

The World Science Fiction Society

Minutes of the Business Meeting at L.A. con IV
Thursday 24th, Friday 25th and Saturday 26th August 2006

Introduction

All meetings were held in room 201C of the Anaheim Convention Centre. The head table officers were:

Presiding Officer: Kevin Standlee

Deputy: Donald Eastlake III

Secretary: Pat McMurray

Timekeeper: Deb Geisler

Technical support was provided by Bill Parker and William Keaton. Mike running was provided by Glenn Glazer and Sandra Childress.

[Secretary: 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. UK spelling is mostly used; because that's the way I spell. Names are deliberately chosen to be the informal versions. These minutes are complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge and recollection and are based on contemporaneous notes. Any other comments or notes I have will be marked in this fashion. Comments thus are purely informative and do not form part of the official text of these minutes.]

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 Australian ballot. Most voting in the course of the meeting is done by an uncounted show of hands or, less commonly, by voice vote or by acclamation. If a voice or show of hands vote appears close or if a counted vote is considered important, a numbered serpentine vote is held.]

Preliminary Business Meeting, Thursday

Meeting was called to order at 10:10. Attendance as shown on the signup sheets was 94.

Coffee was provided by a grant from Interaction.

1. Committee Reports

1.1. Mark Protection Committee (Including Nominations for MPC)

Report was presented by Kevin Standlee and is attached to these minutes. A motion was reported out and is included as 4.1.4. Nominations are in order.

Vince Docherty: Correction to the report: Interaction *has* donated money to MPC.
Kevin Standlee: That is correct, and wasn't reflected in the minutes which only show the US\$ account.

Nominations for MPC members:

Ben Yalow: Move to nominate existing committee to the extent that they agree.

The motion to suspend the rules and nominate the incumbent members was adopted by unanimous consent. There were no other nominees.

1.2. Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

Report was presented by Kevin Standlee and is attached to these minutes.

Kevin Standlee: The Committee asks unanimous consent that the Committee be continued as currently constituted.

Chair: Hearing no objection, the NP&FS Committee is continued as currently constituted.

1.3. Worldcon Runners' Guide Editorial Committee

A verbal report that very little was done this past year was presented by Sharon Sbarsky.

Chair: Reappoint Sharon Sbarsky as Chair of the WRG Committee.

1.4. Hugo Eligibility Rest of the World (HEROW) Committee

Report was presented by Kevin Standlee and is attached to these minutes.

The Committee is making a motion as 4.1.1, without recommendation.

Chair: Hearing no objection, the HEROW Committee is continued with new members to be appointed later this weekend. Those persons wishing to serve on the committee should submit their names to the Chair.

Gary Blog: What will be the impact of the convention being in Japan next year?

Kevin Standlee: That's debate on the motion.

1.5. Formalization of Long List Entries (FOLLE) Committee

Report was received and is attached to these minutes, with the agenda.

Chair: Hearing no objection, the FOLLE Committee is continued as currently constituted.

1.6. The Taming the Digital Wilderness Committee

Report was received and is attached.

Point of Privilege: Could you list members of the committee?

Chair: The Head Table is not certain what the precise membership is. We will make a list of members of all these subcommittees and present it no later than next year.

Colin Harris: Would short videos published on internet sites such as youtube.com be included under the current definition of presented.

Chair Ruling: The Chair rules that those are valid means of publishing such as defined in the Constitution.

2. Worldcon & NASFiC Reports

Ben Yalow: Point of information: Dates are given [on the currency conversion table distributed with the agenda] as 16 August and other dates are given elsewhere [in the individual financial reports.].

Secretary: Date applies only to table itself.

Chair: The conversion table is provided for information only.

2.1 Past Worldcons & NASFiC

2.1.1. ConAdian (1994)

2.1.2. The Millennium Philcon (2001)

2.1.3 Torcon 3 (2003)

2.1.4 Noreascon 4 (2004)

2.1.5 Interaction (2005)

2.1.6 CascadiaCon (2005)

2.2. Seated Worldcons & NASFiC

2.2.1 L.A.con IV (2006)

2.2.2 Nippon 2007

2.2.3 Archon 31 the 9th NASFiC

3. Business Passed On from Interaction

Chair: Will set ten minute limits unless anyone objects. There were no objections.

3.1. Short Title: Best Editor Split

Moved, To split the Best Professional Editor Hugo Award into a Best Editor Short Fiction and Best Magazine Editor Long Award by striking out and inserting new sections as follows:

3.3.8: Best Professional Editor. The editor of any professional publication devoted primarily to Science Fiction or Fantasy during the previous calendar year. A professional publication is one which had an average press run of at least ten thousand (10,000) copies per issue.

3.3.x: Best Editor Short Fiction. The editor of at least four (4) anthologies, collections or magazine issues primarily devoted to less than novel-length science fiction and / or fantasy, at least one of which was published in the previous calendar year.

3.3.y: Best Editor Long Fiction. The editor of at least four (4) novels of written science fiction or fantasy published in the previous calendar year.

Debate time is set at ten minutes. Consideration today is only of amendments. Debate on the substantive change should be restricted to the Main Meeting, except insofar as it applies to any proposed amendment. Amendments that increase the scope of the constitutional amendment (that is, make it more of a change from the original WSFS Constitution than what last year's Business Meeting adopted) would require an additional year of ratification. Amendments that do not increase the scope of the constitutional amendment may be adopted and the amended proposal ratified this year.

Mark Olson moved Trial Period for Hugo Change amendment.

Chair rules that this is a lesser change on the grounds that a change that lasts for a definite period of time is lesser than one that changes the constitution indefinitely.

Seth Breidbart: Will sunset clause be stricken after 2010?

Chair: Yes, by precedent, time-limited clauses of the constitution go away when their effect expires.

Mark Olson: Move to refer to committee to report tomorrow.

Ben Yalow (Against referral): Think we should discuss whether we should have a sunset clause at all, *before* we refer to a committee.

Anita Cole (Against): Think it would be wise to discuss a sunset clause before we refer it.

Mark Olson (Favouring referral): Think it will lead to a confused discussion.

