to gain experience.

6. OTHER BUSINESS

6.1 Committee Appointments

6.1.4 Mark Protection Committee

Mark Olson was appointed as the 2016 representative to the Mark Protection Committee by MidAmeriCon II. His term will expire in 2018.

6.1.5 Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

The appointed members for the 2014-2015 Nitpicking and Flyspecking Committee members are Donald Eastlake (Chair), Jared Dashoff, Tim Illingworth, Jesi Pershing, and Kevin Standlee. The chair has the power to appoint additional members.

6.1.6 YA Hugo Study Committee

Katie Rask was appointed chair of this reconstituted committee. The members are Jodie Baker, Adam Beaton, Warren Buff, Johnny Carruthers, Aurora Celeste, Peter De Weerd, Martin Easterbrook, Chris Garcia, Helen Gbala, Tim Illingworth, Dina Krause, Sue "Twilight" Mohn, Christine Rake, Kate Secor, Kevin Standlee, Marguerite Smith, Tehani Wessely, Clark B. Wierda, and Lew Wolkoff.

6.1.7 WSFS Membership Types and Rates Committee

Mark Olson was appointed chair of this reconstituted committee. The members are Gary Blog, Kent Bloom, Warren Buff, Martin Easterbrook, Donald Eastlake 3rd, Kevin Hewett, Tim Illingworth, Kevin J. Maroney, Priscilla Olson, Ron Oakes, Perky Raj ("PRK") Khangure, Howard Rosenblatt, Ian Stockdale, Kevin Standlee, Don A. Timm, Leslie Turek, and Mike Willmoth.

6.2 Announcements

[Please click here to see Saturday's appointments.](#)

6.2.1 Former Worldcon Chairs Photo Session

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

6.2.2 Mark Protection Committee Meeting

The WSFS MPC meeting will follow the photo session this morning.

6.2.3 How to Join SMOFs Email List

To join the smofs mailing list please go to:

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

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

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

Please be sure to do this as it will decrease the delay in your being added to the list. You may say you attended the WSFS Business Meeting at Loncon 3 as your background information if you wish.

7. ADJOURNMENT

7.1 Adjournment Sine Die

The Business Meeting for Loncon3 was adjourned *sine die* at 11:46 a.m.

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

Members of the Mark Protection Committee from September 2013 through July 2014 were as follows, with the expiration of membership listed in parentheses after their name: Warren Buff (elected until 2014), Linda Deneroff, (elected until 2014), Sandra Levy (appointed by Chicon 7 until 2014), Dave McCarty (elected until 2014), Stephen Boucher (elected until 2015), Scott Dennis (elected until 2015), Donald E. Eastlake III (elected until 2015), Randall Shepherd (appointed by LoneStarCon 3 until 2015), Paul Dormer (appointed by Loncon 3 until 2016), Deb Geisler (appointed by Detcon 1 until 2016) Tim Illingworth (elected until 2016), Kevin Standlee (elected until 2016), Ben Yalow (elected until 2016), and Glenn Glazer (appointed by Sasquan until 2017). Ian Stockdale's term expired at the conclusion of the 2013 meeting, and the MPC thanks him for his service to this committee. Kevin Standlee was re-elected Chairman; Linda Deneroff, Secretary; and Scott Dennis, Treasurer.

The MPC Finance Report is appended at the end of this document. Reports from the Hugo Awards Marketing Committee and Worldcon Website Working Group will be submitted separately from those committees.

This year was a rollercoaster, with some months quiet and some quite active.

1. When Sasquan won the 2015 bid for Worldcon, they asked the Mark Protection Committee to advise on the use of a d/b/a and were advised that as the selected Worldcon, their usage of the marks "Worldcon 2015" and "Spokane Worldcon" were entirely reasonable. Effectively, when they won, they were licensed to use the relevant marks. It was recommended, however, that Sasquan file d/b/a(s) with the relevant local authority so that they can cash checks payable to "Worldcon," or "World Science Fiction Convention." However, the decision to pay for a service mark registration for a convention name is something each committee needs to make for itself. Additionally, it was pointed out that the service mark need not appear on every single page of the website, but the use of footers makes it rather moot. However, Kevin Standlee was concerned that Worldcons are fragmenting their brand recognition by not trading on the same name every year.
2. In November, Ben Yalow pointed out that a new top-level domain name, .fan, was going to be issued shortly, but he felt that there was no need to register worldcon.fan at this time.
3. Also in November, we discovered that on the website of the World Congress on Coloproctology, <http://worldcon2014.com/about-worldcon-2014/>, was calling itself worldcon. Unfortunately their "Contact Us" form failed, there was no direct e-mail address and they are located in India. We finally contacted the Sachin Bhawe, the WHOIS contact, who said he would forward a message to the

conference owners. Kevin also sent a letter via the post office. Unfortunately we never received a response and the website is still active.

