

2017 WSFS BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES
WORLDCON 75. THE 75TH WORLD SCIENCE FICTION CONVENTION
HELSINKI, FINLAND
Thursday, August 10;
Friday, August 11;
Saturday, August 12; and
Sunday, August 13, 2017

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
A. STANDING RULE CHANGES	2
A.1 Short Title: No Candidate Regions	2
A.2 Short Title: No Vanishing Business.....	4
A.3 Short Title: Debate Time Streamlining.....	6
A.4 Short Title: Electronic Documents Are a Thing	7
A.5 Short Title: Butt Out	9
B. RESOLUTIONS.....	10
B.1 Short Title: <i>your name</i> . Eligibility	10
B.2 Short Title: Artist Eligibility.....	11
B.2.1 Short Title: Hugo Awards Study Committee (<i>amendment by substitution</i>)	11
B.3 Short Title: Convention Publications to Be Delivered to Members	15
B.3.1 Short Title: Provision of Convention Publications to Members (<i>amendment by substitution</i>)	17
C. BUSINESS PASSED ON	21
C.1 Short Title: Best Series	21
C.1.1 Short Title: Best Series Clarifications (<i>amendment to ratification</i>).....	22
C.2 Short Title: December Is Good Enough	26
C.3 Short Title: Two Years Are Enough	27
C.4 Short Title: Three Stage Voting (“3SV”) or “The Only Winning Move Is Not to Play”	29
C.5 Short Title: E Pluribus Hugo (Out of the Many, a Hugo)	35
C.6 Short Title: EPH+	39

C.6.1	Amendment to Ratification	40
C.7	Short Title: Defining North America	43
C.8	Short Title: Retrospective Improvement Part 1	44
C.9	Short Title: Retrospective Improvement Part 2	45
C.10	Short Title: Universal Suffrage	45
C.11	Short Title: Young Adult Award	47
C.11.1	Short Title: Clean Up “Young Adult” Award <i>(amendment to ratification)</i>	47
C.12	Short Title: 5 and 6	52
D.	NEW CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS	54
D.1	Short Title: What Our Marks Really Are	54
D.2	Short Title: The Reasonable Amendment	55
D.3	Short Title: Make Room! Make Room!	56
D.4	Short Title: Name That Award: The Second YA Amendment “Young Adult” Award	57
D.5	Short Title: Requiring Electronic Payments	63
D.6	Short Title: The Division of the Hugo Award Best Novel Category	64
D.7	Short Title: A Reorganization of the Best Related Category	66
D.8	Short Title: Best Dramatic Presentation Reorganization	67
E.	COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MOTIONS	71
E.1	Standing Committees of WSFS	71
E.1.1	MPC Nominations	71
E.1.2	Mark Protection Committee Report	71
E.1.3	MPC Election Results	72
E.1.4	MPC Appointments	72
E.2.	Standing Committees of the Business Meeting	72
E.2.1	Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee	72
E.2.2	Worldcon Runners Guide Editorial Committee	73
E.3	Special Committees	74
E.3.1	Formalization of Long List Entries (FOLLE) Committee	74
E.3.2	YA Award Study Committee	74
E.3.3	Hugo Awards Study Committee	88
F.	FINANCIAL REPORTS	89
F.1	Anticipation (Montréal)	89

F.2	LoneStarCon 3 (San Antonio)	90
F.3	Detcon 1(Detroit)	91
F.4	Sasquan (Spokane).....	92
F.5	MidAmeriCon II (Kansas City)	94
F.6	NorthAmeriCon '17 (Puerto Rico)	102
F.7	Worldcon 75 (Helsinki)	103
F.8	Worldcon 76 (San Jose).....	106
G.	SITE SELECTION RESULTS	108
H.	QUESTION TIME	109
H.1	Worldcon 76 in 2018, San Jose, California	109
H.2	New Zealand in 2020	109
	APPENDICES	110
	Appendix A – Mark Protection Committee Report	110
	Appendix B – Hugo Awards Study Committee.....	117
	Appendix C – Analysis of EPH’s Effect on Hugo Voting.....	120

2017 WSFS BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES
WORLDCON 75. THE 75TH WORLD SCIENCE FICTION CONVENTION
HELSINKI, FINLAND
Thursday, August 10;
Friday, August 11;
Saturday, August 12; and
Sunday, August 13, 2017

INTRODUCTION

All meetings were held in Room 208 of the Helsinki Exhibition & Convention Centre in Helsinki, Finland, with Kevin Standlee presiding over all sessions of the Business Meeting. The Officers were:

Presiding Officer:	Kevin Standlee
Deputy Presiding Officer	Donald E. Eastlake III
Secretary:	Linda Deneroff
Timekeeper:	Paul Dormer
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. They 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. The Mark Protection Committee members are usually elected on paper ballots, using the preferential "instant runoff" ballot. Most voting is done by an uncounted show of hands or, less commonly, by acclamation ("unanimous consent"). If the Chair says "If there is no objection . . ." and at least one person objects, the Chair will conduct a vote by show of hands or a counted vote. If a 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.)

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

**WORLD SCIENCE FICTION SOCIETY
BUSINESS MEETING
THURSDAY, AUGUST 10, 2017 – SUNDAY, AUGUST 13, 2017**

The business meeting staff consisted of Kevin Standlee, Presiding Officer; Donald E. Eastlake III, Deputy Presiding Officer; Linda Deneroff, Secretary; Paul Dormer, Timekeeper; and Lisa Hayes, Videographer.

This year the minutes are recorded in the order set in the agenda, but the notes for a single item contain the minutes for all days in which the item was discussed, and the days are noted.

The Thursday meeting came to order at 10:12 a.m. and adjourned at 1:08 p.m.

The Friday meeting came to order at 10:04 a.m. and adjourned at 12:49 p.m.

The Saturday meeting was called to order at 10:07 a.m. It adjourned at approximately 10:30 a.m. for the Worldcon Chairs photo and then resumed at 11 a.m. It adjourned for the day at 1:36 p.m.

The Sunday meeting was called to order at 10:01 a.m.

Prior to the conclusion of adjourning *sine die*, Kate Secor, the WSFS Deputy Division Head, thanked everyone for attending and thanked the table staff for their service. Kevin Standlee extended the thanks to the WSFS division management, Kate Secor, Michael Lee, and the programming, facilities and tech staffs of Worldcon 75.

Vince Docherty then made a motion that the business meeting adjourn *sine die* in memory and honor of David A. Kyle, Kathleen Meyer and Peter Weston, which was seconded and passed without objection. Therefore, Sunday at 10:33 a.m., the business meeting adjourned *sine die* in memory and honor of David A. Kyle, Kathleen Meyer and Peter Weston.

Announcements. Kate Secor thanked the head table staff for its service, which turned around and thanked the WSFS division for all their assistance.

A. STANDING RULE CHANGES

A.1 Short Title: No Candidate Regions

Moved: to amend Sections 6.1 and 6.2 of the Standing Rules by deleting text as follows:

Rule 6.1: Nominations. Nominations for election to the Mark Protection Committee shall be allowed from the floor at each Preliminary Business

Meeting. To be listed on the ballot, each nominee must submit to the Secretary of the Business Meeting the nominee's consent to nomination ~~and the nominee's current region of residence. A nominee shall be ineligible if the nominee could not be elected due to the regional residence restrictions.~~ The deadline for submitting such consent to nomination shall be set by the Secretary.

Rule 6.2: Elections. Elections to the Mark Protection Committee shall be a special order of business at a designated Main Business Meeting. Voting shall be by written preferential ballot with write-in votes allowed. Votes for write-in candidates who do not submit written consent to nomination ~~and region of residence~~ to the Presiding Officer before the close of balloting shall be ignored. The ballot shall list each nominee's name ~~and region of residence~~. The first seat filled shall be by normal preferential ballot procedures as defined in Section 6.4 of the WSFS Constitution. There shall be no run-off candidate. After a seat is filled, votes for the elected member ~~and for any nominee who is now ineligible due to regional residence restrictions~~ shall be eliminated before conducting the next ballot. This procedure shall continue until all seats are filled. In the event of a first-place tie for any seat, the tie shall be broken unless all tied candidates can be elected simultaneously. Should there be any partial-term vacancies on the committee, the partial-term seat(s) shall be filled after the full-term seats have been filled.

Proposed by: The Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

Commentary: When the Site Selection zones were removed from the Constitution, we forgot to remove them from the Mark Protection Committee election provisions in the Standing Rules. It didn't matter in 2016 since the incumbents were re-elected more or less by acclamation but it could cause a snarl in the future.

Debate time was set at 2 minutes.

Thursday's Discussion: Donald E. Eastlake III, on behalf of the NP&FSC, explained that there used to be a definition of regions of North America in the Constitution, but they were removed several years ago and have no effect at all. However, we forgot to remove them regarding the Mark Protection Committee in the Standing Rules. This resolution would simply remove that verbiage from the Standing Rules since it has no effect. **Without debate it passed by unanimous consent.** The Chair then asked if there were any objection to having it take effect immediately. There was no objection.

A.2 Short Title: No Vanishing Business

Moved: to amend the Standing Rules by inserting the following sentence after the first sentence in Rule 2.1:

An item of new business submitted in advance that has been distributed to the membership may not be withdrawn without leave of the Business Meeting.

Proposed by: The Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

Commentary: The whole prior submission of business requirement that the WSFS Business Meeting uses is at variance with normal procedure under Robert's Rules. Robert's only contemplates the giving in advance of "notice" that a motion will be submitted, not the actual "advance submission" of motions. Then, under Robert's, it would be in order to make any motion otherwise in order that is within the scope of that notice – with preference being given to whoever gave notice. We have already had one round of problems when someone wanted to "withdraw" a motion they had submitted in advance. This is inherently unfair to those who want the motion or similar business introduced as, when they have notice the motion has been submitted in advance, they will assume it will come before the meeting and refrain from submitting it themselves. The above is a small addition to the rules that eliminates this problem.

Debate time was set at 2 minutes.

Thursday's Discussion: Kevin Standlee explained that currently once something has been submitted for the agenda and the deadline for submissions has passed, it cannot be withdrawn. Kate Secor asked if the actual effect of this motion would be that no business could be withdrawn after the deadline for submission of business had passed. Donald E. Eastlake III explained that the motion did not relate to the deadline but to distribution to the membership. So, if the membership has received notice of a pending piece of business, the resolution would not allow it to be withdrawn. This is difference from Robert's Rules. Our rules say that motions are submitted in advance. This has led to some confusion because people who have submitted such felt that they should be allowed to withdraw it. Since they have actually submitted the motion, if they were allowed to withdraw it, the business would vanish. Someone else, expecting the motion to appear on the agenda and who might have submitted a similar motion otherwise, would not have submitted it because they expected it to be on the agenda. The business meeting can always allow a motion to be withdrawn, but without such permission, it was the feeling of the NP&FSC that it should appear on the agenda.

Debate time was extended to 6 minutes. Ben Yalow spoke against the motion. Since there is nothing in the rules to prevent the business meeting staff from distributing the agenda early, he wished to amend the motion by adding words to incorporate "after the

deadline stated in this rule. . .” language between “withdrawn” and before “without.” The motion to amend was seconded and would now read:

[An item of new business submitted in advance that has been distributed to the membership may not be withdrawn after the deadline stated in this rule without leave of the Business Meeting.](#)

Ms. Secor asked if the “deadline stated in the rule” was the standard submission date of two weeks prior to the business meeting. The Chair explained that it was, because this motion simply adds a sentence to existing Rule 2.1.

Mr. Eastlake spoke against Mr. Yalow’s amendment. He felt it would defeat the purpose of the rule entirely. Members would get notice that some motion is going to appear therefore don’t submit your own version. By implication, Mr. Yalow’s additional language allows the motion to be withdrawn even if it’s been distributed to the membership, as long as that withdrawal is before the deadline. So the motion could be withdrawn a day or a minute before the deadline, and members who thought an item was going to be on the agenda would have no practical opportunity to submit their own motion. He therefore felt the effect of Mr. Yalow’s amendment would be to nullify the intent of the original motion, while not solving the problem of ‘vanishing business’.” Without objection, the Chair then appointed a committee consisting of Mr. Yalow, Mr. Eastlake and Ms. Secor, to study the original proposal and any pending amendment with instructions to report back to the main business meeting on Friday.

Committee Report: On Friday, the committee reported back and unanimously recommended that the proposed motion be substituted with the following wording:

Moved: to amend the Standing Rules by inserting the following sentence after the first sentence in Rule 2.1:

[Proposed agenda items may be withdrawn by the consent of all proposing members at any time up to two weeks before the published deadline for submitting new business. A list of such withdrawn business must be made available to the membership.](#)

Proposed by: Kate Secor, Ben Yalow, and Donald E. Eastlake III

Commentary: Currently, the deadline for submission is two weeks before the first Worldcon meeting. This motion would allow material to be withdrawn four weeks prior to the first meeting, but noted publicly that it has been withdrawn. Anything that is withdrawn would still have to be noted in the documentation, and there would be a two-week period in which someone else could resubmit the motion.

René Walling asked if business can be withdrawn after the four-week deadline and before the two-week deadline. It cannot.

Debate time was set at 6 minutes.

Friday Discussion: The Chair explicated that currently the deadline for submitting new business to the Business Committee is **two** weeks before the first meeting. However, it is common for advance copies of the agenda with material submitted earlier than the deadline to be circulated on line. This rule would allow anything proposed and circulated to be withdrawn up to **four** weeks before the first business meeting. During the two-week interval before the final deadline, business could no longer be withdrawn, but someone could resubmit the business, if so desired. Any withdrawn business would have to be made available as part of the documentation of the meeting so that people could see what was withdrawn.

René Walling asked for clarification: if new business were submitted within that two-week gap, could it be withdrawn, and the Chair said no.

Kate Secor, the mediator of the committee, said they set a separate deadline because members would think an item would come up because it was submitted and then be surprised when it doesn't. This amendment would strike a balance by allowing material to be withdrawn within a reasonable time (rather than waiting to kill it at the business meeting), with public notification so that there would be no surprises.

PRK believed that there was no time frame specified with how much notice the members must be given of withdrawn business. He felt it would be technically possible for someone to withdraw business but the members not to get any notification with sufficient time to resubmit it. He requested the Chair's assistance in amending this deficiency. Donald E. Eastlake III pointed out that currently there is no standard method to give any member notice of submitted business. The Chair declined to participate in the member's request.

Lisa Hayes called the question, which was seconded.

Joshua Kronengold made a parliamentary enquiry and asked if a motion to close debate outranked amendment of a motion. A motion to close debate has high priority and outranks almost everything. By a show of hands with two-thirds in the affirmative, debate was closed. Then, by another show of hands, **the motion to amend the Standing Rules as submitted by the committee was adopted**, to take effect at the end of Worldcon 75.

A.3 Short Title: Debate Time Streamlining

Moved: to replace Section 3.1 of the Standing Rules with the following:

[Rule 3.1: Main Motions: The Presiding Officer shall designate the default debate time for main motions. If an objection is raised to this](#)

default time, the Business Meeting shall vote on it without debate. If that designated time is defeated, the Business Meeting may, by majority vote, set the initial debate time limit for any motion to any positive even number of minutes up to 30.

Proposed by: The Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

Commentary: With increased Business Meeting attendance, we now seem to commonly have many, many numbers of minutes suggested as a debate limit. This is not just annoying but a waste of time, particularly where, as happens fairly often, the time designated by the Chair is selected anyway. (In the extraordinarily rare case where a debate time over 30 minutes is desired, it would be in order to move to suspend the rules to nominate a larger time.)

Debate time was set at 8 minutes.

Thursday's Discussion: Donald E. Eastlake III explained that in the past the Chair would recommend a debate time limit, and almost always someone objects. Then people propose different values and we end up with a slate of time limits to be voted on, from longest to shortest. The first one to get a majority is the selected one. Most times, the one chosen by vote would turn out to be the one the Chair set in the first place, resulting in a lot of wasted time. This motion is intended to forgo debate on the proposed time limits and adds a limit of 30 minutes. (It would take a two-thirds vote to suspend the rules to go above 30 minutes.)

Perianne Lurie asked to amend the motion by changing “may” to “shall” because what happens if they don’t? Then there is no debate limit. By unanimous consent, Dr. Lurie’s amended language was accepted.

Cliff Dunn then suggested another amendment to add the verbiage “then the business meeting shall proceed to vote on initial debate times of 30, 24, 18, 12, and 6 minutes, in that order, for adoption by majority vote. If all those times are defeated. . .” and then continue as is. However, there was no second, and the motion failed.

Without objection, the original motion with the word “shall” substituted was then adopted. Also without objection, it was agreed to have the amendment take effect immediately.

A.4 Short Title: Electronic Documents Are a Thing

Moved: to amend Standing Rule 2.2 by ~~striking out~~ and adding text for the purpose of requiring the Worldcon Committee to be responsible for providing

copies of all proposals submitted before the specified deadline to the attendees of the Business Meeting, as follows:

Rule 2.2: Requirements for Submission of New Business. ~~Two hundred (200) identical, legible copies of all~~ All proposals for non-privileged new business shall be submitted to the Presiding Officer before the deadline in Rule 2.1 ~~unless such proposals are distributed to the attendees at the Worldcon by the Worldcon Committee.~~ The Worldcon Committee shall be responsible for providing copies of all proposals to the WSFS membership. All proposals must be legibly and/or electronically signed by a maker and at least one seconder.

Proposed by: Cliff Dunn, Charlie Hamilton

Commentary: Recent practice has been for the Worldcon Committee to provide written copies of proposed business to Business Meeting attendees, but this is not in fact a requirement. This effectively transfers current practice into the Standing Rules. It also changes language that implies that all distribution is done by paper copy, something which is increasingly an out-of-date assumption, by explicitly allowing for electronic signatures.

Debate time was set at 10 minutes.

Thursday's Discussion: As maker of the motion, Cliff Dunn made the initial speech in favor. He felt that this motion was simply codifying the current practice. He was surprised to learn that the business meeting is not required to provide copies of all the business coming before the meeting. Additionally, there is no requirement to accept electronic signatures, in spite of the fact that almost everything is submitted electronically. He felt that if any reasonable proposal were not printed by the Worldcon committee, there would be concerns that it was trying to silence someone. It's been practice for some years now, and we should codify it.

Linda Deneroff spoke against the motion. The current secretary has been secretary of the business meeting for several years. She has been willing to collate all the material and upload it to the Worldcon's website. She has the capability to process and produce a unified agenda, but someday, somebody else is going to be the secretary, and that person may not have the time or the technical skills to be able to do this.

Bobson asked about the electronic signatures. There is more than one way to sign things electronically, and he felt things could get complicated quickly. The Chair explained that the proposal does not speak to the type of technology that would produce the document. That is left to the Worldcon committee to determine how they would implement it.

Perianne Lurie said the motion does not require secretaries of the business meeting to post things electronically; it merely enables them to do so.

Kent Bloom pointed out that every Worldcon member is a WSFS member, and that it would be a burden on a convention to produce an agenda to hand out to everyone at registration. Making copies available to everyone as opposed to putting it somewhere where it is accessible to everyone is an extreme burden on a Worldcon. It would mean that in addition to the souvenir book and pocket program, you would have to print the agenda. And since you don't get the agenda until two weeks in advance, it would be a very expensive proposition to hand out to everyone at registration.

Lenore Jones did not believe the proposal required paper copies. Ben Yalow noticed that this amendment would require distribution to every member, including members who do not have web access, email or other electronic means. He encouraged defeat of the motion because the current secretary is willing to do this voluntarily, instead of having it prescribed.

Before continuing, the Chair ruled that this motion, if passed would impose potential additional financial burdens on future Worldcon committees, and, therefore, in accordance with the constitutional requirements, the next two Worldcons would not be bound by this requirement, though they could do so voluntarily.

There were no further speeches in favor. Anne Marie Rudolph spoke against the motion. She felt that enshrining this in the Standing Rules was more than we needed. We are already distributing copies, both electronically and on paper. To enshrine this in writing would impose a financial burden and would not allow for technological changes as things rapidly evolve. Additionally, the Worldcon would never know how many copies they would need to print. She concluded that the current practice was sufficient; the business meeting has been providing proper documentation to all who need it in a timely fashion. She felt it didn't need to be written down and made a requirement.

Without objection, debate ended and brought to a vote. By a show of hands, **the motion was defeated.**

A.5 Short Title: Butt Out

Moved: to amend Standing Rule 1.5 by ~~striking out~~ and adding text for the purpose of banning smoking within future Business Meetings.

Rule 1.5: Smoking. ~~If smoking is allowed in the place where the Business Meeting is held, the Presiding Officer shall divide the room into smoking and non-smoking sections at the beginning of each meeting.~~
Regardless of whether smoking is allowed in the place where the Business Meeting is held, the Business Meeting shall be a non-smoking environment. The Presiding Officer shall notify participants of the nearest

[smoking area\(s\) outside of the location of the Business Meeting at the beginning of each meeting.](#)

Proposed by: Cliff Dunn, Charlie Hamilton

Commentary: While it is increasingly unlikely that we will encounter a facility in the future where smoking is still permitted indoors in a meeting space, it seems to make sense to ban smoking from the meetings entirely as a preemptive measure. Even with a nominal division in the room, the odds of two parts of a meeting space being separated in such a way so as to prevent smoke crossing from the smoking area to the non-smoking area seem unrealistically low. Finally, given present norms within meetings as well as the disability-related issues (such as aggravating asthma) which smoking within the meeting has the serious potential to present, if a smoking section were to have to be declared within a room, the authors of this proposal can already hear the vigorous (and well-reasoned) objections of the attendees of that future meeting from their present position in the timestream.

Debate time was set at 2 minutes.

Thursday's Discussion: Perianne Lurie asked if this motion would also a ban electronic cigarettes. The Chair remarked that the motion doesn't address this, and it would be left up to the Business Meeting and the administering Worldcon. He explicated that if something is not stated explicitly, it's left up to the Worldcon and its Business Meeting. Then, **without objection, the motion was adopted** and will take effect at the conclusion of Worldcon 75.