Patrick Nielsen Hayden (Against): what they said.

Lew Walkoff (Favour): Sunset clauses are very useful, would like to see it tweaked into language that could be used for other purposes.

Seth Breidbart (Against): Could we take a straw poll?

Chair: No.

[Chair: Straw polls are not in order and are considered dilatory because they neither adopt nor reject a measure. See Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised, 10th Edition, p. 415 for a discussion of why this is and of other ways of having non-binding test votes.]

Motion passed to refer to committee.

Chair appointed Mark Olson, Patrick Nielsen Hayden, Chris Barkley, Don Eastlake, and Pat McMurray to the committee, which will meet immediately after this morning's meeting.

4. New Business

4.1. Resolutions

4.1.1 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:

3.2.3: 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.

3.2.4: 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.

Moved by: The HEROW Committee

Debate time is set at ten minutes.

Resolution passed by more than $\frac{3}{4}$.

4.1.2 Short Title: We Need Another HEROW

Moved, To continue the Hugo Eligibility for the Rest of the World (HEROW) Committee as previously charged, with a new Chair and members appointed by the Chair of the Business Meeting, and with the Chair of the HEROW Committee authorized to add additional members to the committee.

Moved by: The HEROW Committee

Debate time is set at ten minutes.

Without objection, Committee was continued. Chair of the meeting will appoint a Chair of the Committee by the end of the Business Meeting.

4.1.3 Short Title: Onwards into the Digital Wilderness

Moved, To continue the Taming the Digital Wilderness Committee as previously charged, with a Chair and members appointed by the Chair of the Business Meeting, and with the Chair of the Taming the Digital Wilderness Committee authorized to add additional members to the committee.

Moved by: The Taming the Digital Wilderness Committee

Debate time is set at ten minutes.

Without objection, Committee was continued. Chair of the meeting will appoint a Chair of the Committee by the end of the Business Meeting.

4.1.4 Short Title: Making a HASH of it

The WSFS Mark Protection Committee moves the adoption of the following resolution:

Resolved, That WSFS directs the Mark Protection Committee to take steps to strengthen the Hugo Award service mark by creating a more distinct and defensible visual identity for it;

That WSFS directs the MPC to create a study committee and to recruit persons not necessarily on the MPC to staff it;

That the study committee, to be known as the Higher and Stronger Hugo Committee (HASH), is directed to report on its progress to the 2007 WSFS Business Meeting and before then in other public fora such as the SMOFS list; and

That, with the approval of the MPC, the study committee is authorized to begin publicizing this stronger mark.

Committee statement:

This proposal begins a process to strengthen the existing (and beleaguered, in that it is the mark that appears to be most often unintentionally infringed upon) Hugo Award mark by creating a distinct image to be associated with it and then to take preliminary steps towards associating that mark with the Hugo Award. This proposal was triggered by the Hugo branding discussion on The SMOFS e-mail list.

Over the past few years, the MPC has dealt with a number of minor infringements of the Hugo Award mark; however, the more pressing challenge is that the Award is simply not as well known as it should be among the people who should know it. For example, the 2005 Worldcon faced considerable difficulty in dealing with British publishers who didn't consider the Hugo Award very important.

The MPC thinks that increased publicity and visibility for the Hugo Award would enhance the Award's presence in the public consciousness, therefore making our exclusive claim to the term Hugo for an award much stronger.

Debate time is set at ten minutes.

Title was changed from Hugo Award Public Awareness Committee by motion of the meeting.

Mark Olson (Favour, on behalf of the committee): Started from attempt to register Hugo rocket design as a mark, which proved very difficult. Because rockets are widely used as science fictional marks and designs, it is necessary to create a stronger mark.

Passed without objection.

4.2. Standing Rules Amendments

4.3. Constitutional Amendments

4.3.1 Short Title: Artist Hugo

Moved, To amend the WSFS Constitution to require that nominations for the Best Professional Artist Hugo Award include one citation of a specific work created by the nominee during the year of eligibility, by adding additional wording as follows:

Add to Section 3.7: Nominations

3.7.4: Nominations for the category of Best Professional Artist must include, in addition to the nominated artist's name, the title of a specific work by the nominated artist or the name of the publication within which the nominated artist's work appeared, either of which must have been first published in the year for which the artist is being nominated.

Add to Section 3.8: Tallying of Nominations

3.8.8: Nominations for the category of Best Professional Artist shall be tallied only by the artist's name and not by the title of any specific cited work or publication within which the nominated artist's work appeared. Nominations for these categories that do not include the information required in section 3.7.4 shall not be counted.

Submitted by: Donato Giancola, Irene Gallo
Debate time is set at ten minutes.

Joan Joucenas: Inquiry: what about original artwork?

Chair believes that hanging an original piece of work in a gallery counts as publication, but does not make this a ruling.

Ben Yalow Inquiry: Does the chair believe that if a future administrator follows this belief, that if a piece of work was hung in a gallery, that piece could not be eligible if published as a book cover the following year.

Chair: The Chair doesn't know; that's why he won't make it a formal ruling.

4.3.1.1 Amendment by Substitution

Substitute for the proposed Constitutional Amendment "Artist Hugo" the following resolution:

Short Title: Best Professional Artist Hugo Administration

Resolved, That the WSFS Business Meeting requests that future Worldcon Committees encourage persons casting Hugo Award nominating ballots for Best Professional Artist to be more proactive in citing current work by the nominated artists by doing the following:

1. Include sufficient space on the Hugo Nominating Ballot for Best Professional Artist for a nominator to submit at least one reference to a work by each nominated artist. Failure to provide such references shall not invalidate a nomination.
2. When the Worldcon Committee determines the nominees, request that the artists provide references to up to five (5) pieces of artwork that the nominated artist believes best represents his or her work for that year, along with permission to cite those works on the convention's web site and/or final Award ballot. Failure to provide such references or permission shall not invalidate a nomination.
3. Make references to such pieces cited in item (2) above available on the convention's web site and/or on the final Award ballot. Failure to provide such references shall not invalidate the final Award ballot.

Debate time is set at ten minutes.