4. In February 2014 we received an email from the owner of hugoaward.com who wanted to know if we would purchase it for (gulp) £399 (about \$665). (Our website is thehugoawards.com specifically because this person owned the domain he was now offering for sale.) Dave McCarty suggested that we offer half that amount because the domain could be of use to us, but in the end we simply ignored the offer.
5. In March 2014, our attorney pointed out that because our marks are federally registered with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Worldcon websites can use the symbol “®” beside the marks if they chose to do so. Lawyers always want their clients to do everything that they can to alert the public that the marks are protected but a website might choose not to do so because the symbol might be unsightly or the site does not want to limit itself to the U.S. Our attorney also pointed out that if we registered in every country that is a signatory to the Madrid Protocol, it could cost over \$10,000. However, we rely on the uniqueness of our marks and their prior international usage to discourage use by others in similar fields. It’s the MPC’s policy to prioritize registration based on the number of Worldcons held in a given country, and in particular any country that has hosted more than one Worldcon. However, if there were a practical way of obtaining an EU-wide registration that isn’t prohibitively expensive, we would be interested. Curiously, while Canada is not a signatory to the Madrid Protocol, China is, but it wouldn’t be worth the effort to register in China. If we could do the entire EU as a single entity, it would probably be more worthwhile, there having been two non-UK-but-EU Worldcons so far. In the end, our attorney filed the U.S. renewal application for World Science Fiction Convention and began renewing the registrations for the four other marks, Worldcon, World Science Fiction Society, WSFS and The Hugo Award. The filing fee is \$500 per mark, for a total of \$2,500.
6. A serious issue arose at the end of March, when Loncon 3 was sent a cease-and-desist letter by the lawyers for fancaster.com, noting that “Fancaster” is a registered trademark in the United Kingdom (Registration number 2433200), USA (Registration number 1,543,885) and European Union (Registration number 005731187). After much discussion, and in consultation with Loncon 3, the MPC determined to fight the order. (The mark as registered is for headphones: there is no overlapping industry, no possible confusion in regard to trade and they lost on a prior attempt against Comcast to claim that “fancast” violated their trademark: (see http://blog.ericgoldman.org/archives/2012/01/im_not_a_fan_of.htm)). (Requesting that Loncon try and change the name of the Fancast Hugo at this late date would be an unreasonable, undue burden.) In the end, the British attorney for Loncon 3 sent a sternly worded letter back to Fancaster indicating

that she did not find infringement and raising other defenses (including the risk of an award of attorneys' fees for frivolous litigation, no likelihood of confusion, etc.) to ward off a potential lawsuit. She also suggested an action be filed to counter Fancaster by applying to get their trademark revoked on the grounds that they have not publicly used it very much. The MPC was unanimous in agreeing to fight this. Previous Worldcons were informed of this situation and asked to pledge funds to help cover costs, should it become necessary (our policy is not to encumber a seated Worldcon until we've tapped all past ones).

7. The MPC's cash reserve is reported to the WSFS Business Meeting, so that WSFS members understand that the MPC is not flush with cash. Further donations will help build up to a reasonable level of reserve, which we will need in the coming months.
8. At the beginning of April, The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office renewed the trademark registration for the mark, "Worldcon." We will need to file another renewal application between June 26, 2023, and June 25, 2024, in order to maintain the registration.
9. Discussion regarding Fancaster continued through the rest of April, with the British attorney recommending collating evidence of how the FANCAST and FANCASTER marks are used, including carrying out Google searches and printing off any reference on websites; receiving any marketing or promotional materials distributed by companies using the term descriptively if the mark is used within those materials; and adding value from WSFS records and members as to the circumstances regarding the decision to adopt "Fancast" as a category. Members of the MPC helpfully provided links to the historical use of "fanzine" and the subsequent derivation of "fancast", and the attorney found evidence of others using the terminology prior to the registration by Fancaster. The estimated cost of the invalidity action is £1,500-£2,000. Obviously, if this proceeds to court, expenses will be much higher.
10. The kerfluffle with Fancaster led directly to a discussion of whether and how to change the way MPC currently collects funds. The donation of \$1 per site selection voter has not changed since 1984, while costs have risen substantially in the "real world". Adjusted for inflation, the amount would be about \$2.25 in today's dollars. No decision was reached.
11. Again in April, the Korean-Japanese food conglomerate Lotte released a "Worldcon" ice cream in conjunction with the Football World Cup. Since we don't have a registration in any place where they are marketing it (the attempt to register marks in Japan came to nothing) and since they're marketing a product, not a service, we took no action.
12. At the end of April, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office renewed the trademark registration for the mark, "World Science Fiction Convention." We

will need to file another renewal application between June 26, 2023, and June 25, 2024, in order to preserve the registration.