B. RESOLUTIONS

B.1 Short Title: *your name*. Eligibility

Moved: to grant *your name*. (*Kimi no Na wa*.) an additional year of Hugo Awards eligibility due to an extremely limited 2016 release, under Section 3.4.3.

Proposed by: Petrea Mitchell, Juan Sanmiguel, Judith Carol Bemis, Christopher Carson

Commentary: *your name*. was given a limited English-language release in Los Angeles in December 2016, eliminating its chance for an extra year of eligibility under Section 3.4.2. It was not given a wider U.S. release until April 2017, after the Hugo-voting deadline. It was not licensed for English-language streaming or DVD during 2016.

Debate time was set at 2 minutes.

Thursday's Discussion: There was no objection or discussion, and **the motion was passed by unanimous consent.**

B.2 Short Title: Artist Eligibility

Moved: to create a committee appointed by the Chair, to

(1) study the fitness for purpose of Sections 3.3.11 (Best Professional Artist) and 3.3.16 (Best Fan Artist) of the Constitution

(2) make recommendations, which may include proposing constitutional amendments, to the 2018 Business Meeting; and

(3) authorize the Chair of the Committee to appoint other persons to serve on the committee at the Chair's discretion.

Proposed by: Nicholas Whyte, Kathryn Duval, Michael Lee and Kate Secor

Commentary: At present, the two artist categories are defined as follows:

3.3.11: Best Professional Artist. An illustrator whose work has appeared in a professional publication in the field of science fiction or fantasy during the previous calendar year.

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.

Four artists who had enough votes to qualify for the final ballot were disqualified this year, two in each category, which suggests that there is a problem.

In one case, an artist whose medium is sculpture and who sells his work, therefore a professional artist in the normal English meaning of the word could not be found eligible for the Best Professional Artist category because his work had not appeared in a genre publication.

For the Best Fan Artist category, it is not clear whether and to what extent online publication of art qualifies for the award.

For both categories, we need to better define which media are included in the award.

B.2.1 Short Title: Hugo Awards Study Committee (*amendment by substitution*)

Moved: to substitute for B.2 the following:

To create a Hugo Awards Study Committee, appointed by the Chair, to

- (1) Study revisions to Article 3 (Hugo Awards) of the WSFS Constitution, including any such proposals for amending Article 3 as may be referred to it by the Business Meeting or suggested by others;
- (2) Make recommendations, which may include proposing constitutional amendments, to the 2018 Business Meeting; and
- (3) Authorize the Chair of the Committee to appoint other persons to serve on the committee at the Chair's discretion.

Proposed by: Vincent Docherty, Nicholas Whyte

Commentary: Besides the Artist Hugo categories mentioned in Resolution B.2, there are proposals on this year's agenda to make substantial revisions to other Hugo Award categories. In addition, there are numerous other proposals that have been proposed informally to make various changes to the Awards. This resolution would replace the narrowly charged Artist Hugo Committee with a more broadly charged Hugo Awards Study Committee with a remit to study the entire structure of the Hugo Awards and, if they see fit, propose changes to next year's WSFS Business Meeting.

The proponents of this motion anticipate that other proposals to revise the Hugo Award categories will be submitted to the committee, and the committee will consider them as well.

Constitutional amendments currently on the agenda for this year's meeting cannot be referred to this proposed committee by the Preliminary Business Meeting, but can be referred to it by the Main Business Meeting.

Debate time was set at 10 minutes.

Thursday's Discussion: The Chair explained that we first had to decide whether to deal with the original motion or the substitute. Once that decision was made, we could discuss it substantively. Mr. Standlee first read the amendment by substitution.

Andrew Adams asked for confirmation that we would debate and appoint the committee at the preliminary meeting. He also asked if the creation of the proposed committee would affect other proposals on the agenda regarding revisions to the Hugo Awards. The Chair explained that Preliminary Business Meeting cannot send material on to next year's Worldcon, either directly or by way of committee. It can, however, refer items in the agenda to a committee to report back at the main business meeting. The main meeting could then, potentially, refer any proposals back to the committee and have them report back at next year's meeting. The job of this committee, if created, could propose constitutional amendments. But the current Business Meeting could also charge a committee and change the charge as necessary.

Vince Docherty spoke in favor of the substituted amendment. Its main purpose was to broaden the charge of the committee to potentially look at all the Hugo categories and either report back at the main meeting this year or bring the issue back next year. We've spent a number of years responding to external attack; he felt the time was right to do a comprehensive review of the current categories in terms of fitness for purpose of the categories, balancing them and studying how well they're being used.

Todd Dashoff asked if it was in order for the committee, if formed, to form subcommittees. The Chair explained that under the Standing Rules, a committee is allowed to organize itself as it sees fit, including creating subcommittees, as long as it's not prohibited by any additional rule.

Nicholas Whyte said all four makers of the original motion were in favor of the substituted amendment. He urged everyone to vote for the amendment and then to vote for the resolution as amended. There was no objection to adopting the substituted amendment as the amendment to be voted upon.

Debate time was reset to 8 minutes for continued discussion.

Kent Bloom moved to postpone consideration of this motion to Friday's main meeting since the preliminary meeting could not charge the committee to report back next year. The Chair pointed out that the committee could be created at the preliminary business meeting. If we did so, we could then suspend the rules and refer other items to it, with instructions to report back on Friday. Therefore he asked Mr. Bloom to withdraw the motion, and it was.

Ron Oakes objected to the resolution and proposed narrowing the scope of the amendment by striking "Article 3" from the text in the first clause and substituting "Section 3.3" in its place. His intent was restrict the committee to looking only at the Hugo categories and not allow them to tinker further with the voting and nominating processes. (Section 3.3 is the actual list of categories.) The motion was seconded.

Mr. Oakes then spoke in favor of his amendment: he felt allowing this new committee to deal with the entirety of Article 3 would technically permit them to make adjustments beyond the scope of the makers' intent. Restricting the committee to Section 3.3 puts a safety net on them.

Kate Secor appreciated the intent of the amendment, but she argued that there is a lot of technical language around defining the term "professional" or defining when items can be moved in Section 3.2. The original charge was to look at professional artist versus fan artist, and if the committee were restricted to only Section 3.3, it wouldn't be able to address deficiencies that exist in the other section.

Paul Treadaway spoke against narrowing the scope. He felt that since the committee is not empowered to do anything except make recommendations, there was no reason to narrow the scope.

Donald E. Eastlake III asked to suspend the rules to permit a second-order amendment to change “Section 3.3” to “Sections 3.2 and 3.3.” By a show of hands the rules were suspended to allow a vote on the substitution, and by another show of hands, the second order amendment passed. The amendment now read “to strike out Article 3 and insert Sections 3.2 and 3.3” (in two places in the first clause). By a third show of hands, the amendment to replace “Article 3” with “Sections 3.2 and 3.3” passed, and the resolution was amended.

Debate now started on the main motion, as amended. Joshua Kronengold moved to call the question, which would close debate and bring it to a vote. There was no objection to doing so. Then, by a show of hands, **the resolution passed and the committee created.** The Business Meeting chair appointed Vincent Docherty as chair of the new committee, with Nicholas Whyte, Chris Barkley, Kevin Standlee, Kate Secor, Michael Lee, Kathryn Duval and John Hertz as additional members. Other members might be added later, at Mr. Docherty’s discretion.

The Chair then asked unanimous consent to suspend the rules to add Items D6 (division of Best Novel category), D7 (reorganization of Best Related category) and D8 (reorganization of Dramatic Presentation category) to the mandate for this committee and to report back on these items at Friday’s main session. There was no dissent.

Perianne Lurie made a motion that the committee “be instructed to consult with outside organizations whose members would be impacted by these changes, such as ASFA and SFWA.” After the motion was seconded, Dr. Lurie argued that if a committee were going to be tinkering with categories that define things like “professional artist,” it would be good to consult with people that are impacted by this and that have greater insight about these things than this body does.

David Wallace asked if this motion would require the committee to consult with the outside groups before they reported back at the Friday session or just before bringing final proposals before whatever business meeting that happens to be. The Chair responded that the committee would not be required to do interviews before Friday’s session. He also explicated that the phrase “such as ASFA and SFWA” was a nonrestricted list and that other organizations could be interviewed as well. Terry Neill said that WSFS is a fan organization, and we need to do our rules ourselves. Many Worldcon members are also members of WSFS and ASFA and publishers, and she would welcome fans that are members of WSFS who are also professionals in their field to be consulted, she did not think we should go outside WSFS to do consulting in that way.

Alex Acks favored Dr. Lurie's proposal. When we are talking about what is professional and what is fan, it is best to consider what professionals would consider professional. A request to consult with organizations and get advisement from them as to what constitutes a professional artist or professional writer is not the same as allowing them to define it for us, but more information is better than less information.

Ben Yalow spoke against Dr. Lurie's proposal. He trusts Vince Docherty and felt we did not need to direct him to consult with anyone in specific; if Mr. Docherty wishes to speak to members of ASFA or SFWA or Rabid Puppies, he knows who they are, and we do not need to place restrictions on him.

Joni Brill Dashoff, the Vice President of ASFA and chair of the Chesley Awards Committee, said she would be on site for consultation. Carl Fink felt this to be a burdensome requirement on the committee. With 20 categories, each of which impacts multiple organizations, the committee would be required to do approximately 100 consultations.

Mr. Acks felt that it was a bit silly to say that personal knowledge of someone is not a reason to say that they need not consult other groups that might be affected by this amendment.

There was no objection to ending debate. Upon a show of hands **the motion to instruct the committee to consult with other groups failed.**

Those who wished to be a member of this committee, were invited to contact Vince Docherty at Vincent.Docherty@gmail.com.

B.3 Short Title: Convention Publications to Be Delivered to Members

Resolved, it is the sense of the Business Meeting that:.

- J Each Worldcon should deliver to all convention members the Progress Reports and the Souvenir Program Book in electronic format, either by mass delivery, or by individually accessed downloads.
- J Each Worldcon should offer all Members the option to have delivered to them the Progress Reports in printed form.
- J Attending Members may choose to accept the Souvenir Program Book in printed form as provided at the convention, or to receive only the electronic format.
- J Each Worldcon should offer Supporting Members the option to have delivered to them the Souvenir Program Book in printed form.

-) The Worldcon may specify in advance a nominal fee to offset the printing and delivery costs for each of these publications for Supporting Members.
-) If a fee is to be charged for the printed version of either the Progress Reports and/or the Souvenir Program Books, this should be specified up front in the convention's bid submission.
-) The option to sign up for the printed version of either or both publications should be included on the Site Selection ballots, and through the convention's electronic Registration process.
-) Supporting Members who have not previously opted to select the print options may do so up to six weeks in advance of the Worldcon.
-) Attending Members who are unable to attend the convention will have their Souvenir Program Books delivered to them at no additional cost.
-) Printed Souvenir Program Books should be delivered to the members who opted for them within 3 months of the close of the convention.

Proposed by: Jo Van Ekeren, Chris Barkley, Seth Breidbart, Greg Machlin, Farah Mendlesohn, Rick Moen, and Steven Silver.

Commentary: The above is a proposed Resolution of Continuing Effect regarding the distribution of Worldcon Progress Reports and Souvenir Program Books.

Resolutions are non-binding, but they are retained in a permanent document and provide advice to future Worldcons of the members' preferences for how things should be handled.

The intent of this resolution is not to hamstring Worldcon committees, or cause them financial hardship, or require unnecessary usage of natural resources for printing, but to ensure that the Worldcon membership has access to the convention publications in their preferred format.

We specifically considered print-on-demand when writing this up, and do not believe that its verbiage excludes POD as an acceptable option for providing either the PRs or the Souvenir Book.

In an ideal world, Supporting Members would continue to receive printed copies of the PRs and the Souvenir Program Book at no additional cost, because it *is* an accessibility consideration.

However, given the rising cost of printing and especially postage charges, we think it is not realistic to expect that practice to continue without raising the current ceiling on the Supporting Membership fee and allowing Worldcons to recoup those costs. Depending

on a member's geographical location and that of the convention, printing and postage charges for one Souvenir Book could well eat up the entire amount of the Supporting Membership fee (or even exceed it).

This resolution is intended to provide guidance to future Worldcons for ensuring that both of these two publications is available to all members in their choice of printed or digital format, and that the availability and arrangements for these are communicated up front to members during the bid process, as well as on the convention's website and social media announcements.

**B.3.1 Short Title: Provision of Convention Publications to Members
(*amendment by substitution*)**

Moved, to amend item B.3 by substituting the following:

Resolved, that it is the sense of the Business Meeting that:

-) Since the rights of Attending Members are explicitly defined (per Constitution Clause 1.5.3) in relation to those of Supporting Members, Supporting members can have no lesser rights to generally distributed publications than Attending members.
-) The right of Supporting Members to receive all generally distributed publications (Constitution Clause 1.5.2) must therefore be interpreted as including the same format options (e.g., physical or electronic copy) as are offered to Attending members.
-) "Generally distributed publications" should as a minimum be considered to include Progress Reports and the Souvenir Program Book.
-) All Members should be able to explicitly specify their preference for receiving printed or electronic pre-con publications (e.g., Progress Reports), in the event that these publications are offered in both formats
-) Supporting Members should be able to explicitly specify their preference for receiving a printed Souvenir Program Book
-) Worldcons may charge additional fees to Members who choose to receive printed publications, to recover the associated costs. Any such fees should be clearly set out as part of the convention's bid filing.

Proposed by: Colin Harris and Ben Yalow

Commentary: We propose this Amendment as we feel the existing Resolution is overly prescriptive and detailed. In general we use the Rules to instruct on what should

be done, leaving the implementation mechanics to individual Worldcons. There is a risk that the current Resolution will place unhelpful or intended limits on the choices of future Committees. This alternative establishes the same key principles in a form in keeping with our normal practice. It also addresses some specific gaps in the existing Resolution.

Debate time was set at 20 minutes.

Thursday's Discussion: The Chair First pointed out that this a resolution, not a constitutional amendment, and it is not binding, but, if adopted, it would go into the Resolutions of Continuing Effect, expressing the sense of the business meeting. Since an amendment by substitution was also up for discussion at this time, the first consideration was which resolution to choose.

Colin Harris said the main motion arose because of some concerns regarding this year's Worldcon's plans for distributing of souvenir books. He felt it was important not to have a knee jerk response to a narrow problem, but to look more broadly at what has been going on with Worldcon in the relevant area. He felt that the substituted resolution addresses some other gaps in our current guidance and fits more properly within the Constitution. We do not tell committees precisely how to conduct themselves; we tell them what they need to do, and we allow them choice of implementation. He felt the main motion had the potential to constrain committees in unintended ways. The substituted motion also addresses another valid concern by permitting additional fees for printed materials. Mr. Harris added that we got ourselves into a small mess when we changed the opt-out option for paper forms to opt-in. The form implied "do you want paper or electronic publications?" with the assumption that it applied only to progress reports, and everyone would receive a paper souvenir book. We still collect the data point, but this year that choice was extended to the souvenir book by default. He felt that this default was incorrect we should be asking, "Do you want an electronic, paper or no progress report? Do you want an electronic, paper or no souvenir book?" in order to be both financially and environmentally efficient.

Rick Moen spoke against the substitution. He felt that it didn't give people timely advance notice about how to exercise their preference, which is essentially the difference between the two motions. This does not really even advise convention committees that they need to give people timely notice of their choices; it just simply says, that it should offer a choice.

Ben Yalow felt people are given timely notice. If a convention committee is going to charge for printed materials, they must include that notice in their bid filing. However, he specifically wanted to address the question of different rights for attending and supporting members. The rights of attending members are defined with respect to supporting members for publications in the Constitution so that you cannot go running around giving supporting members fewer rights to publications than attending

members. Attending members are given explicitly the rights of supporting members plus, not minus.

Joni Brill Dashoff said she had read both proposed resolutions without seeing any method of collecting the information from supporting members who do not choose to upgrade their membership. The only way to collect that information is to have it as an item on the Site Selection ballot. The Chair ruled that that question would be better raised once the decision was made regarding which motion would go forward.

Joshua Kronengold felt the substituted amendment was incomplete without the mention of separate choices for the different kinds of publications.

Andrew Adams supported the concept but felt the main motion was over prescriptive to give specific time limits, particularly with the souvenir book because this is a fast-changing area. He wanted to leave it to the committees only as a guideline in the amended motion.

With no further discussion, the question of adopting the substitute amendment was called. By a show of hands, **the substituted amendment was chosen as the motion.**

Debate time was reset to 12 minutes for continued discussion.

Winton Matthews made a motion to further amend the motion by taking the following bullet point from the original amendment and adding it to the chosen amendment:

-) The option to sign up for the printed version of either or both publications should be included on the Site Selection ballots, and through the convention's electronic Registration process.

The motion was seconded. Mr. Matthews said the current amendment talks only about the bid filing, and he felt that most fans don't even know or get a copy of that. But they would see the printing options on a Site Selection ballot.

Colin Harris spoke against the amendment by pointing out a practical issue. We inherit the supporters from the voting process, and we don't get a publication preference, so we have to ask them. Why don't we just collect that information? Are we going to have differential voting fees according to what someone is asking for? Basically we would be passing preferences on, but not collecting what might be an associated fee. He felt there were only two realistic options. We can do what we do now: (a) let voters have their preference and not recover the funds but recovering the extra charge from new members, or (b) potentially default everyone to electronic and if they want paper, they can change their preference via the registration process and pay the extra charge for paper.

Joni Brill Dashoff spoke in favor of the amendment. Having twice been a Site Selection administrator, she pointed out that there are supporting members who do not have

email, leaving a catch-22: they can't tell the chosen convention that they need printed material because they can't reach you electronically to tell you they can't handle electronic if the question is not on the Site Selection ballot. The winning convention can always go back and tell everyone who has opted for printed materials that in order to receive them they will need to pay an additional fee or connect to print on demand or some other option.

René Walling said such members can contact the convention via mail. He made a motion to suspend the rules to allow a second order amendment to strike the word "electronic" from the motion since many people still register on paper at conventions. By a show of hands, the motion to suspend the rules passed. There was no debate on the amendment. Then, upon another show of hands, the word "electronic" was struck from the verbiage, so the additional language to the amendment read:

-) The option to sign up for the printed version of either or both publications should be included on the Site Selection ballots, and through the convention's Registration process.

By a serpentine vote, the motion to add the above verbiage to the amendment was 29 in favor and 35 against, so the amendment failed.

Mr. Bobson asked if the amendment could be changed from an additional fee for printed publications to a refund for those who choose electronic publications. A motion to refer it to committee failed. Don Eastlake suggested the wording, "Worldcons may provide a refund to members who choose to receive publications electronically," which was seconded. Paul Treadaway suggested alternative wording: "Worldcons may offer a discount to members who choose not to receive printed publications." The final clause of the resolution would thus read:

-) Worldcons may offer discounts to members who choose to not receive printed publications. Any such discounts should be clearly set out as part of the convention's bid filing.

Terry Neill asked if there was already something in the Constitution regarding charging extra for printed materials. Kate Secor asked for a parliamentary ruling as to whether this amendment conflicted with section 1.5.8 of the Constitution: "No convention committee shall sell a membership that includes any WSFS voting rights for less than cost of the supporting membership required by Article 4 in the selection of the convention." The chair took this as a Point of Order and ruled it to be well taken. Thus, the Chair ruled that Mr. Treadway's amendment was out of order.

Bruce Albrecht asked if the program guide (pocket program) is considered part of the printed publications as contemplated by the Constitution. The Chair ruled that the convention's program guide is part of the publications as contemplated by the resolution.

Colin Harris appealed the Chair's ruling on the basis of practical impact and custom and practice. Historically, conventions have not generally included the pocket program as an item to be sent to supporting members (and attending members who did not actually attend), though some Worldcons with excessive print runs and/or lots of money left over have done so. If the Chair's ruling were sustained, future Worldcons would have to expend additional monies to send out the program guides.

By a show of hands, the Chair's ruling was overturned, and the program guide is not necessarily to be considered part of a convention's publications as contemplated by this resolution.

Then by another show of hands, **item B.3.1 (amended by substitution) as originally proposed, passed.**

C. BUSINESS PASSED ON

The following items were passed at MidAmeriCon II in 2016 and must be ratified by Worldcon 75 in 2017 in order to become part of the Worldcon Constitution.

C.1 Short Title: Best Series

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

1. *Insert words in existing Section 3.2.4 as follows:*

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

2. *Modify existing Section 3.2.5 as follows:*

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

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

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

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

4. Insert the following before existing Section 3.8.3:

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

Provided that unless this amendment is re-ratified by the 2021 Business Meeting, this provision shall be repealed, and

Provided that the question of re-ratification shall automatically be placed on the agenda of the 2021 Business Meeting, along with any other constitutional amendments awaiting ratification.

Proposed by: Series Hugo Committee

See the [2016 WSFS Business Meeting Minutes](#) for the makers' report regarding this amendment on pages 134-145 and the debate and revision that produced the final version on pages 85-88.

Debate time was set at 10 minutes.

C.1.1 Short Title: Best Series Clarifications (*amendment to ratification*)

Moved: to amend the Best Series proposal as follows:

In section 3.3.X:

1. replace the word “multi-volume” with “multi-installment”
2. replace “three (3) volumes” with “three (3) installments”
3. replace the words “one volume” with “one (1) installment”.

In Section 3.3.Y:

1. replace the words “additional volumes” with “additional installments”

The revised 3.3.X and 3.3.Y will then read as follows:

3.3.X Best Series. A ~~multi-volume~~multi-installment science fiction or fantasy story, unified by elements such as plot, characters, setting, and presentation, appearing in at least ~~three (3) volumes~~three (3) installments consisting in total of at least 240,000 words by the close of the previous calendar year, at least ~~one volume~~one (1) installment of which was

published in the previous calendar year, and which has not previously won under 3.3.X.

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

Proposed by: Kate Secor and Seanan McGuire

Commentary: Many people appear to have found the use of the word “volume” in this context confusing. This change is intended to clarify that the series need not have additional book-length/standalone works in order to qualify, only enough new words. This allows authors who commonly publish at different lengths in the same universe to more easily and obviously be eligible for this award when they meet word length targets even if they never publish a full book-length work in the series or have not published a standalone/novel-length work in the qualifying year.