Sharon Sbarsky (Favouring substitute resolution): Reason for change is about education, want nominators and voters to look at what's available in any given year, and the amendment in 4.3.1 doesn't really do this.

Leslie Turek: Move to amend the substitute by striking section 1. Makes it appear that you're voting for an individual piece rather than an artist.

Seth Breidbart (Against amendment to substitute resolution): Better to make things obvious

for fans.

Kent Bloom (Favour): Process of administrating Hugos is a difficult job and this additional information is not trivial. Let's not add this burden to the administrator.

Gary Blog (Against): Hugo ballot is getting long enough, shouldn't increase it without good reason.

Ben Yalow: Move to extend debate for an additional five minutes on Leslie's amendment and on the original amendment. (Passed without objection.)

John Lorentz (Against): Actually, some specific instructions such as Section 1 would make life easier.

Irene Gallo (Against): Like Section 1 but need to add that not nominating a piece does not invalidate a nomination.

Ben Yalow (Against): This is only a resolution and does not make the administrator do anything he doesn't want to, unlike a constitutional amendment.

Leslie Turek (Favour): If the info is not going to be used, why put it on the ballot at all?

Colin Harris (Against): Think this is a practical balanced solution, which matches what we tend to do with fiction categories.

Motion to strike section 1 from the substitute resolution failed. Debate returned to the question of substituting the resolution for the originally proposed constitutional amendment.

Mark Olson: Inquiry: Up to 5? Could more be included?

Chair: See no reason why not.

Mark Olson: Think there is still a muddle about published, displayed, etc. Parliamentary

Inquiry: Could this be referred to committee?

Chair: Yes

John Picacio: Move to strike word "not" in last sentence of Section 2.

Kent Bloom: Point of order: That would put a requirement on the administrator, so could only be properly dealt with as a constitutional amendment.

Chair rules the point of order well taken, and that the amendment is not in order.

John Lorenz: Move to extend debate time by ten minutes. (Passed without objection.)

Anita Cole (Against substitute resolution): Not interested because the resolution doesn't have a binding effect.

John Lorentz (Favouring substitute resolution): The constitutional amendment could be very time consuming, but the resolution would be educational and inclusive.

Irene Gallo (Against): Would like to see more rigour put into art awards. Like the substitution but want to see more resolution.

Rick Katze (Favour): I was Hugo Administrator of N4, and feel that voters should be more thoughtful about what they do, but think the amendment would be impossible for the administrator to follow.

Todd Dashoff (Against): Inquiry: Could we take section 2 from the resolution, and make that the Constitutional amendment.

Chair: Yes we could do that, but that's way too complicated to deal with here, so I would suggest referring it to committee.

Mark Olson (Favour): Think this is a difficult problem, don't think amendment will work, but substitute is useful, could do it immediately, and can see how it goes over the next couple of years.

Ed Green (Against): That which is not required is easily ignored. If it is a problem, it needs to be addressed. The resolution doesn't really address that.

Lew Wolkoff (Against): Educated voting should not be optional.

Substitute resolution was carried by the meeting.

Ben Yalow: Move to refer the proposal on the floor (the resolution just adopted as a substitute for the original constitutional amendment) to committee to report tomorrow.

Ben Yalow (Favour): I still don't know whether there is an amendment that I would believe is preferable to the resolution, but I'd like the chance to see.

Mark Olson (Inquiry): Would resolution still be in front of meeting?

Chair: Yes, and they might report an amendment to the resolution or a new constitutional amendment, but I rule they may not report the original constitutional amendment.

Sharon Sbarsky: ?

John Lorentz (Against): Large variety of opinions: might be difficult to get something out of committee by tomorrow.

Motion to refer to committee passed.

Committee: Ben Yalow, Irene Gallo, John Picacio, Mark Olson, Sharon Sbarsky, Rick Katze. Ben Yalow will chair the committee and the committee is instructed to meet as soon as possible, preferably after the conclusion of today's meeting.

4.3.2 Short Title: Conversion Cap Clearance

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution to increase the cap on initial conversion fees from two (2) times the site-selection fee to three (3) times the site-selection fee by striking out and adding text as follows:

Section 1.5.5: Memberships

1.5.5: Voters have the right to convert to attending membership in the selected Worldcon within ninety (90) days of its selection, for an additional fee set by its committee. This fee must not exceed two (2) three (3) times the site-selection fee and must not exceed the difference between the site-selection fee and the fee for new attending members.

Submitted by: Colin Harris, Steve Cooper, Vincent Docherty, Ed Green, Tom Stidman

Debate time is set at ten minutes.

4.3.3 Short Title: Taming the Digital Wilderness, Part 1

Moved, to amend Section 3.10.4 of the WSFS Constitution by substituting "written" for "printed" and inserting "websites" into the list.

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

Moved by: The Taming the Digital Wilderness Committee

Debate time is set at ten minutes.

Mark Olson (Against): Stuff like this shouldn't be sprung on us without warning.

Chair: Mark Olson is foreshadowing a motion to refer this to committee tomorrow, because the preliminary meeting can't do that.

5. Site Selection Business

6. Adjournment

4.1.5 Short Title: The Music of the Planets

Resolved, That the L.A.con IV Business Meeting deplors the demotion of Pluto from the ranks of true planets.

Moved by Ruth Sachter and Geri Sullivan.

Ben Yalow: (Point of order): Believe this may be *ultra vires* (out of our jurisdiction).

Chair: I'll take this as an Objection to Consideration. Shall we consider this question? OTC (2/3 vote against consideration required) failed.

Mr. Yalow asked for a ruling on his point of order. The chair began to work out an opinion on this.

Kent Bloom: Move to adjourn until tomorrow and seconded.

Meeting adjourned at 11:45 until 10AM tomorrow.

[*Secretary: Point of Order was still pending when meeting was adjourned.*]

Main Business Meeting, Friday

Meeting was called to order at 10:11. Attendance as shown on the signup sheets was 126. Coffee and cookies were provided by a grant from Interaction.

Deb Geisler (Question of Privilege): Is the Secretary's Mac's battery one of the exploding ones?

Secretary: Already checked; no, it is not.