13. At the start of May the MPC renewed “wsfs.org” for five years for \$80.25. (They charge \$16.05/year and there's no discount for longer term renewals.)
14. At the end of May, Kevin Standlee noted that the JOF (Journeymen of Fandom) group on Facebook suggested that in lieu of every U.S.-based WSFS convention having to set up a BMI/ASCAP account, the MPC could deal with it as a single account, with each convention paying the appropriate fees through the MPC. While this is asymmetric – it doesn't do much for non-U.S. conventions, which have different licensing rules per country – it wouldn't necessarily be inappropriate for the MPC to do this if the conventions in question wanted to work that way. But the Business Meeting would have to pass a resolution directing the MPC to work with U.S.-based WSFS conventions (including NASFiC) for intellectual property right licenses, including BMI/ASCAP. Glenn Glazer pointed out that BMI/ASCAP charges wildly different fees every year because there is no continuing relationship. However, most members felt this was beyond the scope of the MPC.
15. At the end of May, the Hugo Awards website received an enquiry regarding a Hugo Award with the name Honey Wood on it and asked if there were a market for it. Honey was a conrunner, fanzine fan and secretary of the Cleveland in 55 bid (which resulted in Clevention), which suggests that this particular Hugo is a 1955 committee spare. We determined that it was not in our purview to make an estimate; however, individual members of the MPC acting in their personal capacities contacted the person making the inquiries to discuss the matter further.
16. Also at the end of May, Glenn Glazer required clarification for a flyer being produced by the Spokane CVB, to advertise the city that included references to Worldcon. He asked if all the marks must be listed in the usual disclaimer phrase (“ ‘World Science Fiction Society’, ‘WSFS’, ‘World Science Fiction Convention’, ‘Worldcon’, ‘NASFiC’, ‘Hugo Award’, the Hugo Award Logo, and the distinctive design of the Hugo Award Rocket are service marks of the World Science Fiction Society, an unincorporated literary society.”) or if it were acceptable to use only one or two; e.g., “ ‘World Science Fiction Convention; and ‘Worldcon’ are service marks of the World Science Fiction Society, an unincorporated literary society.” It was decided that if something wasn't a publication, then the authorized group could do what it wanted. It was noted that no notice is required on the physical Hugo awards themselves.
17. In early June, we returned to the Fancaster debacle, with Warren Buff submitting the “Leaky Fancast” podcast that was made by members of the Leaky Lounge back in 2006. Their use of the term “fancast” predated the EU

filing by at least a year and would thus be extremely helpful in invalidating the EU trademark filing. We determined to hold this in abeyance unless needed.

18. Again in June, we learned of Wichita State's "Hugo Wall Award," named for someone by the name of "Hugo Wall." The *Wichita Business Journal* called it "Hugo Award," but we felt we did not need to take any action.
 19. At the end of June, the Loncon 3 lawyer was prepared to file against Fancaster. Alice Lawson, on behalf of Loncon, wanted to know our position because this matter will easily drag on until after Loncon. The MPC's lawyer reviewed the paperwork, calling it "very thorough and of excellent quality" and saying that "the changes are strongly in WSFS's favor." With that said, and with \$10,000 pledged by CanSMOF and SCIFI, (\$5,000 each) in addition to the MPC bank account, the MPC voted to continue the proceeding; however, inasmuch as the Fancaster action might drag on beyond the projected end of the legal entity running Loncon, the MPC needs to determine who actually stands for the MPC in any action (see Item 23 below).
 20. This led to a discussion regarding filing our service marks in the EU. For £2,640 we can get coverage in the UK; for an additional £1,860, we could cover the entire EU. (Considering the entire EU as a single entity obviously meets the two-or-more Worldcons test.) However, we do not have the funds at this time to initiate this process. This discussion, however, led back to the discussion in Item 10 herein, regarding asking for a change in the amount of money donated to the MPC by individual Worldcons and NASFiCs. The three issues involved are:
 - (1) A determination about how much WSFS believes it should be spending to protect our marks globally, in the US, in Europe, etc. How widely should we be looking? In all possible countries? In all countries where bidding is taking place? (There is currently a bid for China right now.)
 - (2) The toll that inflation has taken on the "traditional" \$1 per vote after 30 years without an increase.
 - (3) Transparency regarding the amount of funding available to the MPC.
- We've been saying for years that we need a long-term budget. We still need it, so we can see how much money we need. Our marks renew after ten years, so we need to look over at least that long a window to cover the existing marks in the existing places, plus any additional ones we expect to need. It seems likely that our current level of support from Worldcons (which was established in 1984) is insufficient to support our current level of activity. Once we have done a budget that covers a longer period, we can return to the Business Meeting with a proposal for changes in how Worldcons fund the MPC's operations.
21. In July, we renewed the NASFiC service mark in the U.S.