We believe that this proposal does not increase (or decrease) the scope of the amendment, since it is in accordance with both the original makers’ statements and the committee report from last year, which states:

In this proposal, “volume” is taken to mean any story published separately from the others in a series. Hence, a trilogy of novels, an extremely long novel and two shorter pieces, a pair of long novels and a novella, or a larger number of shorter pieces might make up the requisite three volumes (and total word count) – or even a set of stories greatly exceeding the length and number requirements (a condition which we can foresee as being quite frequent in the earlier years of such an award).

Debate time was set at 4 minutes. (There was no discussion on Thursday).

Friday’s Discussion: If ratified, this motion would take effect at Worldcon 76. Kent Bloom moved to defer discussion of this motion until Saturday, since the Hugo stats would be released on Friday night. The motion was seconded; and by a show of hands, this motion was postponed to Saturday’s meeting.

Saturday’s Discussion: The Chair ruled that the amended proposal to replace the word “volume” where it appears with the word “installment” was neutral in scope. Therefore, if the amendment were ratified, it would not need be ratified again next year. Kate Secor spoke first and said people were confused by the term “volume”. Is a volume a standalone work? Is it a novel, a novella? She’d been asking people what word meant the same thing as “volume” but would not imply that it must be a standalone work published with its own set of covers. She believed this to be a clean-up change.

“Installment” did not change the intent of the amendment but clarified that if two novellas and a novel in a series are published and meet the word length, then it would be re-eligible for Best Series. **Without objection, Item C.1.1 was adopted.**

Farah Mendlesohn spoke in favor of ratifying the underlying amendment. Series fiction has its own arc and challenges. Even when an item within a series is awarded, it’s not the same thing. Series fiction writers when debating series fiction can write 3,000 word emails and say part 2 is in the next email. Hugo categories are about representing the scope of our field, and series fiction over the years has become a significant element of that. Current categories in written fiction are determined by length and are believed to be a complete thing. When a book from a series wins, it’s representative, but you can’t hand to someone and say “this is a great book”; she cited book 4 of George Martin’s *Song of Ice and Fire* series as an example. As a consequence, a highly successful series can be at a serious disadvantage, both in nomination and voting. Even when a novel is complete, the full story can build across a series to end in a very different place. To sustain a series is a significant achievement. The nomination list is every bit as important as the winner; it showcases what people are reading. Additionally, this amendment provides clear rules for bringing in new series, new writers, and stopping repetition; and nominators and/or the Hugo committee will not have to figure out if an item fits into the category. The 2017 Hugo analysis showed voters cast one more vote for the special Best Series category than for Best Novel. This motion also provides a sunset clause in 2021, so we will have four years’ worth of data on which to judge whether the category was working, whether interest in the category was waning or if the quality of nominations was dropping. We should be representing the field as it exists now, and that includes series.

Andrew Adams asked if the winner of this year’s Best Series award (being a special Hugo category) would be eligible again next year. Dr. Mendlesohn assumed not; she believed that the word count would begin again. The Chair then declined to rule on the question, leaving it in the hands of next year’s Hugo administrator. The ruling was appealed and seconded.

Ben Yalow spoke against the Chair’s ruling because he felt it was grounded specifically in the exclusion clause, which says specifically “has not previously won under 3.3.X.” In this case, the work that won was a special award and not under 3.3.X, he felt it would still be eligible and not be covered by the exclusion in the proposed 3.3.X.

Lisa Hayes felt the Chair’s ruling should stand because it leaves the option open to the Hugo administrator. It’s the job of the administrators to interpret the rules.

A motion to end debate and bring the appeal to a vote was moved and seconded. Upon a show of hands, **the Chair’s ruling that the decision whether to consider this**

constitutional amendment as a continuation of the Best Series special category presented this year is up to future Hugo Award administrators was sustained.

Dr. Adams offered an amendment to the exclusion clause to state that the winner of the Best Series special Hugo category given at this year's Worldcon be excluded from eligibility next year. The Chair ruled the motion out of order since it is mechanically impossible because it would increase the scope of the amendment and require an additional year of ratification, making the amendment meaningless.

Perianne Lurie also spoke against ratification of this amendment. She likes series fiction and is sympathetic to Dr. Mendlesohn's argument, she felt there was just not time to become familiar with series with six series in addition to six novels, six novellas, six novellettes, six short stories, etc., in the time because nominating and voting. She also asked what we are supposed to be judging: the material published in the previous year (as one does for other categories), or the series as a whole, and whether items from the previous year carry more weight than the beginning part of the series.

Paul Treadaway asked whether the wording of the amendment excluded graphic series from eligibility. The Chair's opinion was that the only criterion is word count, and that a graphic series would be eligible if it reached that threshold.

Nicholas Whyte, the 2017 Hugo administrator, agreed with Dr. Lurie, and added that the joy of the Hugo Awards is celebrating the literature of the previous year, and that we're changing the meaning if we reward instead work that goes back decades. He counselled thinking carefully what this means for future Hugo Awards.

A motion to end debate was made and seconded but failed to achieve two-thirds in favor to end it.

Anne Marie Rudolph also spoke against the amendment and felt that there is not sufficient time to evaluate nominees properly. She also felt that there would not be enough sufficiently Hugo-worthy series after a few years. There are a lot of series, but she felt "Hugo-worthy" was a different level of qualification.

Mr. Yalow felt there are many Hugo-worthy series, but at some point a Hugo administrator is going to have to decide what is or is not eligible. He used the *1632* series as an example. What is part of that series? What is considered the subseries? Is everything part of the series? What, if anything, is excluded? He felt this award would be difficult, if not impossible, to administer.

Dave McCarty pointed out that in all other fiction categories we work very hard to make sure we are judging complete works. We cannot do that in this category. Items are in various stages of completion, making it an unfair contest.

Debate time ended, and a serpentine vote taken. **By a vote of 51 in favor of the motion to 39 against it, the Best Series amendment was ratified and will take effect at the conclusion of Worldcon 75 (thus being first awarded in 2018), but must be re-ratified at the 2021 Worldcon.**

C.2 Short Title: December Is Good Enough

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution by ~~striking out~~ and inserting text as follows:

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

Proposed by: Colette Fozard, Warren Buff, Nicholas Whyte

See the [2016 WSFS Business Meeting Minutes](#) for the makers' commentary on page 18.

Debate time was set at 8 minutes. (There was no discussion on Thursday.)

Friday's Discussion: This was a motion to change the deadline by which time one has to be a member of an eligible Worldcon in order to nominate for the Hugo Awards. Currently the deadline is January 31 of the current year. This amendment would move the deadline back to December 31 of the previous year (moving it back by one month). Nicholas Whyte, one of the makers, said he was motivated to make this amendment because the single most tedious element of administering the Hugo Awards is the merging of the membership lists of the qualifying conventions in order to create the list of eligible voters. He also pointed out that the January 31 deadline is the only date in the Constitution (in Section 3.7.1). (He also felt that passing this amendment would facilitate three-stage-voting, if that amendment passed.) But the current amendment, he noted, is about improving administration and giving Worldcons an incentive to get their marketing up and running.

Corina Stark felt that finances are much tighter in December, and there will be fewer nominators if this passed.

Ron Oakes felt that this amendment's approach will make it simpler to merge the three different membership databases as currently required. Without this amendment, even if the number of eligible years is shortened, membership data would still need to be merged twice. Passing this amendment would make the date for cutoff of items

published and the date for cutting off the nominators the same, save a lot of work and get the Hugo Award nominations up and running a lot faster.

There was no objection to ending the debate and bringing it to a vote. By a show of hands, the motion was ratified, and will take effect at the conclusion of Worldcon 75, first affecting the 2018 Hugo Awards.

C.3 Short Title: Two Years Are Enough

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution by ~~striking out~~ and inserting text as follows:

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

Provided that members of the 2019 Worldcon will retain their nominating rights in the 2018 Hugo Awards.

Proposed by: Warren Buff, Colin Harris

See the [2016 WSFS Business Meeting Minutes](#) for the makers' commentary on pages 19-20

Debate time was set at 8 minutes.

Friday Discussion: This amendment would remove the rights of upcoming conventions to nominate, except that the 2019 Worldcon would be grandfathered in and retain their right to participate in the 2018 Hugo nominations. Colin Harris said that, as with the prior amendment, this amendment would simplify the nomination process. Typically, the combined pool of last year and current year is several thousand voters. How many extra voters would there be by adding the following year's members? He didn't think there would be many since most of those people were already members of the current year's convention, having voted in Site Selection. Only members of the future Worldcon who were not members of one of the prior two would be disenfranchised, and he suggested that that was a very small number of people. The advantage of this motion is that only two databases need be merged, not three. He also noted that at the time nomination eligibility was extended to the future year's Worldcon, the number of Hugo voters was diminishing, but for several years now, interest in voting for the Hugo Awards has been increasing.

Andrew Adams was sympathetic to the plea to make Hugo administration simpler, but when a Worldcon is in a new city, we get new members and some of them join fairly soon after that Worldcon is seated. We want to bring them into our community, and the Hugo Awards is one of our most high-profile elements. We should encourage them to participate in the Hugo process as soon as possible, and not delay them by a year. We want them to think about upcoming Worldcons, not just the one they've joined, but subsequent ones as well.

Dave Wallace responded that anyone newly drawn into the Worldcon family has the option to buy a supporting membership in the current year's convention in order to nominate and vote. Then they would be able to not only nominate but to vote on the Hugo Awards.

René Walling spoke against the motion. While the number of 50 to 100 members has been mentioned, Mr. Walling has studied the statistics. A lot of people will join a Worldcon two years previous in order to vote Site Selection and bring a future Worldcon to their city. But they sometimes join too late to nominate (or even vote) the Hugo Awards for that year. But if we can bring them in earlier by bringing them in as supporting members and giving them voting rights they'll have more involvement in the process for a longer period of time. Buying a supporting membership in the current year is not a reason to withdraw the third Worldcon eligibility.

Rick Kovalcik spoke in favor of the motion. People who have joined the year before in order to vote Site Selection are already eligible to nominate for the Hugo Awards. We need to do the best job we can. We need to stop doing everything possible and doing a bad job of it. Better to do a few things well and have only two years' worth of people voting than have three years and drive ourselves crazy.

Mr. Whyte pointed out that the numbers involved with taking on the following year's membership are not that great. The real difficulty is merging the previous year's membership and the current year's membership. The following year's membership is only a few hundred extra people. But the question is, is that little bit of extra work worth it in terms of the extra visibility and participation that we give to members. However, this is also a marketing opportunity for the following year's Worldcon to start bringing in people. If you join early you get extra benefits (nomination rights in the current year, and both nomination and voting rights the following year). It looks bad for this meeting to be restricting the franchise.

Steve Cooper spoke in favor of the motion. He said there were 117 new names added to the voting when Loncon 3 the two-year hence convention. He didn't think the numbers made it worthwhile.

PRK was sympathetic to the complexities of merging the membership lists, but having just ratified C.2, December Is Good Enough, and providing an additional 31 days, that

we have the ability to do the merging and enfranchise as many of our members as possible to nominate in the Hugo Awards.

Ben Yalow preferred the idea there is a marketing incentive to say that people who want to vote should join the convention. This motion provides an incentive to join, because you get greater rights. Therefore the marketing works in the other direction.

Winton Mathews asked if the wording in this motion needed to be modified because the previous motion passed; in other words, would the date revert to January 31? The Chair pointed out that including the context of the current motion's proposed changes does not affect the previously ratified amendment. It is not reverting previous changes.

A majority vote was needed to pass this amendment. Since the vote by a show of hands was inconclusive, a serpentine vote was taken. **By a vote of 45 to 41 the motion was ratified and will take effect at the conclusion of Worldcon 75, except that Worldcon 2019's members are grandfathered in to be included in the 2018 Hugo Award nominations.**

C.4 Short Title: Three Stage Voting (“3SV”) or “The Only Winning Move Is Not to Play”

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

Section 3.7: Nominations.

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

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

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

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

~~3.7.5: 3.8.3:~~ 3.7.5: Any nominations for “No Award” shall be disregarded.

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

~~3.7.7: 3.8.6:~~ The Committee shall move a nomination from another category to the work's default category only if the member has made fewer than five (5) nominations in the default category.

~~3.7.8: 3.8.7:~~ If a work receives a nomination in its default category, and if the Committee relocates the work under its authority under subsection 3.2.7 or 3.2.8, the Committee shall count the nomination even if the member already has made five (5) nominations in the more-appropriate category

Section 3.8: ~~Tallying of Nominations.~~ Qualification Stage.

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.8.4: A Qualifier shall be temporarily designated as rejected if it meets the following two criteria:

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

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

3.8.5: The final Award ballots shall list in each category the Qualifiers on the long list from the first Qualifier through the last accepted Qualifier and any Qualifiers tied with it. “The last accepted Qualifier” is the fifth Qualifier on the long list not designated as rejected, providing it exists, otherwise the last such Qualifier providing it exists and is below fifth place, otherwise the fifth Qualifier on the list. No Qualifier on the ballots shall have its rejected status marked.

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

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

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

See the [2016 WSFS Business Meeting Minutes](#) for the makers’ commentary on pages 25-27.

Debate time was set at 20 minutes. (There was no discussion on Thursday.)

Saturday’s Discussion: Kevin Standlee recused himself as chair, and Donald E. Eastlake III, the Deputy Presiding Officer, assumed the Chair. Colin Harris spoke first as maker of the motion. In the interest in getting the most value out of the debate, he focused on why we should ratify this motion. He felt 3SV was a targeted strategy for excluding inappropriate candidates from the ballot, effectively bringing “No Award” forward, ahead of the final voting stage. He felt this was a better than an algorithmic approach, such as EPH, which could be vulnerable to gaming. Three Stage Voting places the responsibility for saying what is inappropriate on the voters as a group. But if you believe there will be another targeted attack on the award, he asked that this motion be ratified. If you don’t feel it is needed, let it lapse. His last point was we should ask ourselves what is our success criteria? What is a good ballot? He felt EPH’s approach, that it will always guarantee a couple of good nominees, no matter what the slate tactics are, isn’t appealing as a definition of success. He believed the slates changed their approach this year because of EPH to more bullet voting, putting up one candidate per category, which, for example, put Vox Day above Patrick Nielsen Hayden in the Editor, Long Form, category.

PRK made a point of enquiry: would an amendment to allow 3SV to be at the discretion of the Hugo administrator be considered greater, equal or lesser in scope? The Chair ruled that such a motion would be of lesser scope.

Perianne Lurie felt we did not need 3SV. Yes, while Patrick Nielsen Hayden might have been displaced by a bulleted slate vote, under the original rules, Mr. Nielsen Hayden would not have made the ballot anyway since there would have been only five nominees instead of six. If a slate is one-sixth of the nominators, they should get one-sixth of the things on the ballot, and she did not see this a problem that needed solving. She felt we should live with the changes we've already made for a few years before making any further changes.

Kevin Standee spoke in favor of 3SV. He felt this amendment was more in keeping with our member-driven decision process we have used throughout the history of the Hugo Awards. It is not an administrator holding a club and arbitrarily disqualifying works; nor is it mathematics that might be difficult to follow. He said 3SV is relatively easy to follow, which is one of its benefits. It has safeguards built in to prevent small groups from overwhelming the process. There is a quorum requirement, so enough people need to participate. And there is a supermajority requirement, whereby 60% of those voting must say no in order to kill a work. He noted that we have already moved the membership eligibility deadline back a month, adding an extra month to the process. This motion will take some of the things the administrator has had to do quickly and in secret out into the open and speed it up. The administrator can contact the top 15 potential Hugo Award finalists, get their acceptances and determine their eligibility earlier in the process. It crowdsources the eligibility and contact information.

Kate Secor spoke against the motion. We want to keep politics out of the Hugo Awards, but she felt 3SV explicitly introduces a political effect into them. It asks voters to reject works not on the basis of artistic merit, but at least partially because we don't like the people who nominated those works. Also, it gives people who want to game the Hugo Awards a threshold they have to reach in order to wreak havoc with them.

Dave Wallace, as a cosponsor of EPH and EPH+, welcomed this amendment as complementary to the other anti-slating methods and restore the honor of being a finalist. This is one more tool in the toolkit.

Linda Deneroff asked if 3SV is intended to be an adjunct to EPH or in place of EPH? The Chair responded that as currently proposed, it would be an adjunct, unless further action was taken by the Business Meeting.

Nicolas Whyte made three points: he had a research team to whom he gave a long list, including the top six finalists. They did their research, and on the day voting closed he was able to contact the finalists almost overnight. Mr. White was originally one of the signers of this amendment, but he stated that he now opposed it. A year ago, it was not

clear that EPH would pass or would work. However, EPH passed, it worked, and he felt that 3SV was now attempting to address a problem that had already been solved and gone away. Mr. Whyte also agreed with Ms. Secor that 3SV could be used politically. Also, it was not clear to him that the proposed thresholds had been set correctly; they might require further fine-tuning in future to get them right. Finally, he didn't feel the credibility of the Hugo Awards was assisted by continually changing the rules to fight against enemies that have gone away. Therefore, he urged a vote against this motion.

Lisa Hayes moved to call the question, which was seconded. However the vote failed since there were less than two-thirds being in favor.

Steven Cooper asked if there were a mechanism to test this process in reality. The Chair's opinion was that no such mechanism existed. The Chair's ruling was appealed¹. Andrew Adams pointed out that while no such parliamentary mechanism existed, a motion mechanism, i.e., a sunrise clause, did exist. No further action was taken on this subject.

Ron Oakes said that from a technical perspective, 3SV would be easy to implement. Secondly, he did not trust some participants to keep their word and stop interfering with the Hugo Awards.

Stephen Boucher moved to amend the motion by inserting "at the discretion of the Hugo administrator". The motion was seconded. However, Kevin Standlee asked that the motion be changed to read "at the discretion of the administering Worldcon" because we do not have an explicit Hugo administration committee. Without objection, the amendment was so modified.

Debate was set at 5 minutes.

Mr. Boucher spoke in favor of the amendment. He believed we need weapons available to us to deal with threats to the integrity of the Hugo process and voting, but we do not need to use them each and every year.

Ben Yalow opposed this amendment because 3SV was already becoming a political question. This would make it even more political and put the Hugo administrator right in the heart of the politics. If the administrator thinks the nominees are bad, the administrator will invoke 3SV; if the administrator think the nominees are good, 3SV won't be used.

¹ Since this wasn't a ruling but an opinion, it was unclear how it could be appealed.

Mr. Standlee asked if the passage of this amendment would increase the scope and the Chair again ruled that it would not because it would not always be in effect. Therefore it would be of lesser scope. This ruling was appealed and seconded. The Chair defended his ruling: The underlying amendment would require that 3SV be used every year; the new motion would put its use at the discretion of the administering Worldcon, making it a subset of the effect. Since a Worldcon would not have to use 3SV, it decreases the scope of the motion.

Joshua Kronengold spoke against the Chair's ruling. He felt it puts the decision to use 3SV into an individual's hands creates a choice. That choice is very significant, and therefore he felt that made this motion a greater change.

Cliff Dunn felt considering a change like this as a lesser change would set a bad precedent for allowing a Worldcon to effectively overhaul an amendment, completely change the spirit of it, and stick the next Worldcon with it "out of the blue".

Ms. Secor made it clear she did not like the underlying amendment, but she defended the Chair's ruling because anything that makes something optional rather than mandatory is a lesser change; it decreases the scope of the change that is being made.

Dr. Adams said another way of looking at this is that this is creating a power for a future Worldcon committee, and therefore he considered it a greater change.

The question on the appeal was called and seconded. By a serpentine vote of 40 in favor to 47 against, the Chair's ruling was overruled. Thus, this amendment would be a greater change; therefore, if the underlying amendment were passed this year, it would require a second ratification next year.

Dave Wallace asked whether we could pass the amendment as is this year and add a new amendment with the additional clause and ratify that next year.

Mr. Standlee moved to end debate on all the questions, including the current motion and then the underlying amendment, which was seconded.

Dr. Adams then asked to call the question solely on the immediately pending amendment. This was seconded.

With two "call the questions" pending, the Chair stated that Roberts Rules calls for the one with larger scope (all pending questions) to be voted upon first. If that vote were to fail, the Business Meeting would then vote on the one with lesser scope (the amendment to make the use of 3SV optional). That meant the first vote would be on Mr. Standlee's motion to call the question on all pending motions, which required two-thirds in favor. By a show of hands, the question was called on all pending motions.

The next vote was on the motion to make 3SV optional. That motion failed by a show of hands.

The final vote was on ratifying the 3SV amendment. That, too, failed by a show of hands.

C.5 Short Title: E Pluribus Hugo (Out of the Many, a Hugo)

This item was ratified at MidAmeriCon II, with a proviso that any business meeting prior to 2022 may move to suspend the changes introduced by E Pluribus Hugo for the following year's Hugo nominations (only), and thus it appears here. There was no accompanying provision to require placement on the agenda in each year through 2022.

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

Section 3.8: Tallying of Nominations.

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

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

Section 3.A: Finalist Selection Process

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

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

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

(3) Elimination Phase: Nominees chosen in the Selection Phase shall be compared, and the nominee with the fewest number of nominations shall be eliminated and removed from all ballots for the Calculation Phase of all subsequent rounds. (See 3.A.3 for ties.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.A.4: After the initial Award ballot is generated, if any finalists are removed for any reason, they will be replaced by other works in reverse order of elimination.

Section 3.9: Notification and Acceptance.

3.9.1 Worldcon Committees shall use reasonable efforts to notify the 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 person notified shall be asked at that time to either accept or decline the nomination. If the person notified declines the nomination, that finalist(s) shall not appear on the final ballot. The procedure for replacement of such finalist(s) is described in subsection 3.A.4.

Section 3.11: Tallying of Votes.

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

~~including any candidate receiving fewer than five votes.~~ During the same period, the results of the last ten rounds of the finalist selection process for each category (or all the rounds if there are fewer than ten) shall also be published.

Provided that any business meeting prior to 2022 may move to suspend the changes introduced by E Pluribus Hugo for the following year's Hugo nominations (only).