Chair: There is an agenda correction. The second item labelled 4.3.3 should be labelled 4.3.4

Mark Olson: Request that Item 4.3.4 be considered immediately after 4.1.6.

Chair: Hearing no objection, we shall do so.

1. Committee Reports

1.1. Mark Protection Committee (Including Nominations for MPC)

The three retiring members were the only nominees and without objection, Scott Dennis, Donald Eastlake III and Ruth Sachter are declared re-elected.

The Mark Protection Committee will be in Room 201C following the Site Selection Business Meeting on Saturday.

2. Worldcon & NASFiC Reports

2.1 Past Worldcons & NASFiC

2.1.1. ConAdian (1994)

2.1.2. The Millennium Philcon (2001)

2.1.3 Torcon 3 (2003)

2.1.4 Noreascon 4 (2004)

2.1.5 Interaction (2005)

Colin Harris: It is our intention that this be our last significant report, and next year will be our final one, where we will dispose of the final trivial amount.

Vince Docherty: Final surplus was about £39,000, about 7% of our turnover, and less than we took at-con. 52% is being passed along to successor Worldcons, with another 20% going to direct Worldcon activities, including Chaos Space Pirates here at L.A. con IV, a travel bursary to Japan for Nippon 2007 and some other events. Thank you very much.

Rick Katze: £500 to Foundation?

Vince Docherty: SF Foundation was heavily involved in Interaction and is a registered charity.

Linda Deneroff: Want to thank Interaction for so promptly fulfilling their responsibilities and disbursing their funds.

(Round of applause from Business Meeting)

Christian McGuire: On behalf of L.A. con IV I would like to thank Interaction for going above and beyond in their distribution of Pass Along Funds.

2.1.6 CascadiaCon (2005)

2.2. Seated Worldcons & NASFiC

2.2.1 L.A.con IV (2006)

2.2.2 Nippon 2007

Typo in financial report, date of conversion rate should read June 30, 2006.

2.2.3 Archon 31 the 9th NASFiC

3. Business Passed On from Interaction

3.1. Short Title: Best Editor Split

Moved, To split the Best Professional Editor Hugo Award into a Best Editor Short Fiction and Best Magazine Editor Long Award by striking out and inserting new sections as follows:

3.3.8: Best Professional Editor. The editor of any professional publication devoted primarily to Science Fiction or Fantasy during the previous calendar year. A

professional publication is one which had an average press run of at least ten thousand (10,000) copies per issue.

3.3.x: Best Editor Short Fiction. The editor of at least four (4) anthologies, collections or magazine issues primarily devoted to less than novel-length science fiction and / or fantasy, at least one of which was published in the previous calendar year

3.3.y: Best Editor Long Fiction. The editor of at least four (4) novels of written science fiction or fantasy published in the previous calendar year.

3.1.1 Short Title: Trial Period for Hugo change

The committee appointed yesterday reported a revised provision:

Provided that this amendment may be repealed by a simple majority vote at either the 2009 or 2010 Main Business Meeting.

Chair rules that provision is in order, and is a lesser change to the current amendment, because amendments that have a time limited effect are a lesser change to those that are not time limited.

Mark Olson (Favouring amendment): Feel this is a very good compromise.

William Keaton: Inquiry: Would this item be automatically placed on the 2009 or 2010 agenda?

Chair rules no; someone would have to propose it.

Chris Barkley: Thanks Mr Olson for his help in this matter.

Rich Zellich (Against amendment): Feels like people trying to take another shot at it.

Rick Katze (Favour): Think this is an improvement.

William Keaton (Against): Think we're establishing a dangerous precedent in removing amendments too easily.

Patrick Nielsen Hayden (Favour): Think this is a good way of respecting WSFS's reluctance to create additional Hugos.

Jared Dashoff: Move to extend debate for five minutes on the amendment and five more minutes on the main motion. (Passed without objection.)

Lynn Anderson (Point of Inquiry): What happens if the proviso is enacted?

Chair: Reverts to original single Hugo.

Seth Breidbart (Favour): Believe this is a good precedent for amendments that we favour but are not sure will be successful.

Darrel Exline (Against): Bad precedent if we make it too easy to kill amendments.

Glenn Glazer (Favour): Sunset clause gives us the opportunity to gather data to support arguments for or against.

Paul Haggerty (Against): Think this is a bad precedent — we can always reverse out a bad amendment.

Rick Kovalcik (Against): Think this is a bad idea because one of the years is likely to be at a small Worldcon in a small country.

Amendment was adopted.

Patrick Nielsen Hayden (Favouring ratification of constitutional amendment as amended): Books have been a main driver of SF for many decades, and we think at least 50 editors

would be eligible for the Long Fiction Hugo. I think this proposal is fair, it's the right thing to do, and if it becomes the feared weak Hugo it can now be reversed out.

Wynton Matthews (Against ratification): What about non-fiction editors?

Mark Olson (Favour): Time to give it a fair trial.

Jared Dashoff: Move to strike the word "fiction" and re-edit the amendment to reflect that.

Chair: Rule that that is not a lesser change, so would have to be ratified next year.

Rick Kovalcik: Appeal the Chair's ruling.

Chair (Favouring chair's ruling): Scope would be broader if this motion was changed.

Rick Kovalcik (Against chair's ruling): This is closer to the current constitution so must be the lesser change.

Ben Yalow (Favour): There are people who would be eligible with fiction deleted, that are not eligible with fiction left in.

By unanimous consent, total debate time extended by five minutes.

Seth Breidbart (Against): Four different categories of fiction and non-fiction editors.

Patrick Nielsen Hayden (Against): For what it's worth, the framers of the original motion don't really care whether this is broadened to include fiction and did not intend to exclude it.

Ruling of the Chair was overturned. This is a lesser change and would not require ratification next year.

Seth Breidbart: Move to refer back to the committee that reported out the "sunset" provision, with instructions to report to tomorrow's meeting or sooner if possible. Motion to refer to committee passed.

At the suggestion of the Chair, and without objection, the meeting recessed at 11:10. .

Meeting reconvened at 11:19.