22. A currently unfinished piece of business consists of a proposal (for the Fancaster action only) to name an individual human being with standing to bring the action on behalf of the WSFS MPC and designate him/her to be our agent (with the understanding that the WSFS MPC – and our backstopped pledges from past Worldcons – would indemnify him or her for any expenses incurred thereby) for this action. The UK lawyers pointed out that we need to move sooner, not later, on the Fancaster action, because if Fancaster makes a claim against Loncon, we won't be able to file the invalidity action at all.
23. Related to the Fancaster action above, the MPC discussed setting up a “Worldcon Intellectual Property Trust” (WIPT) as a holding legal entity for marks. Such an entity, which would be under the control of the MPC, would make it substantially easier to register our service marks in countries outside the USA, most of which will not issue registrations to unincorporated associations. The consensus of the MPC was to seek additional guidance from the Business Meeting, and accordingly the committee has submitted a resolution (see agenda).

– Linda Deneroff –

**Financial Report – Mark Protection Committee – World Science Fiction Society
1 August 2013 through July 31 2014**

	Income	Expense	Balance
Cash on hand as of 1 August 2013			\$10,683.66
Paid to Kevin Standlee for expenses, domain renewal		114.50	10,569.16
Paid to Attorney Esther Horwich, various trademark renewals		2,610.00	7,959.16
Paid to Attorney Esther Horwich, trademark work		1,811.42	6,147.74
Paid to Attorney Esther Horwich, trademark work		464.90	5,682.84
Paid to Kevin Standlee for hosting, domain renewal		160.25	5,522.59
Received from anonymous donor	400.00		5,922.59
Balance as of 31 July 2014			\$5,922.59

Notes:

After the close of this report, the MPC sent Loncon 3's U.S. agent \$220 to cover UK legal costs not otherwise covered by Loncon 3's traditional contribution toward WSFS expenses (GB£2,600) or by a contribution of CA\$5,000 (approximately GB£2,700/US\$4,580) from CanSMOF and a contribution of US\$5,000 from SCIFI paid directly to Loncon 3. The MPC thanks SCIFI and CanSMOF for their donations.

In subsequent events occurring after the period of this report, Kevin Standlee is owed \$80.25 for an additional domain renewal.

These and other recent transactions will be contained in the subsequent period report for 1 August 2014 through 31 July 2015.

The treasurer is not aware of any other pending debts, although Kevin Standlee and Mark Olson each continue to spend small amounts that will eventually require reimbursement. We also may incur additional bills from our intellectual property attorney at any time, and the Marketing Committee has also been authorized to spend small amounts of money.

The Business Meeting and the MPC encourage non-U.S. based Worldcons to use their suggested donation amounts to further the interests of the Society through protection of the Marks in their own countries. The MPC thanks Loncon 3 and Anticipation.

The MPC does not request donations from U.S. Worldcons until after they have been held. The MPC anticipates a generous donation from Chicon 7 and Loncon 3 in the future.

— Scott Dennis

Hugo Award Marketing Committee Report to Mark Protection Committee September 2013 – July 2014

The members of the Hugo Award Marketing Committee (“HAMC”) are Dave McCarty (Chair), Craig Miller, Cheryl Morgan, Mark Olson, and Kevin Standlee. The HAMC members are appointed by the Mark Protection Committee, and the chairman of the HAMC reports to the MPC. HAMC is responsible for maintaining the Hugo Awards website, <http://TheHugoAwards.org>, and answering email sent to info@TheHugoAwards.org.

TheHugoAwards.org provided text-based CoverItLive.com (“CIL”) coverage of the 2013 Hugo Awards Ceremony. As the video stream for the award ceremony experienced a drop during the ceremony, we again saw a spike in usage of the text-based coverage, which had been scaled to allow such usage (822 people watched the CIL coverage).

For the twelve months ending at the end of July 2014, TheHugoAwards.org had approximately 195,000 visitors. The peak visits were about 13,500 for the 2013 Hugo Awards ceremony/results and for the 2014 finalist announcements. Sixty-one percent of visitors are from the U.S., 7% from the UK, followed by Canada, Australia, Germany, Spain, France, Poland, Brazil and Italy.

There was no CoverItLive coverage of the 2014 ballot announcement, but there will be coverage for the 2014 award ceremony at Loncon 3. Loncon 3 is providing logistical support to the HAMC team (Kevin Standlee, Mur Lafferty, and Cheryl Morgan) covering the event.

The Committee continues to act as a clearinghouse for information and questions about the Hugo Awards, including referring specific questions about a given year’s administration to that year’s Hugo Award administrators. This also includes providing information about, and copies of, the Hugo Award logo, whose use we encourage in conjunction with references to the Awards.