See the [2015 WSFS Business Meeting Minutes](#) for the makers' commentary on pages 28-36.

Debate time was set at 4 minutes.

Thursday's Discussion: A motion to suspend EPH for one year was made and seconded. Cliff Dunn objected and made a motion to postpone the discussion indefinitely. He felt EPH worked well and would be problematic to suspend for one year and then go back to it. He felt that would just confuse everyone, so he wanted to nip it in the bud. Ben Yalow, in favor of considering the motion to suspend, said we explicitly added this option. If we are not planning to exercise the right of this assembly to make this decision, we should not have put it in. Since we did, however, we should not squash the right of this meeting to make a decision. Joshua Kronengold felt EPH was working and that it was too early to suspend it. He also moved to call the question, but the Chair ruled that out of order.

Andrew Adams felt we should postpone this discussion until after the Hugo stats were released. Therefore he moved to suspend discussion definitely until the Saturday business meeting. The Chair pointed out that a motion to postpone definitely outranks a motion to postpone indefinitely. The Chair also noted that if the motion to postpone definitely passed, then the motion to postpone indefinitely disappears. **By a show of hands, the motion to postpone definitely to Saturday for discussion passed.**

Debate time was set at 10 minutes.

Saturday's Discussion: Without objection, C.6 was discussed first.

Mr. Yalow spoke in favor of suspending this motion for one year. He said we now have real-world numbers on what EPH actually does. This year, it said that we, as a collective body, thought that Vox Day made a better Hugo nominee candidate for Best Editor Long Form than Patrick Nielsen Hayden. He thought this was directly antithetical to what EPH was intended to do. EPH says that bullet voting works; "you should go out and bullet vote". Mr. Yalow felt bullet voting is a bad idea; he nominates everything he thinks is worthy – until he runs out of slots. He also believed it makes the nomination process hard to explain. Under EPH, if you bullet vote A, it might end up on the ballot, but if you nominate A and B, neither may end up on the ballot. He did

not feel this was a fair way of working. Therefore he proposed getting rid of EPH to see what happens. He felt there have been sociological changes. He felt the “Sads,” unlike the “Rabids,” immediately decided to change from creating a slate of five nominees to creating a long list. He felt that that “was good behavior that should be rewarded, not punished with something like EPH.”

Cliff Dunn spoke against suspending EPH. First, he believed Mr. Yalow’s “sociological changes” were a direct response to EPH. He said the “Sads” might have created another slate if EPH had not been in place. Secondly, he felt that if EPH were suspended, it would put us back where we started and make the Hugo Awards once again vulnerable to slates. Thirdly, he could envision the Hugo Awards switching voting methods every year if EPH were to be suspended next year. He felt the re-ratification of EPH had been put on the ballot solely as an emergency brake in case something interacted strangely. Finally, he said, we should stick with EPH because it works.

Lisa Hayes said EPH has some flaws. We now saw those flaws, and we should suspend it. We have a positive brake, “5 and 6,” which has helped. If we need an additional brake, she preferred other options.

Corina Stark spoke against suspending EPH because, while bullet voting might occasionally get a “bad” candidate on the list, we still have “5 and 6” which will let us ignore one candidate and still have five good candidates on the list.

Kent Bloom favored suspension because he believed that EPH had no effect on the “Puppies.” He felt that repeatedly coming in after No Award was the sociological pressure that caused them to stop the way they behaved. He felt EPH had side-effects that were undesirable.

Alex Acks felt what made the Puppies, particularly the “Rabids,” change their tactics was that they could no longer game the system. If we got rid of EPH, the Puppies, who are watching, would bring the slates back, and we have another bad year “where everything sucks”. Given that we do not have any other options at this point, she strongly suggested keeping EPH until we get something better.

Rick Kovalcik agreed with Mr. Yalow; he felt it would be better to have a clear system that might have some problems in the short term until we could get something that’s defensible. He felt EPH was a horrible system and that it should go away.

Oskari Rantala agreed bullet voting works, but that’s the price we have to pay for a system that is resistant against slates. We have six finalists; we have five Hugo-worthy finalists in the Best Editor category as well. He argued that If you look at how EPH works, voting for items A and B doesn’t remove them both.

Dave McCarty, speaking in favor of suspension, said that as long as we use EPH, we will continue to have perverse results with things getting knocked off the ballot for unknown reasons that cannot be justified without looking at the raw data. He felt that that was an unavoidable side effect of EPH, and that it was damaging to our system.

John Pomeranz reluctantly spoke against suspension. He acknowledged the problems of EPH and had spoken strongly against it on its initial passage. He also felt societal pressures were sufficient to address slate voting and acknowledged the problem of bullet voting. However, he thought the greatest harm would be to let our voting processes constantly swing back and forth. While at some point in time he would seek to pull EPH out of the Constitution, he felt we should let it run for a number of years and continue to get further data on its results. He reiterated that he did not believe the results were so significantly bad that he would support suspending EPH at this time.

By more than two-thirds in favor, debate was closed. Then, by a show of hands, **the vote to suspend EPH failed**. Thus EPH will continue to be in effect at Worldcon 76.

C.6 Short Title: EPH+

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

(1) Calculation Phase: First, the total number of nominations (the number of ballots on which each nominee appears) from all eligible ballots shall be tallied for each remaining nominee. Next, ~~a single "point" shall be assigned to each nomination ballot. That point shall be divided equally among all remaining nominees on that ballot.~~ each nomination ballot shall give a point or fraction thereof to each remaining nominee on that ballot, according to the number of such remaining nominees, using the following pattern (known in voting theory as "Sainte-Laguë divisors"): 1 point for 1 remaining nominee, 1/3 of a point each for 2 remaining nominees, 1/5 of a point each for 3 remaining nominees, 1/7 of a point each for 4 remaining nominees, and 1/9 of a point each for 5 remaining nominees (extending this pattern as needed if a ballot legally has more remaining nominees). Finally, all points from all nomination ballots shall be totaled for each nominee in that category. These two numbers, point total and number of nominations, shall be used in the Selection and Elimination Phases.

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

See the [2016 WSFS Business Meeting Minutes](#) for the makers' commentary on pages 31-37

Debate time was set at 20 minutes. (There was no discussion on Thursday.)

C.6.1 Amendment to Ratification

Moved: to amend EPH+ so that the proposed change to section 3.9.1 (1) of the Constitution reads as follows, with ~~deleted~~ and inserted text:

(1) Calculation Phase: First, the total number of nominations (the number of ballots on which each nominee appears) from all eligible ballots shall be tallied for each remaining nominee. Next, ~~a single "point" shall be assigned to each nomination ballot. That point shall be divided equally among all remaining nominees on that ballot.~~ a point or fraction thereof shall be assigned to each remaining nominee in accordance with section (a) below unless the preceding year's business meeting has authorized the use of section (b) below instead for this year. Finally, all points from all nomination ballots shall be totaled for each nominee in that category. These two numbers, point total and number of nominations, shall be used in the Selection and Elimination Phases.

(a): Regular point schedule: a single "point" shall be assigned to each nomination ballot. That point shall be divided equally among all remaining nominees on that ballot.

(b): EPH+ point schedule: each nomination ballot shall give a point or fraction thereof to each remaining nominee on that ballot, according to the number of such remaining nominees, using the following pattern (known in voting theory as "Sainte-Laguë divisors"): 1 point for 1 remaining nominee, 1/3 of a point each for 2 remaining nominees, 1/5 of a point each for 3 remaining nominees, 1/7 of a point each for 4 remaining nominees, and 1/9 of a point each for 5 remaining nominees (extending this pattern as needed if a ballot legally has more remaining nominees).

Proposed by: Dave Wallace and Kern Wallace

Commentary: E Pluribus Hugo (EPH) was one of two anti-slating provisions ratified by the MidAmeriCon II business meeting. EPH+ is effectively the "extra strength" version of EPH – it has a stronger anti-slate effect than pure EPH (averaging around one extra non-slate nomination per category for slates of various sizes in one study), but it also can change the results more in the absence of slates.

In ratifying EPH last year, we adopted an amendment that allows any business meeting prior to 2022 to suspend the effect of EPH for the following year (only). This proposed amendment would allow each such business meeting to choose between "no EPH",

“basic EPH”, and “EPH+” for tallying the following year’s Hugo nominations, with the default being “use basic EPH” if the business meeting takes no action.

This proposed amendment recognizes that we are currently in a dynamic environment in which it is not completely clear which combination of measures should be used to best limit the effects of slates on the nominations in a given year. Over the past 3 years, we have seen three different strategies adopted by the primary slate to affect the nominations. Their efforts will likely continue, and we should not assume that the specific countermeasures which were reasonably effective in 2017 will be just as effective in future years. Therefore, I favor giving the business meeting each year maximum flexibility to choose countermeasures within the scope of the Constitution in response to what has happened in previous years.

Based on the results of the 2017 Hugo nominations, we may not need the extra strength (and side-effects) of EPH+ for 2018, especially if we adopt 3SV this year. But we might want it for future years, depending on what happens next. If we just vote EPH+ down, it would take two more years to bring it back. By amending as proposed, it could be available the very next year, starting as early as the 2019 Hugo Awards, if the Business Meeting in a given year decides they need a “bigger anti-slate hammer” for the next year’s Hugo Awards.

Debate time was set at 5 minutes (out of the above 20). (There was no discussion on Thursday.)

Saturday’s Discussion: Without objection, C.6 was discussed before C.5.

Before discussion began on ratifying the amendment, Nicholas Whyte gave a report of EPH’s effect on Hugo voting. See [Appendix C](#) for a summary of his verbal report. Lisa Padol moved to thank the administrator for going above and beyond the call of duty in providing this year’s Hugo statistics in great detail, and there was no objection. In addition, the Chair added his personal thanks for the immense amount of work done by Mr. Whyte and his staff.

The Chair made it clear that if C.6.1 passed, he would rule the motion to be a greater change of scope and thus require an additional year for ratification since it complicated the original amendment. This ruling was appealed and seconded.

The Chair defended his ruling and said that it complicated the original amendment and moved it further away from the current Constitution, which increased the scope. In fact, he felt the only way to even digest the motion was to add an additional year for ratification.

Kate Secor spoke against the Chair's ruling. As far as she could tell, the effect of C.6.1 would be to make the use of EPH optional, and thus she considered it a lesser change.

Ben Yalow spoke in favor of the Chair's ruling. Earlier in these proceedings, the members decided that adding greater power and flexibility to a particular amendment constituted a greater change. Therefore, he felt, we should follow that precedent.

Joshua Kronengold, the original maker of the appeal, argued that this motion would allow the Business Meeting to make the change available a year in advance. He said we do this all the time and that it would allow the Business Meeting to add a sunrise clause that stays on for one year, rather than a sunset clause or sunrise clause that is permanent. Therefore he felt it did not increase the scope of the original amendment.

A motion was made to end debate, to which there was no objection. The vote was then taken on the Chair's ruling. By a show of hands, **the Chair's ruling was sustained** and if this motion passed, it would require an additional year of ratification.

Debate then began on the amendment to ratification.

Dave Wallace argued that the effect of this amendment would be to make EPH+ optional by positive option of the Business Meeting. For any year in which EPH was in effect, we would use basic EPH unless the prior year's Business Meeting voted to use EPH+ instead. He said EPH+ was a stronger version of EPH, which could be used only if needed, and that each Business Meeting through 2022 would have a choice between no EPH, EPH or EPH+. He had no issue with adding an extra year for ratification for this motion.

Colin Harris spoke against the motion. He didn't think it was a good idea to switch from year to year or that a previous year's meeting would be in a position to decide which process should be used in the subsequent year because that only becomes clear later on, if/when people declare their intent. Therefore, he didn't feel this motion to be useful. Either we will adopt EPH+ on an ongoing basis or we won't.

Without objection, debate ended. By a show of hands, the vote to amend the motion failed.

Mr. Wallace, one of the sponsors of the original amendment, opened the debate on ratification of EPH+. He called it the extra-strength version of EPH, with a stronger anti-slating effect. He believed EPH+ would get one more non-slate nominee per category on the ballot than EPH. If the choice is between waiting two more years for a new change or passing EPH+ now, Mr. Wallace favored the latter choice since he did not trust the "chief puppy" to cease his attacks on the Hugo Awards.

Dave McCarty spoke against EPH+. Because it, like EPH itself, reward single-bullet voting. People who nominate only one thing have their vote count disproportionate to

everyone else, and EPH+ makes that effect worse. Under EPH+, Mr. McCarty said, the threshold to crack the most nominated categories, such as Best Novel or Best Dramatic Presentation, would go down to about 3% of the nominating population. Therefore, he felt that EPH was worse for recent behaviors and not substantially better for the behaviors we used to see.

Joshua Kronengold moved to add a one-year sunrise clause to this amendment, so that it would not take effect until 2019. However he was ruled out of order because the Chair had called for a speech in favor.

With no further speeches in favor, Lisa Hayes spoke against the ratification. She was fundamentally opposed to EPH and therefore against EPH+. She felt we were tinkering with a process most people don't really understand, and would much have preferred 3SV, and she thought the Business Meeting should come up with a transparent system that all members could understand rather than turning it over to a "magic box."

Kent Bloom followed on what Mr. McCarty said. He felt that by using EPH, we are discouraging people from making nominations if they have more than one thing to nominate because EPH (and EPH+ more strongly) creates slates when they are not really slates. It groups people who simply happen to agree in their taste for film or dramatic presentations, and therefore he felt we should defeat ratification.

Mr. Kronengold moved to call the question. With two-thirds in the affirmative, the question was called to end debate. Then, by a show of hands, **ratification of EPH+ was defeated.**

C.7 Short Title: Defining North America

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

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

Proposed by: The Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

See the [2016 WSFS Business Meeting Minutes](#) for the makers' commentary on page 38.

Debate time was set at 4 minutes.

Saturday's Discussion: The Chair introduced the discussion. This amendment would add a technical definition of what we mean when we say North America by adding a new subsection to Section 4.8. He noted that the inclusion list is a nonexclusive list; it just gives examples, and that other parts of the U.S. are also defined as North America.

Joni Brill Dashoff enquired why was Central America included in North America since that's not what she was taught. (The Chair ruled that this was debate, not an Inquiry.)

Ben Yalow spoke in favor of the motion. He admitted to being the somewhat careless person who removed this section from the Constitution several years ago and apologized to the body for the necessity of putting it back in, but he felt we really needed to do so.

There were several enquiries: Rick Kovalcik wanted to know if Guam would be considered part of North America for purposes of the Constitution. The answer was yes, because any territory or piece of the United States would be considered part of North America for the purposes of administering our Constitution.

Winton Mathews asked about the islands of the Gulf of Mexico, such as Cuba – are they to be considered islands in the Caribbean Sea? The Chair replied that yes, they are part of the Caribbean.

Joshua Kronengold moved to call the question, which was seconded. By a show of hands, the question was called and debate ended. By another show of hands, **the motion defining North America was ratified** and would become part of the Constitution at the conclusion of Worldcon 75.

[Retrospective Improvement was originally one amendment consisting of three sections. It was broken into three segments, one of which failed to pass, and the two that did are listed below as A.8 and A.9.]

C.8 Short Title: Retrospective Improvement Part 1

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

Section 3.13: Retrospective Hugos

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

Debate time was set at 8 minutes.

Sunday's Discussion: This motion would modify the Retro Hugos with new language to allow Retro Hugos for the four-year window in between the third and fourth Worldcons in which there were no Worldcons held due to “the late unpleasantness”.

Lisa Hayes made a motion to postpone indefinitely, but was ruled out of order because it can be made only during the preliminary Business Meeting and because it is not in order against pending constitutional ratifications. Ms. Hayes then called the question, but that too was ruled also out of order until at least one person from each side had spoken. However, no one wished to speak to ratification of this amendment. The vote was then taken, and by a show of hands, **the amendment was ratified and will take effect at the conclusion of Worldcon 75.**

C.9 Short Title: Retrospective Improvement Part 2

To add the following new text at the end of “Retrospective Hugos” section (Section 3.13) of the WSFS Constitution with the following:

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

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

See the [2016 WSFS Business Meeting Minutes](#) for the makers' commentary on pages 39-40.

Debate time was set at 8 minutes.

Sunday's Discussion: The Chair noted that we actually already do this, but it would make such listing a requirement. No one wished to debate this issue, and by a show of hands, **the amendment was ratified and will take effect at the conclusion of Worldcon 75.**

C.10 Short Title: Universal Suffrage

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

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

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

Proposed by: Ron Oakes, Linda Deneroff and Tara Oakes

See the [2016 WSFS Business Meeting Minutes](#) for the makers' commentary on page 41.

Debate time was set at 8 minutes.

Sunday's Discussion: This motion would prevent the uncoupling a full convention membership from the WSFS full attending membership. It would not affect reduced-price memberships for one-day, children, first-time attendees, young adult, memberships, etc.

Bobson asked whether voting for the Hugo Awards was one of the WSFS rights. The Chair replied that it was, and Mr. Bobson then asked how could someone still buy a full membership after voting closes. The Chair explained that although the right to vote for the Hugo Awards is a WSFS right, once voting has closed, that right is no longer available. For example, persons who buy full memberships at the door have Hugo Award voting rights, but the voting is already closed, and they cannot go back in time and vote. WSFS voting rights include the right to nominate for the current year's Hugo Awards, the right to nominate for next year's Hugo Awards, the right to vote on this year's Hugo Awards, the right – subject to paying an additional amount – to vote on the Worldcon site selection, and the right to attend and participate in the WSFS business meeting if you have an attending membership.

No one wished to debate this issue, and by a show of hands, **the amendment was ratified and will take effect at the conclusion of Worldcon 75.**

C.11 Short Title: Young Adult Award

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

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

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

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

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

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

Provided that filling the < blank> in this amendment to name the award shall not be considered a greater change in the scope of the amendment;

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

Provided further that the question of re-ratification shall automatically be placed on the agenda of the 2021 Business Meeting.

Proposed by: Members of the YA Award Committee

See the [2016 WSFS Business Meeting Minutes](#) for the makers' commentary and report on pages 48 and 130-133.

Debate time was set at 20 minutes.

C.11.1 Short Title: Clean Up “Young Adult” Award (*amendment to ratification*)

Moved, to amend the proposal to create a Young Adult award by ~~striking out~~ words as follows:

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

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

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

~~*Provided that filling the < blank > in this amendment to name the award shall not be considered a greater change in the scope of the amendment;*~~

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

Provided further that the question of re-ratification shall automatically be placed on the agenda of the 2021 Business Meeting.

Proposed by: Members of the YA Award Committee

Commentary: This motion removes the null <blank> to reduce confusion and removes an extra “and” for grammatical clarity. If ratified in this form, the amendment would create an unnamed YA award which would be awarded next year.

During the last year on several online forums, substantial discussion occurred about whether filling in the <blank> would increase the scope of the amendment, thus requiring an additional year of ratification. The discussions were complex enough that the Business Meeting Chair changed his intentions for ruling on three different occasions, ultimately deciding to rule that, according to the Constitution (Section 6.7: Commencement), the provision does not function until after the amendment’s ratification. The committee felt that it was more important to pass the award, rather than to embroil it in further heated debates about a) the minutiae of WSFS parliamentary and constitutional law, and/or b) the suitability of various name options.

We concluded that removing the <blank> and the name change provision reduces the scope of the original constitutional amendment because it returns the process to that already laid out in the current Constitution. Removing the <blank> therefore does not change the ratification requirements of the award, and it can be ratified in this form in Helsinki.

Debate time was set at 4 minutes.

Friday Discussion: The Chair explicated that ratification of this amendment would create a new award – not a Hugo Award – sanctioned in the Constitution for young

adult science fiction and fantasy. The committee that created it has also introduced a “clean up” amendment that strikes out material about the blanks in the motion regarding a name for the award. The Chair ruled that, if adopted, this “clean up” amendment (item C.11.1) would not increase the scope of the original amendment, which, if ratified, could take effect next year. Therefore, the first item under discussion was C.11.1.

Katie Rask spoke in favor of the amendment to strike out the provisions and the blank. The discussions on line, she said, consisted of a lot of procedural, parliamentary and constitutional debate about the issue. The YA Committee listened and felt that this revised amendment was the best way to respond. Rather than try to fill in the blank, the committee planned to submit a new amendment using the usual constitutional method, with a two-year vote and ratification. If the nameless award passed, immediately afterward, the business meeting would take up the naming process.

Perianne Lurie wanted clarification that should the current motion pass, we will have an award that is not a Hugo Award that has no name for at least a year. In addition, she felt that there was no requirement that it be actually named. So we may be stuck with a nameless award that we cannot have a service mark on for the indefinite future.

Joshua Kronengold felt this was not a feasible award because no one wants to give out an award with no name. It’s useless to debate because no one wants to give out a nameless award. He felt we should narrow it down to something that is passable this year, and then talk about whether we want to do a greater change or give it a sunrise or sunset clause. First we should have a clean thing we can consider.

Kate Secor said that the naming of this award is contentious. That implied to her that we may not be able to name the award without several years of discussion, during which time we would be giving out an award without a name. She didn’t believe that that was good for the Worldcon, good for the Hugo Awards or good for the people receiving the award. We have to name the thing, or we shouldn’t pass it. The Chair pointed out that the interim name would simply be called The Young Adult Award, and that the question of a name will come up later in the agenda.

The question of striking out the provision and the blanks in the pending amendment to ratification required a majority vote, passed by a show of hands, and were removed from the proposed constitutional amendment.

Thus debate now began on the debate on whether to ratify the Young Adult Award.

Katie Rask, one of the assistant chairs for the YA committee, spoke in favor, reiterating that we have more time to name the award. The committee has provided plenty of evidence over the years that this award is needed. She felt it was most important to get the award passed, currently referred to as the “Award for Best Young Adult Book,” before moving on to the next stage of finding a permanent name.

The Chair reminded everyone that the amendment does contain a sunset clause calling for re-ratification by the 2021 Business Meeting, at which time it will automatically be on that year's agenda.