Mark Olson presented the Committee's report, which modified the proposed amendment as follows:

Moved, To split the Best Professional Editor Hugo Award into a Best Editor Short Fiction and Best Magazine Editor Long Award by striking out and inserting new sections as follows:

3.3.8: Best Professional Editor. The editor of any professional publication devoted primarily to Science Fiction or Fantasy during the previous calendar year. A professional publication is one which had an average press run of at least ten thousand (10,000) copies per issue.

3.3.x: Best Editor Short Form Fiction. The editor of at least four (4) anthologies, collections or magazine issues primarily devoted to ~~less than novel-length~~ science fiction and / or fantasy, at least one of which was published in the previous calendar year.

3.3.y: Best Editor Long Form Fiction. The editor of at least four (4) novel-length works primarily devoted to ~~novels of written~~ science fiction and / or fantasy published in the previous calendar year that do not qualify as works under 3.3.x.

Provided that this amendment may be repealed by a simple majority vote at either the 2009 or 2010 Main Business Meeting.

Debate time extended by ten minutes without objection.

Margene Bahm (Against substitute version): Why do we need the final clause?

Mark Olson (Favouring substitute version): Without the clause, anthologies might qualify for the long form Hugo.

Lew Wolkoff (Against): Doesn't mention fandom specifically. Move to amend by adding "And fandom".

Chair: Secondary amendments are out of order at this time.

[Chair: Upon reflection, this probably was not the case, because the proposal on the floor was a motion to substitute a new version of the original proposal, and that is the only time that secondary amendments are allowed. However, given the nature of the proposal, it seems likely that the proposed amendment would have broadened the scope of the constitutional amendment sufficiently as to exceed its original scope, and therefore would have required an additional year of ratification.]

Glenn Glazer: Move the previous question [End Debate] on the amendment. By a two-thirds vote, debate was closed on the amendment.

Motion was amended as shown above.

[Secretary: Debate now returns to Constitutional Amendment.]

Colin Harris (Favouring ratification): Revised wording is an attempt to match the complete definition of the existing category.

Janice Gelb (Against ratification): Definition of editor can vary widely by publishing house, by company, by work. The word editor may not be a good indication of the involvement of the named individual in the work.

Motion was ratified by a vote by show of hands.

4. New Business

4.1. Resolutions

4.1.5 Short Title: The Music of the Planets

Resolved: The L.A.con IV Business Meeting deplores the demotion of Pluto from the ranks of true planets.

Moved by Ruth Sachter and Geri Sullivan.

Chair: Point of Order still pending on whether this resolution was *ultra vires*.

Mark Olson: Move to suspend the rules and move to the end of the agenda.

Motion was passed.

4.1.6 Short Title: Best Professional Artist Hugo Administration

This resolution was a substitute for 4.3.1 Constitutional Amendment. The committee to which the matter was referred reported the following proposed substitutions:

Resolved, That the WSFS Business Meeting requests that future Worldcon Committees encourage persons casting Hugo Award nominating ballots for Best Professional Artist to be more proactive in citing current work by the nominated artists by doing the following:

1. Include sufficient space on the Hugo Nominating Ballot for Best Professional Artist for a nominator to submit at least one reference to a work by each nominated artist. Failure to provide such references shall not invalidate a nomination.
2. When the Worldcon Committee determines the nominees, request that each artist ~~the artists~~ provide references to three (3) or more ~~up to five (5)~~ pieces of artwork that the nominated artist believes best represents his or her work first published ~~for~~ that year, along with permission to cite those works on the convention's web site and/or final Award ballot. Failure to provide such references or permission shall not invalidate a nomination.
3. Make references to such pieces cited in item (2) above available on the convention's web site and/or on the final Award ballot. Failure to provide such references shall not invalidate the final Award ballot.

Ben Yalow: Committee has reported a slightly modified resolution which suggests that artists should provide citations to three or more artworks in their acceptance. This resolution is not binding on Worldcon committees, etc. In addition, the committee recommends a constitutional amendment as 4.3.4 that would *require* artists to provide citations.

Rick Kovalcik (Against substitute): Requires that an artist has created at least three works and is a huge change from up to five.

Mark Olson (Favouring substitute): The committee felt that most working artists were producing 6 up to 100s of works.

Todd Dashoff (Inquiry): What sort of works would qualify?

Chair doesn't feel he needs to rule on this. It's the responsibility of the Hugo administrator.

Patrick Nielsen Hayden (Favour): Hugos don't have to cover every single possibility.

Rick Kovalcik (Against): Opposed to use of word "published."

William Keaton (Favour): A resolution seems an excellent way to sample this sort of change.

Motion to substitute the amended resolution reported by the committee was passed.

John Lorentz (Favouring resolution): Feels like an excellent way to encourage and educate the voters.

Gary Blog (Against resolution): Should be doing this for fan artist and fan writer as well.

Resolution was adopted.

4.3. Constitutional Amendments

4.3.4 Short Title: Best Artist Hugo Eligibility

Moved to amend Section 3.9 of the WSFS Constitution by adding text as follows

Section 3.9: Notification and Acceptance. Worldcon Committees shall use reasonable efforts to notify the nominees, 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 shall be asked at that time to either accept or decline the nomination. If the nominee declines nomination, that nominee shall not appear on the final ballot. In addition, in the Best Professional Artists category, the acceptance must include citations of at least three (3) works first published in the eligible year.

Moved by Ben Yalow (Chair), Sharon Sbarsky, Mark Olson, John Picacio, Irene Gallo and Rick Katze. This committee, along with the interested parties of Patrick Nielsen Hayden, Jared Dashoff, Alan F Beck, Geri Sullivan and Seth Breidbart

Ten minutes debate time allowed.

Ben Yalow (Favouring adoption of constitutional amendment): Resolution is just social engineering and could be ignored. The purpose of the constitutional amendment is not to change what the voters need to do, or to make a more than trivial change to what the administrator needs to do. This encourages the artist to show the best work they've done over the previous year.

Don Timm (Against adoption of constitutional amendment): Shouldn't we amend 3.3.9 as well?