Kate Secor made a motion to add a sunrise clause: "Provided that this award need not be awarded until such time as a specific name for the award has been adopted." Cliff Dunn asked the rules be suspended to change "need not" to "shall not". Because Mr. Dunn's motion was a second-order amendment, it required a two-thirds vote in favor to allow its introduction. The motion failed by a show of hands. Ms. Secor's motion was then seconded. When asked if this was a greater change to the amendment, the Chair ruled that it did not increase the scope of the amendment, which would allow the amendment to be ratified at this meeting.

Ms. Secor reiterated that there was sufficient concern among members of the meeting about giving out an unnamed award.

David Peterson pointed out item 3.X capitalized the text, "Award for Best Young Adult Book." Therefore, if this amendment passed, the award would have a name. (The name would be "Award for Best Young Adult Book.") He felt the question before the meeting was whether we want a different name later. Mr. Peterson then said that presenting an award for Best Young Adult Book would not be too bad. The alternative is having another year (or years) without an award until we decide what the award would be called. He felt that authors would rather have an award for Best Young Adult Book than no award at all. PRK raised a point of order that Mr. Peterson was debating the underlying motion, and not Ms. Secor's amendment. The Chair ruled that the point of order was not well taken and that Mr. Peterson's argument was germane to the pending question.

Dr. Lurie said that the problem was it's not a Hugo Award and it's not a Campbell Award so it's just an award for young adult book given out by 'who the hell knows.' It's not the WSFS Award for Best Young Adult Book. It's an award without a name. If the administering Worldcon wants to do that, they're still permitted to.

Ziv Wities asked whether it could be called a WSFS Award for YA. The Chair declined to state an opinion on this subject and would leave it up to the administering convention.

Ben Yalow agreed in general that we should not give out a nameless award, but it was decided earlier that we could not have a second-order amendment. Therefore he suggested defeating Ms. Secor's amendment, immediately replacing it with a motion that says we cannot give out the award until it is named. This would give clear guidance to administering conventions. The Chair stated in answer to the unstated parliamentary enquiry was yes, such a motion would be in order.

Ms. Hayes asked to call the question on the pending provision amendment only. A two-thirds vote being necessary, the question to end debate passed. Then, by a show of hands, Ms. Secor's amendment failed.

Mr. Yalow moved a new motion to add the proviso, "Provided that this award shall not be awarded until such time as a specific name for the award has been adopted."

Terry Neill spoke against the amendment. She was concerned that this would delay the implementation of the Young Adult award, which has already been delayed for several years. She said this award is needed and wanted by the membership of this society, and she felt it was worth giving the award out even with a generic name. She felt we should not stop the momentum of this award for want of a name. Therefore she asked that Mr. Yalow's amendment be voted down.

Richard Gadsden asked if this amendment would preclude a Worldcon committee from using its power under Section 3.3.17 of the Constitution to create an additional category. The Chair ruled that doing so would thus make it a special Hugo Award. He then clarified that Worldcons are allowed to create awards to be given out at the Hugo Award ceremony, if they wish. However, they cannot put such awards on the ballot. They would have to be on a separate ballot.

Andrew Adams spoke in favor of this motion. If you are going to create this award, we need to have it properly in place in all its glory right from the start.

Chris Gerrib spoke against the motion. We should not let perfect be the enemy of good. He said we've been fussing around with this for years, and we should get it done.

Dr. Lurie felt that this was the only way we're going to get a name for the award because if we're not forced to do so, she didn't believe it would happen, and she felt strongly we need to have a name for this award.

Mr. Peterson noted that time had already been scheduled on the agenda for discussing a name for this award.

Cliff Dunn felt that just because we have the name discussion scheduled on the agenda didn't mean we would actually come up with a name. He didn't want the award to be "half-baked." He envisioned several Worldcons using different names for the award or getting a *de facto* name attached that we have no control over.

Mr. Kronengold felt we shouldn't put dangling elements into the Constitution. If we want to wait until we have a name, just do a greater change and push it for another year, "rather than putting something into the Constitution that doesn't do anything until we pass another amendment to the Constitution."

Without objection, the question was called to vote on Mr. Yalow's provision amendment. By a serpentine vote of 35 in favor to 56 against, Mr. Yalow's motion failed.

Debate time was reset to ten minutes for the underlying motion.

Ms. Rask opened the discussion on the underlying motion. She wanted to clarify the timeline for the award. Should this motion be ratified, the next steps would be to name the award, which would be a two-year process. Four hundred sixty names have been

proposed; the committee has already researched and vetted them, and has made its suggestion in its report.

Todd Dashoff made a parliamentary enquiry: would putting the word “WSFS” in front of “Award for Best Young Adult Book” make it a greater change? The Chair ruled that trying to add a name to the award at this stage of the process would increase the scope of the award and therefore require an additional year of ratification.

Kent Bloom reiterated that, like last year, he is opposed to trying to divide literature into categories by age or type or anything else. We need to pick the best of the best, and not have two awards for essentially the same thing.

Mr. Kronengold moved to call the question, which was seconded. A two-thirds vote being necessary, the question to end debate passed.

By a show of hands, the chair believed that the amendment (C.11.1) was ratified. However, the vote appeared close, and a serpentine vote was held. **By a vote of 65 in favor and 27 against, the amendment was ratified and will take effect at the end of Worldcon 75.**

C.12 Short Title: 5 and 6

This item was ratified at MidAmeriCon II, with a proviso that any business meeting prior to 2022 may move to suspend the changes introduced by 5 and 6 for the following year’s Hugo nominations (only), and thus it appears here. There was no accompanying provision to require placement on the agenda in each year through 2022.

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

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

Provided that any business meeting prior to 2022 may move to suspend the changes introduced by 5 and 6 for the following year’s Hugo nominations (only).

See the [2015 WSFS Business Meeting Minutes](#) for the makers’ commentary on pages 23-24.

Debate time was set at 10 minutes.

A motion was made to suspend this amendment for one year, which was seconded. Discussion was postponed until the Saturday business meeting.

Saturday Discussion: Dave McCarty made a motion to suspend the rules and discuss this item C.12 after the conclusion of item C.5. By a show of hands, this motion passed by a two-thirds vote. Ben Yalow made a parliamentary enquiry. The Business Meeting is not allowed to adjourn *sine die* when there is privileged business still on the agenda, and he asked hypothetically if postponing the motion to suspend 5 and 6 would prevent adjourning *sine die*. The Chair's opinion was that because suspension of 5 and 6 was currently before the meeting, it had been considered and postponing it or laying it on the table would not prevent adjournment *sine die*, but it would require a two-thirds vote to lay it on the table. Andrew Adams then asked what level of vote would be required to take it off the table. The Chair replied that while it would take two-thirds to put an item aside, it would take only a majority to pick it back up. By a show of hands, the motion to lay 5 and 6 on the table failed and continued before the meeting.

Kent Bloom spoke in favor of suspending 5 and 6 for one year because we had just agreed not to suspend EPH, and he felt they worked at cross purposes to each other. He thought a significant fraction of EPH actions to remove slate nominees from the ballot are reversed by 5 and 6. Therefore, he felt we should suspend at least one of them to find out how bad that was.

Joshua Kronengold said that while having six finalists increases the amount of reading material, he urged not suspending 5 and 6 because, as had been mentioned in other discussions, switching back and forth is bad for the awards. Therefore he felt we should let it run to see how it continues to work before deciding we don't want a sixth finalist.

Dave McCarty said EPH has been tested on many sets of data. That data showed that about 50% of the time, if you have a slate of five candidates, the ones that EPH knocked out of the top 5 was put back in by 5 and 6. He reiterated that EPH and 5 and 6 do not work well together, and that at some time in the future we should remove one of them.

Steven desJardins, one of the original makers of 5 and 6, said that we should not suspend it, first for the reasons of consistency already stated, but also because he believed 5 and 6 was beneficial and provided some resistance against slating. He agreed that sometimes it might put a slate finalist back on the ballot, but just as often or more often it put a genuine finalist on the ballot to counter a slate. He also felt a broader range of finalists on the ballot was good for its own sake and added to the luster of the ballot. Anecdotally, he added that this was a very popular change among voters, and we should be reluctant to mess with something people like.

Lisa Hayes made a motion to close debate, which passed by a two-thirds show of hands. Then, by another show of hands, **the suspension of 5 and 6 failed and will remain in effect for Worldcon 76.**

A motion to adjourn and continue on Sunday was made by Rick Kovalcik and seconded. Upon a show of hands, the Saturday meeting adjourned and picked up the remaining items on Sunday.

D. NEW CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Items under this heading have not yet received first passage and will become part of the Constitution only if passed at Worldcon 75 and ratified at Worldcon 76. 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.

D.1 Short Title: What Our Marks Really Are

Moved: to replace section 2.2 of the Constitution with:

Every Worldcon and NASFiC Committee shall include a notice in each of its publications that clearly acknowledges the service marks of the Society. The Mark Protection Committee shall supply each Worldcon committee with the correct form of such notice.

Proposed by: The Mark Protection Committee

Commentary: The technical ownership of some of the Society's service marks has recently changed, per the direction of the Business Meeting. Specifically, World Science Fiction Society's ("WSFS") service marks in the EU are now owned by Worldcon Intellectual Property, a non-profit corporation controlled by WSFS and, for various legal purposes, delegated to the Mark Protection Committee ("MPC") to manage. The MPC has recommended new language that reflects these changes, but the current notice is written into the Constitution, making it difficult to change the verbiage when circumstances change. There are also projected changes in the technical ownership of the various service marks, which will have no practical effect, since Worldcon Intellectual Property is fully under the control of the MPC, but will require changes in the service mark notice. In addition, the Society may from time to time direct the MPC to register additional service marks. Currently, all of these cases require the Society to go through the two-year Constitutional amendment process for what is a mere technical adjustment. This proposed amendment allows the MPC to change the notice to reflect where the marks are actually held without needing to go through the Constitutional amendment process.

Debate time was set at 4 minutes.

Sunday's Discussion: The Chair pointed out that the amendment as written neglected to include NASFiC committees from being supplied with the correct form of notice. Thus, without objection, the final sentence was changed to "The Mark Protection

Committee shall supply each such convention committee with the correct form of such notice.” John Pomeranz made a motion to suspend the rules adopt the amended amendment without discussion. A vote by show of hands was close, but before a serpentine vote could be taken, Mr. Pomeranz withdrew the motion, to which there was no objection.²

Perianne Lurie asked if a Worldcon website constituted a publication. The Chair responded that if a convention uses the mark, they should use the service mark language. René Walling asked if Worldcon or NASFiC bids should also be required to use the language. The Chair pointed out that the existing text doesn’t say anything about bid committees; however, the Mark Protection Committee will do what it can to assist bid committees with the language.

Bobson asked if service mark language would be required on things like membership badges. The Chair answered that it would not be and further recommended reviewing the full section of the Constitution concerning service marks.

No one wished to debate this issue, and by a show of hands, **the amendment passed and will be sent on to Worldcon 76 for ratification.**

D.2 Short Title: The Reasonable Amendment

Moved: to amend 3.8.5 (Nominee Diversity) of the WSFS Constitution by striking “best” and inserting “reasonable” in its place.

The revised 3.8.5 will then read as follows:

3.8.5: If there are more than two works in the same category that are episodes of the same dramatic presentation series or that are written works that have an author for single author works, or two or more authors for co-authored works, in common, only the two works in each category that have the most nominations shall appear on the final ballot. The Worldcon Committee shall make ~~best~~[reasonable](#) efforts to notify those who would have been finalists in the absence of this subsection to

² Chair’s note: After the meeting, the Chair realized that a motion to suspend the rules and adopt by acclamation like this requires a *unanimous* vote, not a two-thirds vote. This is because of the Standing Rule that requires that at least one speaker from each side of the debate be given an opportunity to speak in debate. Suspending this rule infringes upon the rights of every member present, and therefore it requires the unanimous consent of all meeting attendees to suspend it.

provide them an opportunity to withdraw. For the purpose of this exclusion, works withdrawn shall be ignored.

Proposed by: The Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

Commentary: In the re-worded “Nominee Diversity” amendment ratified in 2016 “best efforts” is used. That is potentially dangerous. Some interpret “best” as a very high bar and this could cause legal problems for some future Hugo administrators. Note that the similar provisions in 3.9.1 of the Constitution use “reasonable efforts” which seems, to be a bit repetitive, more reasonable.

Debate time was set at 4 minutes.

Sunday’s Discussion: This motion changes one word in the middle of the paragraph. John Pomeranz made a motion to suspend the rules to adopt the motion by acclamation. With a two-thirds vote in the affirmative, **the amendment passed and will be sent on to Worldcon 76 for ratification.**

D.3 Short Title: Make Room! Make Room!

Moved: to strike out the words “the lesser of five thousand (5,000) words or” from Article 3.2.8 of the Constitution.

The revised 3.2.8 will then read as follows:

3.2.8: The Worldcon Committee may relocate a story into a more appropriate category if it feels that it is necessary, provided that the length of the story is within ~~the lesser of five thousand (5,000) words or~~ twenty percent (20%) of the new category limits.

Proposed by: Nicholas Whyte and Gregory N. Hullender

Commentary: At present, a work may be moved to a different category provided that it is within “the lesser of five thousand (5,000) words or twenty percent (20%)” of the length limit for that category. In practice, the 5,000-word limit applies only when there is a choice between Best Novel and Best Novella; in all other cases, the limit is 20%.

Increasingly we are seeing both works which are marketed and generally perceived as novellas but are longer than the current Best Novella upper limit of 45,000 words (one such case in 2017 was “Penric’s Mission”, by Lois McMaster Bujold) and also works which are marketed and generally perceived as novels but are shorter than the current Best Novel lower limit of 35,000 words (one such case in 2017 was *The Wild Robot*, by Peter Brown).

The current 5,000-word limit is inconsistent with the 20% limit set for all other cases, and also inconsistent with contemporary publishing, marketing and reading practice.

We therefore propose to remove it; the effect will be to change the “wobble room” between Best Novel and Best Novella from 5,000 words to 8,000 words (20% of the 40,000-word limit set in the constitution).

Debate time was set at 6 minutes.

Sunday’s Discussion: The substantive effect of this amendment would be to increase the grey boundary between the novel and novella Hugo Awards to 8,000 words from 5,000. Cliff Dunn made a motion to refer this item to the Hugo Awards Study Committee, but it was not seconded.

Perianne Lurie moved to suspend the rules and immediately adopt the motion without discussion. With a two-thirds vote in the affirmative, **the amendment passed and will be sent on to Worldcon 76 for ratification.**

D.4 Short Title: Name That Award: The Second YA Amendment “Young Adult” Award

Moved: to name the award for best young adult book the <> [Lodestar] Award for Best Young Adult book by inserting words as follows. The revised Young Adult award would then read as follows:

3.7.3: Nominations shall be solicited only for the Hugo Awards, the John W. Campbell Award for Best New Writer, and the <> Award for Best Young Adult Book.

3.10.2: Final Award ballots shall list only the Hugo Awards, the John W. Campbell Award for Best New Writer, and the <> Award for Best Young Adult Book.

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

Provided that this amendment shall be introduced only if the YA Award Amendment (C.11) is ratified.

Proposed by: Members of the YA Award Committee

Commentary: This amendment names the Young Adult award using the standard two-year ratification system per the WSFS Constitution. This Second YA Amendment will only be in order if the original proposal for the Award for Best Young Adult Book itself passes its second year of ratification at Helsinki's Business Meeting.

The Young Adult Award Committee was tasked with recommending a name for the young adult award, which received first passage last year. After much study we decided to recommend that the award be named Lodestar, from lode ('journey, course, guide') + star. A Lodestar is a star that guides or leads, especially in navigation, where it is the sole reliable source of light—the star that leads those in uncharted waters to safety. The guiding star frequently appears in speculative fiction, and is tied to the notion of the hero's quest. While it evokes stargazers and adventurers, it also calls to mind distant galaxies and travel through space. It therefore applies to both Fantasy and Science Fiction, is international in scope, and has symbolism that is cross-generational. For more details on this process, please see our full report.

While the majority of the committee supports the adoption of the name Lodestar for the Award for Best Young Adult Book, there was great diversity of opinion surrounding the award name and strong feelings expressed by the many who participated in our naming survey. Therefore, the Committee is proposing a second, separate amendment to name the award, so that the original proposed amendment may pass second-year ratification as a nameless award. The Second YA Amendment is designed to accommodate a Business Meeting vote on the final name, with second-year ratification in San Jose.

As for deciding on a final name, in order to streamline the process, the Committee recommends that:

- 1) Any nominations for the final name vote be accepted during the Preliminary Business Meeting and First Main Business Meeting. We ask that legitimate entries for the name (we have *very limited time*, so please no joke entries) be presented anonymously to the high table or the committee assistant-chair at the PBM and first MBM, but no later, so that we may have the evening before the vote to investigate the names for legal reasons (trademarks, etc.).
 - a) Please, before nominating something for the ballot, we ask that you first vet any names online to determine if an award/prize already exists with that name and that it is not trademarked (see <https://www.uspto.gov/trademark>). For more on what to consider when vetting a suggestion, see our report on page [bookmark].
 - b) The committee has already considered over 400 suggestions, so *please* see Exhibit 2 in our report before making suggestions. (Again, *very limited time!*)

- 2) The final list will be shared on the WorldconYA Twitter, on Facebook, and via paper copies, the evening prior to any vote to replace all instances of “Lodestar” in the blank, so that members have time to consider the ballot.
- 3) Before voting, the Business Meeting members debate the relative merits of the nominated names, with a time limit of 2-3 minutes per name, unless debate time needs to be extended.
- 4) After debate, vote on a final name to insert into the amendment by an Instant Runoff ballot, which will be printed out on paper ballots.
- 5) After a final name is chosen, vote on initial-ratification of the Second YA Amendment.

Advice from YA Professionals on the Committee

The YA authors and publisher who advised the Committee ask that the Business Meeting, when picking a name, keep in mind:

The award is meant to recognize excellence, which should take precedence over a name that emphasizes the targeted age range. (“Emerging Voices” or “Seeds of the Future” would be better suited to awards for books written *by* young authors, not books marketed to young readers.)

Avoid names that talk down to young readers or that feel condescending, like “Juvie” or “Youthie”.

Avoid names that imply YA is only a stepping-stone or gateway to “better” adult SFF; rather, it is a destination in its own right.

Writing YA is just as serious an endeavor as writing adult SFF, and any name should reflect that; avoid names that imply YA is dumber, or more childish, than adult SFF

Avoid names that will drive away readers young or old, and keep in mind that the name could influence how teachers and librarians see the award and its winners.

The Committee nominates the following name to fill the blank in the motion: Lodestar.

Debate time was set at 16 minutes.

Thursday’s Discussion: Katie Rask moved to postpone discussion of this motion definitely until Saturday, and after the discussion on the original YA amendment (C.11 and/or C.11.1). If the YA amendment passed, she expected that nominations would open, and she recommended that an instant runoff ballot be created for a vote to be taken at the beginning of Saturday’s meeting. The Chair suggested that it might be better to take up discussion of this new amendment (D.4) immediately after the vote on the YA proposal’s ratification on Friday. If it is ratified, members could make

nominations during Friday's meeting, and the vote would be taken at Saturday's meeting. Dr. Rask suggested that ballot nominations be made anonymously to the head table, then collected in order to create a written ballot; however, the Chair preferred to wait until Friday's discussion when we would know whether such a ballot was even necessary. Joshua Kronengold felt we need to have some discussion on the process. However, there was no objection to the process as outlined by the Chair.

Friday's Discussion: This discussion followed immediately upon ratification of the Young Adult Award amendment. The Chair explicated that this amendment would name the Young Adult Award by filling the blank, possibly with Lodestar, the recommended choice of the YA Committee. Before debate could begin on the underlying motion, a name needed to be chosen. The Chair suggested first voting yes or no whether to use the name Lodestar. If that passed, it would fill the blank. Otherwise, we treat it as a blank and solicit nominations for a name.

Before discussion began, however, Joshua Kronengold moved to suspend the rules to postpone the item definitely for 5 minutes to allow the YA Committee to present some corrections of errors that crept into the written report. Before a vote could be taken, Ziv Wities asked if these corrections would change the committee's recommendations. The motion to postpone definitely for 5 minutes passed by a show of hands, and the YA committee was recognized to speak to the assembly for not more than 5 minutes.

Mr. Kronenberg spoke on behalf of the committee. As a minor correction, he pointed out that the percentage of those in the first survey (the open survey) was not 52%; it was 54%. Additionally, when the summary specified 52% wanting a name versus 48% not wanting one, that was an accidental misrepresentation of the data and should have been 54% in favor of a person name versus the next possible candidate being around 25%, and thereby a 25% lead in plurality of wanting a person's name.³ This concluded the committee's report, and discussion began on the name Lodestar. Again the Chair suggested voting yes or no on the name Lodestar to fill the blank. If that name was rejected, there would be a blank in the motion and the meeting would begin soliciting nominations for a name (and Lodestar would be one of them). Nominations would be taken at this time (Friday) and voted upon by preferential ballot on Saturday. Once that concluded, the underlying motion would come back for discussion with the new name. Upon a show of hands, the blank was filled with "Lodestar".

Item D.4 with the word "Lodestar" as the potential name for the award now came up for discussion. It would still need to be ratified at Worldcon 2018, and therefore, while the award could be made next year, the name would not be part of the award at that time.

³ The numbers have been corrected in the report attached as part of these minutes.

Mr. Kronengold made a parliamentary enquiry: could we add a provision to the proposed constitutional amendment before us to retroactively name the award the Lodestar Award. However, the Chair ruled that such a provision was out of order because we cannot bind the past, only the future. The Chair's ruling was appealed and seconded. Geoff Thorpe did not see why we cannot do this.

Perianne Lurie asked to call the question on the appeal only, which passed by a two-thirds show of hands. A majority in the negative would be needed to override the Chair's ruling. By a show of hands, the Chair's ruling was sustained, and a retroactive amendment was not in order.⁴

David Peterson spoke in favor of naming the award Lodestar. The primary job of the YA Committee since MidAmeriCon II has been spent going over and vetting every single possible name. Lodestar might not be everyone's favorite choice, but it was the choice they stood behind because didn't violate any other award names (which other choices did). They didn't want to name the award after an already existing award. He felt Lodestar was the best option, and he strongly supported it.