Chair observes that specific Hugo requirements in the Constitution override general Hugo requirements.

[Chair: That is, the specific rule proposed as part of section 3.9 would override the general description of the Best Professional Artist category at 3.3.9.]

Darrell Exline (Favour): Doesn't eliminate people who don't accept from the ballot

Seth Breidbart (Point of Order): Would the Chair rule on the previous speech?

Chair: No. Chair cannot correct or amend errors of fact in any member's speech. Debate need not be factual.

Rick Kovalcik (Against): So many reasons to be opposed to this, what does published mean, why three instead of one?

Mark Olson (Favour): When something was written or painted is not the same as when it was published.

John Lorentz (Against): Currently it's quite difficult to get acceptance, and we're extending proof of eligibility to only one category.

Susan de Guardiola (Against): In practice personal Hugos are often given on a body of work, rather than a specific work.

Ben Yalow: Move to extend debate.

Less than 2/3rd so debate was not extended.

On a rising serpentine vote of 66 in favour and 24 against, the constitutional amendment was adopted and is sent to next year's Worldcon for ratification.

4.3.2 Short Title: Conversion Cap Clearance

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution to increase the cap on initial conversion fees from two (2) times the site-selection fee to three (3) times the site-selection fee by striking out and adding text as follows:

Section 1.5.5: Memberships

1.5.5: Voters have the right to convert to attending membership in the selected Worldcon within ninety (90) days of its selection, for an additional fee set by its committee. This fee must not exceed two (2) three (3) times the site-selection fee and must not exceed the difference between the site-selection fee and the fee for new attending members.

Submitted by: Colin Harris, Steve Cooper, Vincent Docherty, Ed Green, Tom Stidman

Colin Harris (Favouring constitutional amendment): Existing rules are too constraining on overseas Worldcons. The current deep discounting is quite difficult for the shorter two years, so conventions could have a flatter membership fee profile over those two years. This would also allow us to keep voting fees at a reasonable level.

Rick Katze (Against constitutional amendment): Don't trust all Worldcon committees. If we raise the cap, they'll want the money.

Linda Deneroff (Favour): If we want to encourage more people to vote, we want to keep voting rates low.

Ben Yalow (Against): \$250-300 at the door memberships is driving away our lifeblood. I'm paying too little for the Worldcon, you need to make me pay more — and I think increasing the voter fees is a better idea than this 3x idea.

Leslie Turek (Against): Early joiners are just joining automatically, whether or not they go.

Steve Norris (Favour): Think raising the voting fee dampens the democratic process.

Sharon Sbarsky (Against): Historically when we moved from 1x to 2x first Worldcon who could did charge the full higher rate.

Doug Freaf (Favour): The lower voting fee is more important to me, than the conversion rate.

On a vote by show of hands, the constitutional amendment failed.

4.3.3 Short Title: Taming the Digital Wilderness, Part 1

Moved, to amend Section 3.10.4 of the WSFS Constitution by substituting "written" for "printed" and inserting "websites" into the list.

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

Moved by: The Taming the Digital Wilderness Committee

Mark Olson: Move to refer the motion back to Committee for further consideration. Greater notice is needed of this sort of motion, for example through the SMOFS list.

Motion was passed and referred to the TtDW Committee.

4.1.5 Short Title: The Music of the Planets

Resolved: The L.A.con IV Business Meeting deplores the demotion of Pluto from the ranks of true planets.

Moved by Ruth Sachter and Geri Sullivan.

This motion still has a pending point of order adhering to it.

Rick Katze: Move to adjourn.

Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 12:28.

Site Selection Business Meeting, Saturday

Meeting was called to order at 10:14. Attendance as shown on the signup sheets was 104. Coffee was provided by a grant from Interaction.

Secretary: The Secretary expressed his thanks to Chaz Boston-Baden and the Newsletter staff for their assistance and support in preparing the agenda. He also noted that thanks to the wonders of budget transfer, the WSFS Business Meeting has financed the production of one issue of the Newsletter.

5.1. Report of the 2008 Site Selection & Presentation by Winners

The report was presented by Jeff Orth, the Site Selection Administrator and is attached to these minutes.

Jeff Orth: Would like to thank Dick Spellman and Steve Francis for their experienced support and assistance. Thanks also to Diane Lacey, Jim Murray, Paula Murray and Tim Miller. Count started at 6:20 and Denver was declared the winner at 8:59 by 12 votes. The None of the Above showdown was done and was trivial. There were five pizzas.

Chair: Without objection the meeting would like to thank the Site Selection Administrator for a job well done.

Chair: Unanimous consent to commend the bids for well run and organised campaigns.

[Chair: The Secretary has recorded the intent of the Chair's comment; his actual words were somewhat less clear, and the Chair subsequently apologized to all the committees for any offense he may have given.]

Chair: Ask for unanimous consent to destroy the ballots. Hearing no objection the ballots were destroyed.

[Secretary: Note that this is the procedural point at which the ballot becomes final.]

Kent Bloom, Chair of Denvention 3: Thanks to the voters, special thanks to Chicago and Columbus bids and only a shame we couldn't all win. Denvention 3's guests will include Lois

McMaster Bujold, Tom Whitmore, Wil McCarthy. Conversion table will be set up in an hour or so.

Steve Francis: We will be doing a party in 5-510 tonight.

Judy Bemis: Convention treasurer?

Kent Bloom: Bob MacIntosh assisted by Brian Mormon

Ben Yalow: How long are rates on PR0 good?

KB: At least until the end of the year.

Tom Whitmore: Thank you for inviting me as a guest.

Cheryl Morgan: Intend to add more guests?

KB: Yes

Robert Klein: Any info on hotel rates?

KB: Not yet. Rate quote is \$119 plus inflator of 5% or less.

Ruth Sachter: Other committee members.

KB: Mary Mormon for Program, starting to recruit members.

Chair: Who is MPC representative?

KB: None yet, but I will attend the MPC after the meeting.

Winton Matthews: Will you do something special to help people get from the airport to the convention?

KB: No plans yet.

Christian McGuire: Pass along funds?

KB: Yes, we're going to participate in PAF.

Gary Blog: On behalf of the newsletter staff would like to thank the Site Selection Administrator and all three bids for their access and support.

Perianne Lurie: Are friends who voted automatically members?

KB: Yes

Rick Katze: Move to move item 4.1.5 to end of agenda after all other site selection business and before adjournment.

More than 2/3rd in favour so agenda was rearranged.

Dave McCarty (Chair of Chicago in 2008 bid): Thanks to everybody we met over the past three years and the new friends we've made.

Kim Williams: (Chair of Columbus in 2008 bid): Thanks to all the people we met and how much we learnt, and we've got t-shirts still available at a discount.

Christian McGuire: Want to thank Jeff Orth, all of his staff and all of the bids. L.A. con IV appreciates that it worked so well.

1. Committee Reports

All business under this heading was completed at the Preliminary or Main Business Meetings.

Chair appoints to the HEROW committee: Vince Docherty (Chair), Perianne Lurie, Pam Fremon, Paul Haggerty, Gayle Surette, Cheryl Morgan and Kevin Standlee. The Chair of the meeting authorises the Chair of the Committee to appoint others to the Committee as he chooses.

Chair appoints to the TtDW committee: Glenn Glazer (Chair), Paul Haggerty, Gayle Surette, Ben Yalow, Seth Breidbart, Cheryl Morgan, Tim Illingworth and Peter Wilkinson. The Chair of the meeting authorises the Chair of the Committee to appoint others to the Committee as he chooses.

2. Worldcon & NASFiC Reports

All business under this heading was completed at the Preliminary or Main Business Meetings.

*[Secretary: As a courtesy, the Secretary has included financial reports received in advance of the Business Meeting in the Agenda. Next year, the Secretary is getting married on 17th August, and is also concerned about the logistics of creating and printing the huge Preliminary Business Meeting agenda in Yokohama. Therefore, the Secretary plans to create and print the agenda well in advance. **Worldcon and NASFiC reports will only be included in the Agenda if received before 1st AUGUST 2007.** The responsibility for copying and distributing reports finished after that date rests solely with that Worldcon or NASFiC.]*

3. Business Passed On from Interaction

All business under this heading was completed at the Preliminary or Main Business Meetings.

4. New Business

4.1. Resolutions

4.1.5 Short Title: The Music of the Planets

Resolved: The L.A.con IV Business Meeting deplores the demotion of Pluto from the ranks of true planets.

Moved by Ruth Sachter and Geri Sullivan.

As indicated above, moved to last item of business before adjournment.

5. Site Selection Business

5.2. Reports by seated Worldcons & NASFiC

5.2.1. L.A.con IV (2006)

Ed Green answered questions on behalf of L.A. con IV.

Tom Whitmore: How many members?

Ed Green: Approximately 6355 members, warm body count 4921

Seth Breidbart: How many taster memberships?

Ed Green: Don't have full numbers, maybe 75 or so on Friday, will make full numbers available.

Linda Deneroff: Thanks L.A.con IV for being a wonderful convention.

Ed Green: Thanks to staff, volunteers and members. We will not be having a Dead Dog party, we are having a Dead Pluto party.

Priscilla Olson: What about non-warm bodies at future Worldcons?

Chair: I refer you to the Chair of the FOLLE committee?

5.2.2 Nippon 2007

Hiroaki Inoue (Chair), Shouichi Hachiya, Maho Watanabe, Peggy Rae Sapienza answered questions on behalf of Nippon 2007.

Ben Yalow: When will hotel bookings be able to be made?

Peggy Rae Sapienza: Can be made now through the convention's travel agency. Report was attached to preliminary Business Meeting and will be included in minutes.

Hiroaki Inoue (Chair): We are preparing for 2007, any items that have not yet been concluded such as hotel rate will be updated on our website by mid-September.

Rick Kovalcik: Times of Hugos and Masquerades?

Peggy Rae Sapienza: Having the Masquerade in the afternoon is traditional in Japan.

Beth Morson: How many memberships have been sold?

Peggy Rae Sapienza: We have sold more than 1,000 non-Japanese memberships, and there will be English language items and translation.

Chair: By precedent, Business Meeting will be conducted in English.

5.2.3 Archon 31, the 9th NASFiC

Steve Norris and Rich Zellich answered questions on behalf of Archon 31, the 9th NASFiC.

Steve Norris: Want to wish Japan every success.

Rick Kovalcik: Hotel rates yet?

Steve Norris: Hotel reservations after October, the hotel seems to have trouble in distinguishing between this year's and next year's ArchonÉ

Rich Zellich: Main convention hotel is \$120 or so this year, other local hotels are \$69 to \$85 or so. We'd expect the main hotel to be \$130 or so, but we don't know for certain yet.

Margene Bahm: Hotels on other side of convention center are closer than the main convention hotel.

John Lorentz: How large is Archon usually?

Steve Norris: About 2,500 people normally. We're anticipating 3,000 to 3,500 people at the NASFiC.

5.3. Presentation by future Worldcon bids

5.3.1. Presentation by bidders for 2009

Margene Bahm answered questions on behalf of KC in 2009 and Rene Walling answered questions on behalf of Montreal in 2009. Both appeared jointly before the meeting each wearing the other bids t-shirt.

Margene Bahm: Paperwork will be filed today.

Gary Blog: Question for Rene, what about security and air travel?

Rene Walling: Impossible to predict for 2009. Should be very similar to domestic US travel

Glenn Glazer: Is it true all your programming will be in French.

Rene Walling: Bien entendu, nous sommes sur que tout le monde nous comprendra lorsque nous parlerons francais.

[*Secretary: We are certain that everyone will understand us when we speak French.*]

Rene Walling: Bilingual convention and documents, translation where necessary.

Linda Deneroff: Hayfever?

Margene Bahm: Over by Worldcon time.

Rene Walling: Pretty similar.

Lew Wolkoff: Will the KC Worldcon be bilingual?

Margene Bahm: Our second language will be Linear B.

Lew Wolkoff: Dates of your convention.

Rene Walling: Thursday 6th — Monday 10th August

Margene Bahm: The usual Labour Day weekend.