Dr. Lurie proposed an amendment to strike out Lodestar and substitute Madeleine L'Engle, given that that was the name chosen by the vast majority of those polled. The motion was seconded. Dr. Lurie noted that the poll showed 243 people chose Madeleine L'Engle versus only one vote for Lodestar.

Katie Rask pointed out that the questionnaire was fill-in-the-blank in order to get everyone's ideas. There were movements on line to name the award after particular authors, but those voters were not considering some of the underlying issues associated with naming an award after a person. Age had a lot to do with what names people were choosing.

The Chair interrupted at this point to obtain consent from the assembly to read papers. By a show of hands, consent was granted, and Ms. Rask read some quotes about why Ms. L'Engle was not a good candidate to name the award after.

Ben Yalow said if we are trying to get some degree of public recognition for an award, having a name associated with it that people think of when they think of YA literature is more likely to gain credibility for the award than a random name like Lodestar or another generic name.

⁴ The Chair notes in retrospect that he should not have allowed the Appeal, because this was an opinion, not a ruling. Only rulings (not opinions) can be appealed. Had someone tried to move such an amendment and the Chair ruled the amendment out of order for the stated reasons, that ruling could have been appealed.

A motion to extend debate to 6 minutes total time failed since there was less than two-thirds in favor of extension.

Lisa Hayes moved to call the question and end debate, which was seconded. By a show of hands, debate was ended.

The amendment to strike out Lodestar and insert Madeleine L'Engle failed by a show of hands.

Ms. Hayes moved to call the question on the underlying amendment, which again was seconded. Dr. Lurie made a parliamentary enquiry: if the amendment were adopted with the name Lodestar this year, could next year's Business Meeting propose a different name when the amendment is ratified? Or would it require an additional year of ratification? The Chair ruled that it would require an additional year of ratification.

Anne Marie Rudolph asked if the Worldcon next year could use the name Lodestar. The Chair noted that in his personal capacity he is the WSFS division manager for Worldcon 76; therefore, he recused himself from the decision, and Donald E. Eastlake III once more assumed the Chair. He ruled that because of the requirement for ratification, the award will not have actually been named. Therefore the convention could use "weasel wording," such as "likely to be called Lodestar," but it cannot actually call itself the Lodestar Award.

Michael Lee pointed out that the award that is currently the World Science Fiction Award was for the first couple of years not officially named the Hugo Award.

Rick Kovalcik made a parliamentary enquiry: since Worldcons can issue their own special Hugo Awards, could not next year's Worldcon have the Lodestar Hugo Award for Best YA? The deputy chair believed they could, but that would be a separate ruling.

Mr. Yalow then appealed the ruling that said the committee cannot name a Hugo Award anything other than by the names in the Constitution. The deputy chair pointed out that this would be a special Hugo Award, an award for that one year only. Mr. Yalow argued that it could be called a special Hugo Award, but that award would not be the same award as the Lodestar Award. The deputy chair agreed that it wouldn't be the same award; it would be a special Hugo Award. Worldcons can create a special Hugo category and give it any legal name.

Dr. Lurie pointed out that in this specific instance the Constitution has said that this is not a Hugo Award, and therefore the Worldcon committee cannot create a special Hugo for this category. The deputy chair said they can create a special Hugo whose category definition is identical to the category definition of the Lodestar Award. It wouldn't be the Lodestar Award, but it would have the identical category definition.

Dr. Adams pointed out if Worldcon 76 did this, they would then be awarding two Young Adult Awards.

Kevin Standlee, in his personal capacity, moved to close debate on the appeal of the Chair's ruling (that next year's Worldcon could use its special Hugo Award ability to create a category that had effectively the same definition as the YA Award, and would also have to give out the YA Award that was just created).

Kate Secor believed that the ruling being appealed was that next year's Worldcon committee could call it a Lodestar Hugo Award as part of making that special award – which was a separate issue from whether they could create a special Hugo Award. The question was called on the appeal by a two-thirds vote.

The Chair called for the vote on the appeal of the Chair's ruling that next year's Worldcon committee, should they choose to exercise their authority to have a special Hugo Award, could call it the Lodestar.

There was some disagreement that this was not, in fact, the ruling being appealed. The Chair pointed out that the Chair's ruling (that they cannot actually call it the Lodestar Award but could use “weasel wording” to say “likely to be called Lodestar Award in the future,” or something similar) was not appealed. The ruling being appealed was that they could create a special Hugo Award and call it the Lodestar Hugo if they wish.

By a show of hands, debate was closed. Again by a show of hands, **the ruling of the Chair was sustained.**

Mr. Eastlake then turned control of the meeting back to Mr. Standlee.

A motion was made to call the question and end debate on item D.4 and bring the question to a vote, which passed by a two-thirds show-of-hands vote.

Finally, **the motion to adopt the name Lodestar Award for the YA Award, subject to ratification next year, passed by a show of hands and was sent on to Worldcon 76 for ratification.**

D.5 Short Title: Requiring Electronic Payments

Moved: to amend Section 1.5 of the WSFS Constitution by [adding](#) a new subsection after existing subsection 1.5.8 for the purpose of requiring the Worldcon Committee to accommodate electronic payments, as follows:

[1.5.9 Unless prohibited from doing so by law, any Worldcon Committee which advertises a price or prices for memberships shall ensure that said memberships or to can be purchased electronically at any and all of the](#)

prices indicated. This rule shall not be construed to prevent the re-pricing of memberships in different currencies to account for changes in the price of the currency of the host location of the convention, nor shall it affect their ability to offer memberships in other currencies at conventions at a localized price. Any price which cannot be obtained electronically must be clearly indicated as such.

Proposed by: Cliff Dunn, Charlie Hamilton

Commentary: This amendment seeks to address two related issues. The first is ensuring that concons make arrangements to allow all would-be members to pay electronically, unless currency controls or something similar prevent it. Given the extreme ease with which money can be transferred across borders, there seems to be no reason not to allow would-be members to purchase their memberships this way (and indeed this is effectively codifying existing practice; if a con did not offer the electronic purchase of memberships, it is likely that there would be a very negative reaction to such a decision).

The second is ensuring that generally-advertised prices are, in fact, generally available without having to go through different processes (beyond perhaps the use of a different payment processor). Again, present payment technology allows the setting of prices (and conversion between currencies) with relative ease. If other prices are to be displayed (for example, £25, \$35) they need to be clearly indicated as such.

Debate time was set at 10 minutes.

Thursday's Discussion: Terry Neill moved to postpone this amendment indefinitely, which was seconded. She felt it imposed a burden on convention committees, and if we want to do something like this we should bring it up next year so we have more time to perfect it. Joshua Kronengold believed this motion should be referred to committee rather than postponed indefinitely. Ben Yalow said the original makers had no objection to kill the motion and bring a revised motion back next year, so we should kill this motion now. Then, with more than two-thirds voting in favor, the motion was postponed indefinitely and would not come up for further discussion this year.

D.6 Short Title: The Division of the Hugo Award Best Novel Category

Moved: to strike Section 3.3.1 of the WSFS Constitution by ~~deleting~~ and adding text as follows in order to divide the award into two categories:

3.3.1: Best Science Fiction Novel. A science fiction ~~or fantasy~~ story of forty thousand (40,000) words or more.

[3.3.2: Best Fantasy Novel. A fantasy story of forty thousand \(40,000\) words or more.](#)

Proposed by: Vincent Docherty, Chris M. Barkley and Robert J. Sawyer

Commentary: Best Novel is by far the category with the highest participation by nominators and voters every year, at a time of great strength in genre publishing. By splitting the category in a simple way, the Worldcon community can recognise more works.

The most useful comparison of what we are trying to accomplish is the Locus Awards, which divide the Novel nominees into the following categories:

-) Locus Award for Best Science Fiction Novel
-) Locus Award for Best Fantasy Novel
-) Locus Award for Best Horror Novel
-) Locus Award for Best First Novel
-) Locus Award for Best Young Adult Book

Analysis: Under the current WSFS rules, the John W. Campbell Award for Best New Writer is probably sufficient to cover first time writers, and/or risks duplicating works.

There is also an emerging YA award, which could potentially become a Hugo category in the future (or not, depending on what happens at the Helsinki Business Meeting).

The nominators and voters of the Hugo Awards have predominantly nominated sf and fantasy works rather than horror. (We therefore offer the conjecture that if nominators want to nominate a work of horror, it can be done as a work of fantasy.)

Definition of the boundaries between fantastic genres are notoriously difficult; nevertheless, almost all genre novels are published with a clear category (perhaps not surprising as the genres are largely publishing-derived).

Rule 3.2.6 refers to the fiction categories by name and will need minor adjustment. (Suggestion: Borrow simplifying text from Section 3.2.5's "story categories".)

Rule 3.2.8 relating to fiction category boundaries remains unchanged.

Here are some examples of how this might look (minus recent Sad/Angry Puppy nominees, using the existing long lists of nominees):

2015 SF:

-) *Ancillary Sword* by Ann Leckie
-) *The Three Body Problem* by Liu Cixin
-) *Lock In* by John Scalzi

-) *The Martian* by Andy Weir
-) *My Real Children* by Jo Walton

2015 Fantasy:

-) *The Goblin Emperor* by Katherine Addison
-) *City of Stairs* by Robert Jackson Bennett
-) *Words of Radiance* by Brandon Sanderson
-) *The Mirror Empire* by Kameron Hurley
-) *Full Fathom Five* by Max Gladstone (speculative choice to replace *Skin Game* by Jim Butcher)

2016 SF:

-) *Ancillary Mercy* by Ann Leckie
-) *Aurora* by Kim Stanley Robinson
-) *Karen Memory* by Elizabeth Bear
-) *The Just City* by Jo Walton
-) *The Water Knife* by Paolo Bacigalupi

2016 Fantasy

-) *The Fifth Season* by N.K. Jemisin
-) *Uprooted* by Naomi Novik
-) *The Traitor Baru Cormorant* by Seth Dickinson
-) *The Grace of Kings* by Ken Liu
-) *Sorcerer to the Crown* by Zen Cho

Discussion: This motion was referred to the Hugo Study Committee.

D.7 Short Title: A Reorganization of the Best Related Category

Moved: to strike Section 3.3.5 of the WSFS Constitution by ~~deleting~~ and [adding](#) text as follows:

~~**3.3.5: Best Related Work.** Any work related to the field of science fiction, fantasy, or fandom, appearing for the first time during the previous calendar year or which has been substantially modified during the previous calendar year, and which is either non-fiction or, if fictional, is noteworthy primarily for aspects other than the fictional text, and which is not eligible in any other category.~~

3.3.5: Best Non-Fiction Book. Any book or work related to the field of science fiction, fantasy, or fandom, appearing for the first time during the previous calendar year or which has been substantially modified during the previous calendar year, and which is clearly non-fiction or has a basis

in fact with the intent to be educational and/or informational in nature and which is not eligible in any other category.

3.3.6: Best Art Book. Any art book or related volumes of works in the field of science fiction, fantasy, or fandom, appearing for the first time during the previous calendar year or which has been substantially modified during the previous calendar year.

Proposed by: Vincent Docherty and Chris M. Barkley

Commentary: A review of the top 15 works nominated each year shows that significant numbers of non-fiction and art books are still being judged Hugo-worthy by many nominators.

Looking again at the Locus Award, (and the Locus annual recommendations list), one can see two strong and stable categories; Best Non-fiction Book and Best Art Book.

The definition of content in the Hugo rules now explicitly makes clear that electronic forms of text are equivalent to print. The word “book” can therefore be used to describe a unit of published work in either electronic or printed form.

We also believe there is a need to better promote art in the Hugo Awards, reflecting the significance art has to the genre.

Discussion: This motion was referred to the Hugo Study Committee.

D.8 Short Title: Best Dramatic Presentation Reorganization

Moved: to strike Sections 3.3.7 and 3.3.8 of the WSFS Constitution by [adding](#) text as follows:

3.3.7: Best Dramatic Presentation, Long Form. Any theatrical feature or other production, with a complete running time of more than 90 minutes, in any medium of dramatized science fiction, fantasy or related subjects that has been publicly presented for the first time in its present dramatic form during the previous calendar year.

The intent if this motion is mainly for theatrical films, theater presentations and audio books, etc.

3.3.8: Best Dramatic Presentation, Episodic Form. Any television program or other production, with a complete running time of between 30 and 90 minutes, in any medium of dramatized science fiction, fantasy or related subjects that has been publicly presented for the first time in its

present dramatic form during the previous calendar year. No more than two episodes of any one series may be finalists in this category.

The intent of this motion is for stand-alone television episodes or other media.

3.3.83.3.9: Best Dramatic Presentation, Short Form. Any ~~television program or other~~ production, with a complete running time ~~of between 30 and 90~~ less than 30 minutes, in any medium of dramatized science fiction, fantasy or related subjects that has been publicly presented for the first time in its present dramatic form during the previous calendar year. No more than two episodes of any one show may be finalists in this category.

The intent of this motion is mainly for current Internet/YouTube type works, or cartoon/serials, typically less than 30 minutes.)]

3.3.10: Best Dramatic Presentation, Series. Any episodic series or other dramatic production, with more than four episodes of sixty minutes or more, or a running time of 240 minutes or more in any medium of dramatized science fiction, fantasy or related subjects that has been publicly presented for the first time in its present dramatic form during the previous calendar year.

The intent of this motion is for streaming series, mini-series or episodic television shows are eligible, the key point being to honor programs comprising a single story-arc presented over a number of episodes, rather than separate episodes in an anthology series, which would be eligible in the BDP-Episodic category.)

Current Rule 3.2.10 relating to BDP category boundaries remains unchanged, as does Current Rule 3.2.9 (“No work shall appear in more than one category on the final Award ballot.”)

Proposed by: Vincent Docherty and Chris M. Barkley

Commentary: After fifteen years, we both think that is time to overhaul and reorganize the Best Dramatic Presentation Hugo category.

The basic principles the Hugos use for works are measurability (word count, minutes) and discrete units of content, rather than the container. In practice the story-arc has been used as the main determinant of “discrete/single work” by both voters and administrators, with length then used to determine which category to use. Hence story-arc based (mini)series and pairs/trios of episodes have appeared on the ballot in both short and long form. Stand-alone episodes and movies have always been treated as single works, and the case where movies are part of a series seems not to be an issue, in a similar way to novels in a series – they generally are separated by years and are marketed as discrete works.

We have seen a huge increase in the number of genre series in recent years especially with services such as Hulu, Netflix and HBO. A quick analysis shows a count of almost 80 such series in English in the last year or so (see below). This presents us with an opportunity to honor a series through the nomination process.

Here is a long list of recent and/or current television and streaming (mini-)series:

11.22.63	Marvel: Agent Carter
12 Monkeys	Marvel: Agents of S.H.I.E.L.D.
3%	Marvel: Jessica Jones
A Series of Unfortunate Events	Marvel: Legion
American Horror Story	Marvel: Luke Cage
Ascension	Marvel: Daredevil
Black Mirror	Mr. Robot
Black Sails	Once Upon a Time
Class	Orphan Black
Colony	Outcast
Containment	Outlander
Continuum	Penny Dreadful
Crazyhead	Powers
Dark Matter	Preacher
DC: Arrow	Second Chance
DC: Gotham	Sense8
DC: Legends of Tomorrow	Shadowhunters
DC: Supergirl	Sleepy Hollow
DC: The Flash	SS-GB
Dirk Gently's Holistic Detective Agency	Star Wars Rebels
Doctor Who	Stranger Things
Emerald City	Supernatural
Frequency	Teen Wolf
From Dusk Till Dawn	The 100
Game of Thrones	The Aliens
Glitch	The Expanse
Grimm	The Leftovers
Helix	The Magicians
Heroes Reborn	The Man in the High Castle
Hunters	The OA
Humans	The Returned
iBoy	The Shannara Chronicles
iZombie	The Strain
Killjoys	The Vampire Diaries
Limitless	The Walking Dead
Lucifer	The X-Files
	Thunderbirds Are Go

Travelers
Twin Peaks
Under the Dome
Van Helsing

Westworld
Z Nation
Taboo

Discussion: This motion was referred to the Hugo Study Committee.

E. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MOTIONS

E.1 Standing Committees of WSFS

E.1.1 MPC Nominations

Nominations to the Mark Protection Committee (“MPC”) opened at Thursday’s meeting. The three members of the committee whose terms expired in 2017 were John Coxon, Linda Deneroff and Dave McCarty. They, as well as Mike Willmoth, were nominated for the three positions, and all gave their consent to their individual nominations. There were no other nominations.

E.1.2 Mark Protection Committee Report

See [Appendix A](#) for the written report.

The Mark Protection Committee is the only permanent WSFS committee, and it takes care of the WSFS service marks, like “Hugo Award” and “Worldcon”. At Friday’s session Kevin Standlee was pleased to report that the EU service mark for “Hugo Award” was registered in the EU as of last year. In addition, the name “Worldcon” and the Hugo Award logo were also registered in the EU. That is the second country/region to have registered marks. (The other, of course, is the U.S.) Otherwise it was a relatively quiet year for the MPC. We answered queries and dealt with minor mark infringements. In this coming year, the committee expects to do a review of what its expenses will be over the next ten years, which will go up now that we have additional marks to protect and renew periodically. We plan to have a more comprehensive report on plans for future strategy in San Jose next year.

Andrew Adams reported that the New Zealand committee has registered Worldcon 78.org and worldcon2020.org domains, and will hand over those domains to whoever wins for 2020. He asked if the MPC would start reserving such domain names some years ahead: given that we now have a repeating pattern for Worldcon names, we run the risk of someone squatting on such domain names if we don’t. Mr. Standlee said the MPC is aware of this and it’s on the list of things to get done in the coming year or two.

Vince Docherty reminded us that the MPC registered worldcon.com and pointed it to worldcon.org. He didn’t want the committee to forget this, because it was an expensive domain to purchase. Mr. Standlee pointed out that the list in the written report was not a comprehensive list and that the MPC, on behalf of WSFS, maintains our domain names as well as our intellectual property. He also said that through the Hugo Awards Marketing Committee, the MPC also manages the hugo.org, worldcon.org, wsfs.org,

and nasfic.org websites. If anyone finds mistakes on the websites, please contact the webmaster of the individual website.

E.1.3 MPC Election Results

The election was conducted on Friday. Bob McIntosh and Todd Dashoff were appointed as tellers for the election. After ballots were counted, Mr. McIntosh reported that John Coxon, Linda Deneroff and Dave McCarty were re-elected to the Mark Protection Committee. Without objection, the Chair then instructed the tellers to destroy the ballots.

Nominee	First Ballot	Second Ballot
Linda Deneroff	45	48
Dave McCarty	14	15
John Coxon	9	10
Mike Willmoth	5	
Spoiled Ballots	3	
Total Ballots	76	

E.1.4 MPC Appointments

On Saturday, after the announcement of the Site Selection results, Paul Dormer was appointed to the MPC as the representative from Dublin until 2021.

E.2. Standing Committees of the Business Meeting

E.2.1 Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

The members of the NPFSC for 2016-2017 are Donald Eastlake (Chair), Jared Dashoff, Linda Deneroff, Tim Illingworth, Jesi Pershing, and Kevin Standlee. The authority of this committee stems from:

Standing Rule 7.7: Nitpicking and Flyspecking Committee

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

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

The committee is willing to serve for another year.

Actions: The current list is at <http://www.wsfs.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/2016-Rulings-of-Continuing-Effect-for-2017.pdf>

Recommendations: The Committee recommends passage of the following standing rule changes and amendment: [A.1 No Candidate Regions](#); [A.2 No Vanishing Business](#); [A.3 Debate Time Streamlining](#); and [D.2 The Reasonable Amendment](#).

On Friday, Donald E. Eastlake III explained the function of the NP&FS committee maintains a list of rulings and resolutions of continuing effect. It works on improving the rules by fixing glitches and inconsistencies. This year, he said the committee was proposing four items. Items A.1 and A.3 were adopted on Thursday; A.2 was referred to a committee to report back later on Friday; and B.3 was a new constitutional amendment, also coming up later on Friday. Mr. Eastlake thought they were pretty simple changes that he hoped would improve the rules. There were no questions, and the WSFS BM Chair reappointed the committee (Donald Eastlake, Jared Dashoff, Linda Deneroff, Tim Illingworth, Jesi Pershing, and Kevin Standlee) *in situ* and appointed himself chair of the NP&FSC (unless the committee decides later to pick someone else).

E.2.2 Worldcon Runners Guide Editorial Committee

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

Standing Rule 7.8: Worldcon Runners Guide Editorial Committee

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

The Worldcon Runners Guide Committee continues to make incremental progress in updating the online guide. We hope to have more improvements by the time Worldcon 75 occurs this August.

Mike Willmoth made his report on Friday. He said there had been some progress this year, but he had no access to the website. He recommended that the Guide be moved to

another site under WSFS control, either to wsfs.org or some equivalent site. The committee was then reappointed *in situ*, with the right to appoint other members at Mr. Willmoth's discretion. The Chair also suggested that Mr. Willmoth consult with the Hugo Awards Marketing Committee if he wished to move the Guide to another domain.

Judith Herman was added to the committee on Saturday.

E.3 Special Committees

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

The Long List Committee has continued to curate the Long List of Worldcons. This has been a quiet year with the only correction being an update to the Baycon attendance numbers for 1968.

The Long List Committee for 2016-2017 consists of Mark Olson (Chair), David G. Grubbs, Joe Siclari, Kent Bloom, Colin Harris, Kevin Standlee, Tim Illingworth, and Ben Yalow.

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

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

There was no verbal report. Without objection, the committee was continued for another year as currently constituted.

E.3.2 YA Award Study Committee

This an abridged version of the committee's report; the full version is available online (http://www.worldcon.fi/files/YA_Award_Full_Report.pdf) and limited print copies will be provided at the Business Meeting.

Chair: Anna Blumstein

Co-chairs: Helen Gbala and Katie Rask

Committee Members: Warren Buff, Tim Illingworth, Joshua Kronengold, Laura Lamont, Julia Mccracken, Farah Mendlesohn, David Peterson, Christine Rake, Marguerite Smith, Adam Tesh, Clark Wierda, Lewis Wolkoff

YA Author Members: Leigh Bardugo, Kate Elliott, Daniel José Older

WFSF Parliamentary Advisor: Kevin Standlee

INTRODUCTION

The WSFS Business Meeting in Helsinki in 2017 is scheduled to ratify an award to honor the best Young Adult book of the year. The award received first passage in 2016. The award would be nominated and voted on as part of the Hugo Awards process, but it would not be a Hugo Award. Because the creation of a YA Award had stalled, the 2014 Business Meeting created a committee to study the issue. The 2015-16 committee recommended a Campbell-like Award compromise because the Hugo Award categories emphasize word-count, rather than content and target audience. Given the complex issues associated with naming an award, a provision was included in the proposal to allow for the naming to occur in Helsinki, in 2017.

The committee was re-formed in 2016 in Kansas City and tasked with researching names for the award. Additionally, the committee monitored online debates about the amendment's naming provision and ultimately decided to submit a motion to remove the provision. The reasons for this decision are described in the motion's commentary.

The committee collected public input via several surveys. We engaged in extensive research and also drew on our expertise and judgment, along with participation from a panel of YA professionals, to reach our final recommendations:

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) We recommend that the award be named. Leaving the award unnamed will hinder its ability to gain recognition and prestige.
- 2) We also recommend *against* naming it the “Worldcon Award” because:
 - a) Our surveys indicate that calling the award “Worldcon” was the least popular option,
 - b) The other awards given by WSFS have names other than “Worldcon”
 - c) It would hinder the award's ability to gain recognition and prestige.
- 3) We recommend naming the award “Lodestar,” based on discussion and voting amongst the committee, combined with public feedback. From *lode* (“journey, course, guide”) + star; a Lodestar is a star that guides or leads, especially in navigation, where it is the sole reliable source of light—the star that leads those in uncharted waters to safety. The guiding star frequently appears in speculative fiction and is tied to the notion of the hero's quest. While it evokes stargazers and adventurers, it also calls to mind distant galaxies and travel through space. It therefore applies to both Fantasy and Science Fiction, is international in scope,

and has symbolism that is cross-generational. More about the process we used to recommend the name “Lodestar” is in the full report on the website.

- 4) We recommend that last year’s proposal be ratified without the null and that the provision allowing naming the award in a single year be removed. We have submitted an amendment to the proposal with these changes. If the award passes this year, then it would be presented at San Jose, but would not be named.
- 5) We also recommend that the naming process begin this year. We are introducing a new amendment to the WSFS Constitution that would name the award. We have left the name blank so that it can be filled at the Business Meeting using IRV. If this amendment passes, a named award would first be given at the 2019 Worldcon.

We do not request to continue the Committee, unless the Business Meeting recommends doing so.

We have compiled an extensive report with our findings, to assist the Business Meeting in naming the Award. The first section explains the complex factors underpinning name selection, and our process. The second and third sections describe the public surveys we created, with their findings. Exhibits 1-3 provide the data from our surveys. Only Exhibit 2 is included in the abridged report in the agenda. Tables 1-7 are included in the extended report online.

RESEARCH AND PROCESS

The committee sought feedback from the broader community through a series of surveys. We targeted both members of the SFF fandom community and members of the YA community. We also hoped that these surveys would increase knowledge of and interest in the award.

We invited three YA authors and a YA publisher to participate on the committee as ‘YA experts.’

After taking in ideas, the Committee created a shortlist (more on this process in the next section). The shortlist was featured in a public questionnaire and consisted of the top five names plus “Worldcon,” which was considered the default option: Anansi, Lodestar, Ouroboros, Spellcaster, Tesseract, Worldcon.

NAMING CONSIDERATIONS

Because we all did not completely agree on the most important selection criteria, the process of narrowing down the name entries was tricky and at times contentious. The

sometimes-conflicting criteria were valued differently by various committee members, as we reviewed the entries. Examples of various selection criteria included:

Represents both science-fiction and fantasy genres, or all speculative fiction

Cross-generational appeal and continuing relevance to future generations, i.e. “evergreen”

Celebrates the history of SFF books for young people, or should not be tied to a particular book/series world

International appeal rather than focused on one national/linguistic tradition

Follows Worldcon traditions in award naming

Any referenced book should be YA, or it can reference children’s literature books

Evocative of SFF themes and concepts

Memorable idea/image for increasing award recognition

Name conveys coming-of-age idea, or name avoids “condescending” coming-of-age ideas

Name respects problem solving skills, maturity, and intelligence of teens

Name should not imply that YA is simply a stepping-stone or doorway to better “adult” SFF

After much debate, we disqualified suggestions based on the following criteria:

- 1) Already used for other award names,
- 2) Living individuals,
- 3) Trademark or branding concerns.

We felt that living individuals were not eligible because some international Worldcon communities (e.g., Europe) consider it inappropriate to name an award after a living person, not to mention doing so requires the individual’s permission.

TRADEMARKS AND PERMISSIONS

We were conscious of trademarks as we analyzed the entries for two reasons.

First, we thought it best to avoid legal action against WSFS by using names already registered as trademarks in the U.S. (We could potentially use a word for an award name that was already trademarked if (a) the trademark owner gave us permission, or (b) there was no real conflict/overlap in use. For practical reasons we avoided (a) and *tried* to be aware of (b).) We checked names electronically: <http://tmsearch.uspto.gov/>.

Second, the Mark Protection Committee may want to trademark the award, and so we tried to keep that option open. Not only would we need to avoid using already trademarked words, but also a rep from the MPC noted that, based on past WSFS efforts with the USPTO, the service mark must be “distinctive and non-generic.”

Personal Names

The issue that caused the greatest conflict among the committee was whether to use names of real people. Because a number of authors were suggested in the Name Collection Questionnaire, some committee members felt that they should be included on the shortlist, but others were very opposed. At the end of the shortlist creation procedure, no authors were included.

Some of the main points of debate included:

Arguments for Using Personal Name

- A person’s name recalls the history of SFF literature
- The Hugo/Campbell Awards are themselves named after editors
- Celebrates professionals who influenced current Worldcon readers/writers
- 52% of the respondents said they would prefer the award to be named after a person when asked to choose a category of naming type
- Avoiding author names in order to prevent offensiveness can border on discrimination or erasure

Arguments against Using Personal Names

- 48% voted that the award should be called something other than a person’s name
- Award should celebrate SFF worlds and ideas, not individual people
- Award designation shouldn’t be about “us” and what we liked, but instead about current and future teens
- Better to have more universal name that can have meaning for each generation, rather than one that may become outdated and meaningless to later readers
- Worldcon is an international community, but individual authors are inherently associated with specific nations and languages
- Not the award’s job to “educate” the youth by naming the award after one particular author
- Teens’ changing social expectations make the work of several of the suggested authors objectionable

- Because early SFF YA was a didactic genre, most writers had agendas that will be unacceptable to people today
- Naming an award after a person expresses approval for *all* the author's books, including any that are unfitting
- Ties the award too closely to the life of the named person, so that their baggage carries over to the award
- Many people on public forums said emphatically that they were opposed to a person-name
- Attempts to name award after person will lead to very heated and contentious debates, which will hurt the award

One of the most common nomination trends was that people suggested authors they read when they were a young. Personal experience (and thus age) greatly influenced the name suggestions. There was a clear link between the age of the voters and which author they suggested, since they usually picked an author that chronologically coincided with their teens.

Because expectations change, several early SFF favorites may not appeal to teens today and in the future. Popular writers who were suggested in the name collection polls included those whose works exhibit problematic representations of girls and women, a penchant for “fat shaming” or negative commentary on appearance, questionable portrayals of diverse sexualities and racial stereotypes, use of fiction as a vehicle for evangelical or religious messages, and inappropriate teen-adult sexual relations.

While historical contexts at the time an author wrote may have been different than they are now, teens today and tomorrow experience these works differently. Some committee members felt that we should highlight SFF history by honoring authors, while others felt that we should ensure teens view the award in a positive light, by being aware of their ever-changing reading experiences.

PUBLIC FEEDBACK AND SURVEY PROCESS

Initial Collection of Ideas

We sought the public's assistance in collecting name ideas for consideration. We did so through informal means and formal means. The formal means were a series of official questionnaires and polls. The informal efforts included brainstorming possibilities, which the committee began doing in 2015. We also recorded suggestions posted in the SMOFs closed listserv, discussion boards, Facebook threads, Twitter, and other platforms. We created the “Worldcon YA” Facebook page and Twitter account (@WorldconYA) in order to promote feedback opportunities and to share news.

Our first official survey, the Name Idea Poll, was a simple form asking responders to enter any suggested award titles. It was shared on Facebook and received 41 responses.

Name Collection Questionnaire

The Name Collection Questionnaire asked that respondents to suggest designations for the award, as well as a few related demographic questions (See Exhibit 1 in the full report). The point of this questionnaire was not to learn which names were most popular but simply to gather ideas from a variety of interested people. This questionnaire ran from early September 2016 until November 2016.

We heavily promoted the questionnaire. A professional graphic designer on the committee developed outreach materials for both social media and print. We also followed online discussions about the questionnaire and observed that several “movements” developed with the purpose of encouraging certain name types over others. For example, some groups argued that underrepresented authors should be honored, so that after October 25, author suggestions derived almost exclusively from a limited list of female writers. There were informal campaigns on behalf of some authors that gained traction on Twitter. Campaigns by the parties representing authors also became involved (e.g., announcements made by Madeleine L’Engle’s official Twitter account and tweets by her family).

The Name Collection Questionnaire garnered 1,116 responses, with a total of 456 name suggestions. After combining the public’s suggestions with the other names we had already compiled, we had a master list of ca. 460 unique name ideas. (See Exhibit 2 below.)

Of the suggestions, 108 (24%) were already used in other award titles and 24 (5%) had trademark concerns.

We also asked respondents about which category of name (Person, Thing, Idea or Generic) they would prefer. 5.65% preferred generic, 16.67% preferred Idea, 23.57% preferred a thing, and 54.12% preferred a real person. Respondents were asked their age category, but so few people responded in any category other than adult that we were not able to analyze the entries based on this data.

Sponsorship

Angus Killick from Macmillan Children’s Publishing contacted WSFS to suggest the name L’Engle for the award. He manages the division’s marketing. Killick explained that they and the L’Engle family were interested in any way of honoring L’Engle,

given that 2018 is the release of the *Wrinkle in Time* movie and it is the 100th anniversary of L'Engle's birth.

A WSFS member suggested to Killick that Macmillan consider sponsoring the award. Killick indicated that Macmillan's sponsorship was dependent on the award being named after L'Engle. As we noted in our previous report in Kansas City in 2016, sponsorship is not required for a new award, nor is it financially necessary. If the award were managed in the manner of Dell Magazines' sponsorship of the Campbell award, MacMillan would designate the award parameters, design and provide the trophy, and could choose someone to present the award, while WSFS would administer the award on the same ballot as the Hugos.

The committee debated the issue. Concerns about the independence, or perceived independence, of the award arose, as did logistical problems. We also felt that we still needed to give the public an opportunity to provide feedback on various name options, in order to provide data to the Business Meeting. Ultimately, the committee did not include L'Engle on the shortlist. Because MacMillan is interested in honoring L'Engle in any way, and they see 2018 as an especially important year, we encourage San Jose or other interested parties to contact Killick and MacMillan.

Committee's Process for Generating the Shortlist

After these polls closed, the YA committee began considering the public's feedback. We began discussing the questionnaire results, looking at names that received multiple entries, and those that we found compelling. We then started disqualifying suggestions based on criteria listed above. We found that many of the best suggestions were already used for other awards or were trademarked.

We then individually picked up-to-ten names to place on the shortlist. After compiling this "medium list" and debating the options, each committee member voted on their five favorite names from the "medium list" to create the final shortlist. The shortlist consisted of the top five names plus "Worldcon," which was considered the default option: Anansi, Lodestar, Ouroboros, Spellcaster, Tesseract, Worldcon.

Cultural Sensitivity and Cross-cultural Awareness

After the committee settled on the shortlist, the chairs sought to vet the options with respect to cultural sensitivity and cross-cultural awareness. We contacted people who work on cultural sensitivity a) in fandom (e.g., diversity-oriented fan groups and convention committees) and b) in a professional capacity (authors, editors, commentators, and academics). Over email, we invited 15 people to provide feedback. We received 9 responses.

General Summary of the Responses:

- Anansi: Okay to use (2 responses); You shouldn't use (6 responses)
- Lodestar: Okay to use (7 responses); You shouldn't use (1 response)
- Ouroboros: Okay to use (5 responses); You shouldn't use (3 responses)
- Spellcaster: Okay to use (6 responses); You shouldn't use (2 responses)
- Tesseract: Okay to use (7 responses); You shouldn't use (1 response)

The Public Shortlist Voting Survey

We evaluated this shortlist using a public Shortlist Voting Survey (See Exhibit 3). It was open January 15 to March 15, 2017. There were 650 responses to our Shortlist Voting Survey. The most popular name was "Tesseract" followed by Lodestar, Anansi, Ouroboros, Spellcaster, and finally Worldcon. We also looked at how different categories rated the different names. The only significant difference was in the age category, where the 66+ age range and teens did not rank Tesseract as their top choice (choosing Lodestar and Spellcaster respectively). 94% of the respondents had read a YA book.

The public feedback from the Shortlist Voting Survey revealed, however, that Tesseract is the name of a Canadian speculative-fiction publishing house (Tesseract Books), as well as a long-time anthology begun in 1985 and edited by Judith Merril. The Tesseract Anthology has 20 volumes, it won the Aurora Award, and it includes stories by Hugo and Campbell Award winners.

After acquiring the Shortlist Voting Survey results, the Chairs reached out to EDGE/Tesseract Books. The publisher asked that we not use the name. Therefore, given the term's established use by SFF colleagues and Canadian fandom, as well as the explicit request of Tesseract Books, the committee agreed that the name Tesseract should not be used.

The next most popular name was Lodestar. After some discussion, the committee voted 10 to 5 to recommend the name Lodestar.

EXHIBITS 1 AND 3:

See http://www.worldcon.fi/files/YA_Award_Full_Report.pdf

EXHIBIT 2: COMPLETE LIST OF SUGGESTIONS FROM ALL SOURCES

Symbols: Already an award:
Copyright issues: ©
Living person: L

Abell(1,)
Above Time and Space (1)
Abracadabra (1)
Adventures of the Literary (1)
Age of Wonder (3)
Alanna (1)
Alchemist (2, book title)
Aleph (1)
Alice (in Wonderland) (3)
Alice Dalgliesh (3)
Alicorn (1)
All Aboard (1)
Andre Alice Norton (22,)
Andromeda (Constellation) (2)
Anne McCaffery (12)
Anywhere But Here (1)
Ardath Mayhar (1)
Asterias (1)
Aurora (3,)
Auryn (2)
Avalon (1)
Awardy McAwardface (2)
Bardic (1,)
Beacon (1,)
Best How Even Reaction Scene! (1)
Best Other-wordly YA (1)
Best YA Book of 20XX (5)
Bernie Sanders (1, L)
Betwixt (1, sff mag)
Beyond (1)
Beyond Imagination (1)
Beyond the World (2)
Blazer (1)
BLLEMY - for Butler, Le Guin, L'Engle,
McCaffrey, and Yolen (1, L? (Le Guin &
Yolen))
Blooms of Youth (1)
Bookest (1)
Brave New World (1, book title)
Brian Jacques (1)
Bright Blooms (1)
Bright New Flame (1)
Bright Spirits (1)
Broad Vision (1)
Broader Horizons (1, community org)
BRYA (Best Reading for YA) (2)
Bubbles (1)
Buffy Summers (1)
Building Brighter Futures (1, book title)
Calliope (1,)
Camazotz (1)
Captivating (1)
Charles Lutwidge Dodgson (3,)
Chesterfield Sofa (1)
Chimaera (1, press)
Chosen One (1, book title)
Chrestomanci (4)
Citizen of the Galaxy (1, book title)
C.L. Moore (2)
Clockwork(1)
Codex (2,)
Comet (1,)
Coming of Age (1)
Compass(3,)
Constellation and Peregrination (1)
Constellations (1,)
Cosmic Connection (1, book title)
Crooked kingdom (1, book title)
Crows (1)
C.S. Lewis (9, 'Clive Staples')
Dark Woods (1)
Dawn Ascendant (2)
Diane Duane (4, L)
Deep Breath (1)
DeLorean (1, ©)
Destiny (1)
Detcon1 (1)
Diana Wynne Jones (128)
Doorway (1)
Dorothy Gale (1)
DoublePlusGood (1)
Douglas Adams(3)
Dragon, Young D., Fire D. (4,)
Dragon Glass (1)
Dream Catcher (1,)
Dreamers, Young D. (2)
Dreamland (1)
Dwarf Star (1,)
Eager (1)
Earthling (1)
Earthsea, New Earthsea (6, ©)
Edge (1, , press)
Edith Nesbit (2)
Effulgent (1)

Ellipsis (1, 'Ellipse')
 Elroy Jetson (1)
 Emerging Voices (1)
 Emoji (1)
 Empyrean (1)
 Enchantment (1, 'Land of E.')
 Ender Wiggin (2)
 Envisioning the Future through Sci- Fi (1)
 Epic (1,)
 Equinox (1)
 Etheral (2,)
 Event Horizon (1)
 Excellence in Young Adult SFF (1)
 Excelsior (2,)
 Expanded Horizons (1)
 Explorer (2,)
 Extraordinary Imaginary (1)
 F. Orlin Tremayne (1)
 Fae (1, 'F.A.E.')
 Fairy Dust (1)
 Fantabulous Fantasy Novel (1)
 Fanta-galactical (one word) (1)
 Far Out (1, name of business)
 Farandolae (1)
 Farthest Shore (1, book title)
 Fiction for Developing Minds (1)
 Fictioneer (1)
 Firebird (1,)
 Firebolt (1,)
 Flashlights (1)
 Flights into Imagination (1)
 FOMO (1)
 Formative for Young Adult fiction (1)
 Frank Herbert (1)
 Freedom Focus (1)
 Frodo Baggins (1, ©)
 Frontier (1,)
 Future (2,)
 Galaxy, Young Galaxy (4,)
 Galaxy's Finest (1)
 Galileo (1,)
 Gateway (4,)
 Gardener of Worlds (1)
 Gateway to Oz (1)
 Ged (1, 'GED')
 George R.R. Martin (1, L)
 Generation Ship (5, 'Next Generation Ship')
 Giver (2, book title)
 Glimmer (1, 'Glimmer Train')
 Goblet of Fire (1)
 Golden Age (1,)
 Golden Age of Science Fiction (1)
 Golden Gnome (1,)
 Golden Manticore (1, 'Rampant Manticore')
 Golden Snitch (6, ©)
 Good Writing (1)
 GoshWow (1)
 Grogard (1)
 Ground Control (1)
 Griffin/Gryphon/Gryffin (3,)
 H. G. Wells (2,)
 Harper (1,)
 Harry Potter (2, ©)
 Hebe (2)
 Heinlein(20,)
 Hermione Granger (7, ©)
 Hero of Your Own Destiny (a YODA, for short) (1, YODA©)
 Hogwarts (2, ©)
 Holden Caulfield (1)
 Homer (1,)
 Hope (1,)
 Horizon, Young/NewHorizon(8,)
 Howler (1)
 Hubble (Telescope) (1,)
 Hugo, Hugoette, Yugo (20,)
 Hyperspace (1)
 Idun (1)
 Illuminae (1, book title)
 Imaginary (1)
 Imaginator (1)
 Imagine (1,)
 Impossible (1)
 Infinite Possibilities (1)
 Inkling (1)
 Innovation (1,)
 Insanity (1)
 Interstellar (3)
 Interstellar Pig (1, book title)
 Intrepid (1,)
 Iron Heart (1)
 Isaac Asimov (1)
 J. K. Rowling(37, L)
 J.P. Travers (1)
 J.R.R. Tolkien(5, ©)
 J.R.R. Tolkien Fellowship (1, ©)
 Jane Yolen (18, L,)
 Joan Aiken (2)
 John Bellairs (3)
 John Christopher (2)
 John Ringo (1, L)
 Jophan (1)
 Judy Blume (4, L)
 Juve, Juvie (2, ©)
 Katniss Everdeen (1, ©)
 Keene (1)

Keychain (1)
 Kitchen Sink (1)
 Kraken (2)
 Kurt Vonnegut (1,)
 Labyrinth (1, possible ©)
 Lamp Post, Golden (3)
 Lantern (1,)
 Last Unicorn (1, book title)
 Leapfor YA SFF (1)
 Least Romantic and Mary Sue (1)
 Legacy (1,)
 Lighthouse (1,)
 Limitless World (1)
 Literary Explorer (1)
 Literary Pulse (1)
 Lloyd Alexander (5)
 Lodestar (1)
 Lodestone (1)
 Lois Lowery (9, L)
 Looking Glass (1)
 Lumos (1,)
 Maddy (1,)
 Madelaine L'Engle (243)
 Madeleine L'Engle Galaxy (1)
 Maggie (for Magic) (1,)
 Magic, Myths, and Meteors (1)
 Magience (1, webcomic title)
 Mary Shelley (10,)
 Maureen Daly (1)
 Meg Murray (2)
 Megrez (1)
 Menolly (1)
 Michael Ende (1)
 Middle-Earth (1, ©)
 Midgard (1)
 Midnight (1)
 Misfit (1, possible ©)
 Mockingjay (2, ©)
 Mogget (1)
 Monica Hughes (2,)
 Morrigan (2)
 Mrs. Whatsit (1)
 Na (1)
 Nadsat (1)
 Narnia (1, ©)
 Nautilus (1,)
 Neal Shusterman (2, L)
 Nearos (1)
 Nebula (1,)
 Neil Gaiman (4, L)
 Nesbit (1)
 New Age (1)
 New Dawn (1)
 New Generations (1,)
 New Heights (1)
 New Hope (1)
 New Universe
 New Vistas (1)
 Next Generation (2,)
 Night Sky (1)
 Nova (4,)
 Not Quite Talented Enough For Those Who
 Write For Adults (1)
 Octavia Butler (6)
 Odyssey (1,)
 Okazigo (1)
 Optimus Prime (1)
 Orson Scott Card (3, L)
 Otherworld (1, ©)
 Ouroboros (1)
 Out of This World (3)
 Outstanding Achievement in YA Spec Fic (2)
 Owl (1,)
 Padawan (1)
 Page Turner (1,)
 Pari (1)
 Path (1,)
 Pathfinder (1,)
 Patricia C. Wrede (2, L)
 Pern (3, "Dragonriders of..."©)
 Perseus (Constellation) (1,)
 Peter Beagle (1, L)
 Peter Pan (2,)
 Phantom Tollbooth (1)
 Philip Pullman (3, L)
 Phoenix, Rising (6,)
 Piers Anthony (1, L)
 Pluto (1,)
 Podkayne Fries (8)
 Pointy Ear (1)
 Polaris (1,)
 Portal (13,)
 Portkey (1)
 Prime (1,)
 Prince (1)
 Prospective Innovator (1)
 Protostar (4, SF book title)
 Pyxis (mariner's compass) (1,)
 Quasar (1,)
 Quest (2,)
 Quest for Elemental Excellence (1)
 Rabbit Hole (1)
 Radiant (1,)
 Ralph (1)
 Ray Bradbury (5,)
 Raygun (1, possible ©)