Sharon Sbarsky: Will both participate in Pass Along Funds?

Both: Absolutely.

Perianne Lurie: What is situation for public smoking in both your cities?

Margene Bahm: Not sure for 2009. At the moment most places have smoking sections, but that may change by 2009.

Rene Walling: Province of Quebec recently passed a law prohibiting smoking in bars and restaurants.

5.3.2. Presentation by bidders for years after 2009

Stephen Boucher answered questions on behalf of Australia in 2010:

Stephen Boucher: Bidding for Melbourne, hoping for traditional Labour Day weekend.

Glenn Glazer: Typical temperatures?

Stephen Boucher: Daytime 18C, evenings 10-12C

Rick Kovalcik: Just a small question? What size is your country and city?

Stephen Boucher: The country is a Continent, 97% the size of the lower 48 US states. The city is Melbourne has 4 million people, making it larger than Glasgow, Anaheim, Denver, Seattle, and Yokohama.

[Secretary has researched these statistics and found them to be correct. Furthermore, depending on your statistical definitions, Melbourne may be the largest city to hold a Worldcon since New York in 1967. Australia is indeed a large country and Melbourne is indeed a large city.]

William Keaton: Will there be bilingual programming?

Stephen Boucher: Official language will be Australian, but English translation will be provided when necessary.

Seth Breidbart on behalf of Minneapolis in 73: Minneapolis is still bidding for 73 when it comes round again.

Pat Porter: Seattle will be bidding again for 2011.

Steve Norris: Move to adjourn *sine die*.

Chair: This is the debatable form of the motion to adjourn.

Pat Porter: Move to limit debate to 30 seconds each.

Ed Green: Is that debatable?

Chair: Motions to set time limits are not debatable.

Motion to set debate time on the motion to adjourn passed by 2/3rd.

John Lorentz (Against adjournment): Want to see *ultra vires* point decided.

John Lorentz (Against): This cute motion [The Pluto motion that would be killed if the meeting adjourned at this time] acquired a serious point that we need to decide. The parliamentary tricks made this a major irritant.

Motion to adjourn failed.

4.1.5 Short Title: The Music of the Planets

Resolved: The L.A.con IV Business Meeting deplores the demotion of Pluto from the ranks of true planets.

Moved by Ruth Sachter and Geri Sullivan.

Chair: Unclear whether 4.1.5 is in order and refers the point of order to the membership.

[*Chair: This is debatable because an appeal from the Chair's ruling on the point of order would have been debatable.*]

Don Timm (Motion in order): In 1969 we applauded the moon landing. If we can applaud that, we can deplore the loss of a planet. It is the opinion of the body, not binding on anyone.

Ben Yalow (Motion not in order): The fact that we've made mistakes in the past doesn't mean that we have to repeat them. We have very little control over the naming of the planets, and this is not within the scope of this body's objectives to lobby the AIU or NASA.

Rick Kovalcik: Move the previous question [end debate on the point of order].

Motion to end debate fails.

Mark Olson (Motion in order): Barely in control of ourselves, so that shouldn't stop us, and we have a 64 year tradition of holding our meetings on planetary bodies so it is relevant.

Seth Breidbart (Motion is in order): The Meeting clearly has the power to deplore in its own name, so the motion is in order at this time.

Ben Yalow (Point of Order): The makers of the agenda appear to be participating in debate and that section [involving a humorous cartoon] should be withdrawn.

[*Secretary: Note that this is a separate point of order from the one currently on the floor.*]

Chair rules that this point is not well taken as that section is clearly intended to be a humorous aside and is not substantive.

Rick Kovalcik: Appeals ruling of the Chair.

Debate time had expired, so the appeal was undebatable.

Chair's ruling on the agenda was sustained.

Assembly decided motion was not *ultra vires* and therefore the point of order against it on this ground was not well taken.

Motion to extend debate on the resolution failed. However, procedural motions are still in order, although they are not debatable.

Glenn Glazer: Move to amend by substituting the word "Goofy" for the word "Pluto".

Chair rules motion is dilatory.

Ben Yalow: Move to amend by substituting the word "applauds" for the word "deplores".

Someone (Name not recorded by Secretary): Point of Order: Amendments that reverse the effect of a proposal are not in order.

Chair: Point not well taken. Although an amendment that merely negates a proposal (such as striking out "deplores" and inserting "does not deplore") would not be in order, an amendment that creates a motion of the opposite intent is in order.

[*Chair: See Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised, 10th edition, p. 131, lines 13-23 for an example of such an amendment.*]

Geri Sullivan: Move to refer to committee to report next year.

Motion to commit fails.

Jared Dashoff: Move the Previous Question.

Ben Yalow (Point of order): Rules don't allow us to call the question with less than one minute remaining.

Chair rules the point of order not well taken. Although technically Standing Rule 5.5 prohibits the motion for the Previous Question when there is less than one minute of debate time remaining, the Chair rules that the intent of SR 5.5 is to avoid wasting debate time. When debate time has expired entirely, Previous Question has the specific effect of shutting off the making of lower-ranking subsidiary motions (commit, amend, etc.) and therefore is in order.

[*Chair: Besides, the vote required to Suspend the Rules and the vote for Previous Question are both the same (2/3), and therefore someone could get the exact same effect by moving to Suspend the Rules and call the Previous Question.*]

Motion on the Previous Question [shutting off the making of lower-ranking subsidiary motions] passed.

Motion to substitute "applauds" for "deploras" fails.

Howard Rosenblatt (Point of order): Five minutes of debate.

Chair: All time used in other matters and debate has been closed off.

[*Chair: Regrettably, in the heat of the moment, the Chair neglected to notice that there had never been any substantive debate on the main motion, although it was touched upon obliquely during the debate on the motion's admissibility. The Chair was mistaken when he ruled the point of order not well taken. Standing Rule 3.5 attempts to guarantee a minimum of two minutes substantive debate for both sides of a question.*]

On a rising serpentine vote of 41 in favour and 29 against, the resolution was adopted.

6. Adjournment

There being no further business, and without objection the meeting adjourned *sine die* at 12:25.