Read it and Reap (1)
 Readers for the Future (1)
 Real Imagination (1)
 Rebel (1,)
 Rebellious Voices (1)
 Regeneration (1,)
 Revolutions in Words (1)
 Rise (1,)
 River Styx (1)
 Roald Dahl (1,)
 Rodent of Unusual Size (1)
 Robin McKinley (5, L)
 Roke (1)
 Rookery (1)
 Russies (1)
 S.F. Hinton (4, L)
 Sága (2, Saga=book name)
 Saint-Exubery (1,)
 Sarah J. Maas (1, L)
 Sarah Trimmer (6)
 Scarab (1)
 Scheherazade (2)
 SciFan (1)
 SciFFy (1)
 Sci-Fi and Fantasy (1)
 Scout's (1)
 Scully (1, 'Vin Scully')
 Seeding the Future (1)
 Sense of Wonder (3)
 Shadowstar (1)
 Shannon Hale (1, L)
 Sharyn November (1, L)
 Shepherd's Crown (2)
 Shattered Shell (1)
 Signal (1,)
 Silent Planet (1)
 Silver Scroll (1,)
 Silver Tree (1,)
 Siren (1,)
 Skyrocket (1, ©)
 Snitch (1, ©)
 The Something (1)
 Space Cadet (4)
 Space Dragons (1)
 Spark, Young Spark (3,)
 Specter (1)
 Spellcaster (2)
 Sprout (1,)
 St. Exupery Asteroid (1)
 Stanford Torus (1)
 Star (1,)
 Starlight (4,)
 Stargazer (3,)
 Star Magic (1)
 Star Witches (1)
 Starfaring (1)
 Sunrise (1, 'State Sunrise')
 Supernova (1)
 Susan Cooper (11, L)
 Suzanne Collins (2, L)
 Syfantasy (1)
 Sylvia Engdahl (1, L)
 T.H. White (1)
 Tamora Pierce (47, L)
 Tan Tan (1)
 Tanith Lee (1)
 TARDIS (2, ©)
 Tauri (3)
 Terry Pratchett (12)
 Tesseract (31 conflict with SFF publisher see report)
 Theodor Seuss Geisel (1)
 There and Back Again (1)
 There Might Be Dragons (1)
 Threshold/The Threshies (3)
 Thor Bradley Rudbek (1)
 Tiffany Aching Lancre Blue (1)
 To Bravely Go (1)
 To Worlds Beyond (1)
 Tomorrow (1)
 Tom Swift (3)
 Tove Jansson (6)
 Trident (1,)
 Triumphant Worldbuilder (1)
 Twain Clemens (1)
 Twilight (1)
 Unboxed (1)
 Unicorn (5,)
 Universe (1)
 Utopia (1)
 Ursula K. Le Guin (90, L)
 V.E. Schwab (1, L)
 Victor Appleton (1)
 Virgo (Constellation) (1) Vision (1,)
 Vogon (1)
 Voice for Young Adults (1)
 Voices of the Future (2)
 Voyager (2)
 Vox Day (1, L)
 Waiting for the Next Speed of Light (1)
 Wardrobe (1)
 William Sleator (1)
 Wings (1,)
 Winston (2)
 Wonderland (3,)
 Worldcon/WSFS (19)

Worlds with Words (1)
Wrinkle in Time (4, book title)
YA Fa (1)
YA Fantasy Book of the Year (1)
YA Sci-Fan (1)
YA Speculative (1)
YALL Choice (1, YALLfest = YA con)
YANAH (Young Adult Not a Hero) (4)
YANAH (Young Adult Not a Hugo) (1)
YaYa (1,)

Young Adult Fantasy
Young Adventure (1)
Young and Mighty (1)
Young Heroes (1,)
Youthful Glow Light Bulb (1)
Youthie (1)
Zenith (1,)
Zenna Henderson (1)
Zilpha Keatley Snyder (1)
Zwitterion (1)

The committee asked not to be reappointed as its work is done. Terry Neill thanked the YA Committee for all their hard work.

E.3.3 Hugo Awards Study Committee

Thursday's Report: Vince Docherty thanked those who offered their names. Since they were to report back the next day, Mr. Docherty felt that since they had only one day in which to create a report, his assumption was that the committee would recommend the specific categories to the committee, excluding the YA category. However, he suggested that those already appointed to the committee meet Friday morning, prior to the convening of the Business Meeting.

Friday's Report: Mr. Docherty thanked everyone who asked to be on the committee (22 members and counting). He confirmed that they will study the three referred items, along with any other recommendations. See [Appendix B](#) of these minutes for the written report, which outlined some of the work to be undertaken.

There was no objection to referring items D.6, D.7 and D.8 (the three Hugo Award changes) back to the Hugo Award Study Committee to report next year.

F. FINANCIAL REPORTS

F.1 Anticipation (Montréal)

**Financial Report
Anticipation
For the period of August 1, 2016 to July 15, 2017**

Balance on August 1, 2016	\$36,168.81
Administrative Fees	\$195.44
Grants	
Smofcon Scholarships	\$2,000.00
SmofConSouth Grant	\$500.00
CostumeCon 38 Grant	\$2,000.00
SFContario Grant	\$1,500.00
Total expenses	\$6,195.44
Balance on July 15, 2017	\$29,973.37

Submitted by René Walling on behalf of Cansmof Inc.

Note 1: All amount in Canadian Dollars (CAD)

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

103-2077 Wilson
Montréal, QC H4A 0A3
Canada

or by e-mail at: cansmof@gmail.com

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

F.2 LoneStarCon 3 (San Antonio)

Remaining Funds August 5, 2016 to July 20, 2017

Date	Description	Amount	Total
8/5/2016	2016 Balance		\$51,891.23
8/19/2016	Children's Programming Grant	\$500.00	\$51,391.23
11/28/2016	SMOFCon Travel Grant - Emma England, The Netherlands	\$600.00	\$50,791.23
7/20/2017	Outstanding Balance		\$50,791.23

Prepared by: Bill Parker
Convention: LoneStarCon 3
Parent Organization: Alamo Literary Art Maintenance Organization
Current Tax Status: a 501©(3) Organization
Address: P.O. Box 27277, Austin, TX 78755-2277
Website: <http://alamo-sf.org>

Officers:
President: Scott Zrubek president@alamo-sf.org
Vice President: Randall Shepherd vicepresident@alamo-sf.org
Secretary: Jonathan Guthrie secretary@alamo-sf.org
Treasurer: Bill Parker treasurer2016@alamosf.org
Communications: Kurt Baty communications@alamo-sf.org
IT: Steve Staton it@alamosf.org
Webmaster: Bill Parker & Clif Davis webmaster@alamo-sf.org

F.3 Detcon 1(Detroit)

Detcon1 Financial Statement

Balance as of 9/1/2015		\$12,726.26
Income		
5/20/2016	Bank adjustment	\$1.00
Expenditures		
10/7/2015	State annual reporting	\$20.00
10/30/2015	Federal taxes and fees	\$1,940.00
12/18/2015	Quicken annual Subscription	\$137.95
5/26/2016	Grant to MidAmericon II for ASL Interpretation	\$1,790.00
8/22/2016	NASFIC 2017 seed money	\$6,000.00
10/1/2016	Monthly bank fees	\$14.00
11/1/2016	Monthly bank fees	\$14.00
12/1/2016	Monthly bank fees	\$14.00
12/27/2016	Science Fiction Outreach Project	\$2,797.31
Closing balance		\$0.00

Submitted by Don Wenzel, Detcon1 Treasurer and Tammy Coxen, Detcon1 Chair
July 8, 2017

Detcon1 was the 2014 NASFiC and was run by Driving the Future, Inc, a 501(c)(7) not-for-profit organization incorporated in Michigan.

*Registered address:
508 Little Lake Dr.
Ann Arbor, MI*

*Contact: Tammy Coxen, President
chair@detcon1.org
734-276-3215*

*Officers:
Tammy Coxen, President
Don Wenzel, Treasurer
David Stein, Secretary*

F.4 Sasquan (Spokane)

Sasquan Financial Report as of July 20, 2017

Prior Report as of W74:

Convention Income:	\$1,269,690.24
Convention Expenses	<u>\$1,089,320.76</u>
Remaining Funds:	\$180,369.48

Pass-along Distributions:

Pass-Along Distributions:	\$90,185.00
Post-Con Distributions and Grants Prior to Wind Down	<u>\$54,500.00</u>
Funds Remaining at last Report (W74) and Distributed to SWOC:	\$35,684.48

Since W74/July 28, 2016

Misc. Payments/Reimbursements by Sasquan	\$1,295.47
Funds Disbursed to SWOC in December 2016	\$34,389.01
Remaining Funds from W74 Party Advance Fund ⁵	\$3,346.95
Total Sasquan Surplus entrusted to SWOC in January 2017 ⁶	\$37,735.96

⁵ The Cascade Writers Program is a registered non-profit in the State of Washington who provide educational seminars and workshops for the general public interested in writing and publishing. Teachers have included Jay Lake, Ken Scholes, Mark Teppo, Randy Henderson, John Pitts, etc. More information can be found at <http://www.cascadewriters.com>.

Funds Disbursed 2017

Grant to Cascade Writers Program	\$2,500.00
Grant to Science Fiction Outreach Project	<u>\$5,000.00</u>
Total Disbursed as of July 20, 2017	\$7,500.00
Remaining Funds	\$30,235.96

Sasquan has wound down as an organization and disbursed its remaining funds to the parent organization, SWOC. SWOC is a 501(c)(3) organization incorporated in the State of Washington. You can find more information at <http://www.swoc.org>

All Sasquan surplus funds are being kept separate from SWOC's operating budget, which is used to pay for a PO Box and a storage locker as SWOC functions as an umbrella organization for other small, fandom conventions that maintain their own books and funds.

Prepared by: Kathy Bond, SWOC Treasurer katharinebond@gmail.com

Convention: Sasquan

Parent Organization: Seattle Westercon Organizing Committee

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

Address: Sasquan/SWOC; PO Box 88154; Seattle, WA 98138

Website: <http://www.swoc.org>

Officers:

President: Sally Woehrle

Vice President: Jerry Geiseke:

Treasurer: Kathy Bond

Alessandro Oliverez-Sanchez

Dick O'Shea

Adam Bird

Pat Porter

Marah Searle-Kovacevic

Alex Von Thorne

⁶ The Science Fiction Outreach Project is a 501(c)(3) organization who go to Comic Cons to attract book readers to Worldcon and other conventions, gatherings, and clubs. More information can be found at <http://www.science-fiction-outreach.org>.

F.5 MidAmeriCon II (Kansas City)

MidAmeriCon II Financial Statement August 1, 2014 – July 15, 2017

INCOME	AMOUNT	TOTAL	GRAND TOTAL
Memberships		\$805,278.50	
Voting Fees from Loncon		\$24,963.12	
Chairs Office / Finance		\$27,922.34	
<i>Transfer from Bid</i>	\$5,709.47		
<i>Bank Interest</i>	\$3,617.55		
<i>Misc Donations</i>	\$7,409.64		
<i>Writers' Workshop Income</i>	\$780.00		
<i>Party income</i>	\$8,060.68		
<i>Party Ice</i>	\$825.00		
<i>Misc Income</i>	\$1,520.00		
Dealers / Art Show		\$61,978.00	
<i>Dealers Room (PAID Multiple Tables)</i>	\$23,350.00		
<i>Dealers Room (PAID Single Table)</i>	\$6,600.00		
<i>Dealers Room (PAID Booths)</i>	\$13,500.00		
<i>Dealers Room - Power</i>	\$3,000.00		
<i>Art Show - Pre-con Fees (Panel & Table)</i>	\$4,725.00		
<i>Art Show - Pre-con Fees Print Shop</i>	\$825.00		
<i>Art Show - Mail In Fees</i>	\$425.00		
<i>Art Show - At-con (sales commission) 10%</i>	\$5,533.00		
<i>Creators Alley (PAID Prime Day Tables)</i>	\$2,300.00		
<i>Creators Alley (PAID Secondary Day Tables)</i>	\$220.00		
<i>ASFA Donation</i>	\$1,500.00		
Services / Finance		\$16,990.80	
<i>Merchandise</i>	\$5,440.80		
<i>Fees from Mobie Users</i>	\$11,550.00		
Facilities		\$27,217.99	
<i>Marriott Comp Rooms</i>	\$11,003.77		

<i>Suites Income</i>	\$16,214.22	
Advertising and Publications		\$15,847.94
<i>Progress Reports</i>	\$2,719.45	
<i>Souvenir Book</i>	\$13,128.49	
Grants and Pass-Ons		\$99,429.70
<i>LoneStar Con Pass-along</i>	\$30,000.00	
<i>Mil-Phil Pass-along</i>	\$22,400.00	
<i>Sasquan Pass-along</i>	\$28,389.70	
<i>Alamo "Fred" Grant</i>	\$2,000.00	
<i>Driving the Future: ASL Grant</i>	\$1,790.00	
<i>Sasquan Hugo Party Grant</i>	\$2,000.00	
<i>NASA Grant</i>	\$5,000.00	
<i>Plaque</i>	\$750.00	
<i>Bench</i>	\$700.00	
<i>Park</i>	\$3,550.00	
<i>Beatty Lego Grant</i>	\$1,100.00	
<i>Finland Grant for Ustream</i>	\$1,500.00	
<i>SFSFC Grant for WSFS Internet</i>	\$250.00	
Garage Sale		\$1,050.00
	Total Income:	\$1,080,678.39

EXPENDITURES

Chairman's Division			(\$394,280.79)
General Expenses		(\$7,371.52)	
<i>Committee Meetings</i>	(\$5,192.42)		
<i>Travel / Expenses Support</i>	(\$1,450.00)		
<i>Misc Expense</i>	(\$663.10)		
<i>Skype Subscription</i>	(\$66.00)		
Pre-Con		(\$7,141.79)	
<i>Sasquan - Hugo Losers</i>	(\$4,688.41)		
<i>Sasquan - Hugo Nominee Gifts</i>	(\$856.46)		
<i>Sasquan - First Night</i>	(\$1,026.56)		
<i>Sasquan - Shipping</i>	(\$570.36)		
At-Con		(\$3,068.37)	
<i>Chair's Fund</i>	(\$933.85)		
<i>Hugo Losers Party Space</i>	(\$2,134.52)		
Post-Con		(\$217,205.16)	
<i>Reimbursements</i>	(\$178,606.66)		
<i>Mailing Expense</i>	(\$598.50)		

<i>Pass On Funds Helsinki</i>	<i>(\$33,000.00)</i>	
<i>Pass On Funds 2017 NASFIC</i>	<i>(\$5,000.00)</i>	
SFWA Suite Hire		<i>(\$4,799.06)</i>
IT Support		<i>(\$15,703.75)</i>
<i>Software</i>	<i>(\$60.00)</i>	
<i>Internet Services</i>	<i>(\$5,198.35)</i>	
<i>Hardware Purchases</i>	<i>(\$1,470.33)</i>	
<i>Rentals for At-Con- IT</i>	<i>(\$7,371.52)</i>	
<i>Consumables</i>	<i>(\$929.55)</i>	
<i>MailChimp</i>	<i>(\$674.00)</i>	
Guest of Honor		<i>(\$18,271.89)</i>
<i>Kinuko Craft travel</i>	<i>(\$2,417.00)</i>	
<i>Kinuko Craft hotel</i>	<i>(\$762.45)</i>	
<i>Kinuko Craft per diem</i>	<i>(\$500.00)</i>	
<i>Patrick Nielsen Hayden travel</i>	<i>(\$275.20)</i>	
<i>Patrick Nielsen Hayden hotel</i>	<i>(\$609.96)</i>	
<i>Patrick Nielsen Hayden per diem</i>	<i>(\$500.00)</i>	
<i>Teresa Nielsen Hayden travel</i>	<i>(\$275.20)</i>	
<i>Teresa Nielsen Hayden hotel</i>	<i>(\$609.96)</i>	
<i>Teresa Nielsen Hayden per diem</i>	<i>(\$500.00)</i>	
<i>Tamora Pierce travel</i>	<i>(\$1,420.00)</i>	
<i>Tamora Pierce hotel</i>	<i>(\$1,091.93)</i>	
<i>Tamora Pierce per diem</i>	<i>(\$500.00)</i>	
<i>Michael Swanwick travel</i>	<i>(\$1,749.00)</i>	
<i>Michael Swanwick hotel</i>	<i>(\$24.50)</i>	
<i>Michael Swanwick per diem</i>	<i>(\$500.00)</i>	
<i>Pat Cadigan travel</i>	<i>(\$4,429.40)</i>	
<i>Pat Cadigan hotel</i>	<i>(\$33.25)</i>	
<i>Pat Cadigan per diem</i>	<i>(\$500.00)</i>	
<i>GoH Gifts</i>	<i>(\$801.00)</i>	
<i>Kinuko Craft Art Ship</i>	<i>(\$773.04)</i>	
Other Guests		<i>(\$5,319.91)</i>
<i>Fan Fund winners room(s)</i>	<i>(\$894.63)</i>	
<i>Paul and Storm Travel</i>	<i>(\$755.00)</i>	
<i>Paul and Storm Hotel</i>	<i>(\$771.20)</i>	
<i>Astronauts - Travel</i>	<i>(\$1,282.12)</i>	
<i>Astronauts - Hotel</i>	<i>(\$609.96)</i>	
<i>Astronauts - Per Diem</i>	<i>(\$1,007.00)</i>	
GOH Book		<i>(\$4,264.17)</i>
<i>PNH Royalties</i>	<i>(\$500.00)</i>	
<i>Production Cost</i>	<i>(\$3,764.17)</i>	

Event Tech		(\$95,027.27)	
Main Stage	(\$85,591.03)		
Second Stage	(\$8,936.53)		
Office	(\$499.71)		
Exhibit Tech		(\$16,107.90)	
Hospitality	(\$9,746.80)		
Flex Activities	(\$2,737.28)		
Sports Field	(\$3,623.82)		
Finance Division			(\$64,930.35)
Sales Tax Paid		(\$16,742.28)	
Fees		(\$30,834.46)	
Credit Card Fees	(\$20,303.09)		
PayPal Fees	(\$2,014.84)		
Square Fees	(\$7,806.08)		
Other Bank Fees	(\$710.45)		
Insurance and Liscensing		(\$4,553.79)	
Insurance	(\$3,833.79)		
ASCAP	(\$720.00)		
Pre-Con Expenses		(\$572.65)	
Office Expenses	(\$365.37)		
Postage (pre-con)	(\$207.28)		
At-Con Expenses		(\$12,227.17)	
Registration - Badges	(\$3,691.00)		
(\$3,497.74)			
Registration Forms at Con	(\$316.00)		
Treasury / Cashier Expenses	(\$1,472.64)		
Registration Computers, Printers, Squares	(\$800.00)		
Travel - registration equipment/badges	(\$834.79)		
Power Drop for Registration Area	(\$127.50)		
Internet for Registration	(\$1,487.50)		
Facilities Division			(\$147,029.94)
Convention Center		(\$112,441.90)	
Convention Center Hire	(\$78,760.00)		
Convention Center Internet	(\$1,700.00)		
EMT Services	(\$2,093.60)		
Paid Security	(\$29,888.30)		
Convention Center Catering		(\$20,010.91)	
KCCC Water	(\$5,010.91)		
Aramark - Limited Corkage	(\$15,000.00)		

Facilities (Not CC)		(\$135.00)	
<i>Marriott Convention Space Rental</i>	(\$135.00)		
Tips		(\$310.00)	
WSFS Business Meeting		(\$1,374.93)	
<i>Business Meeting - Printing</i>	(\$69.67)		
<i>Business Meeting - Coffee</i>	(\$986.26)		
<i>Site Selection 2018</i>	(\$159.50)		
<i>Site Selection NASFIC 2017</i>	(\$159.50)		
Hugo Admin		(\$12,757.20)	
<i>Hugo Rockets</i>	(\$4,204.42)		
<i>Hugo Rocket Base Construction</i>	(\$5,643.43)		
<i>Hugo Award Shipping Boxes</i>	(\$101.21)		
<i>Hugo Postage</i>	(\$208.14)		
<i>Retro-Hugo Rocket Base Construction</i>	(\$2,600.00)		
Exhibits Division			(\$163,432.92)
Fixed Exhibits		(\$6,556.61)	
<i>GoH Exhibits</i>	(\$1,043.06)		
<i>All Other Displays</i>	(\$1,493.44)		
<i>Star Wars Exhibits (toys, legos)</i>	(\$1,725.12)		
<i>WHO Exhibit Shipping</i>	(\$1,095.54)		
<i>NASA Shipping</i>	(\$940.63)		
<i>Exhibits Shipping</i>	(\$258.82)		
Art Show		(\$9,498.53)	
<i>Panel Shipping / Transport</i>	(\$2,502.17)		
<i>Artshow Lighting</i>	\$14.14		
<i>Prizes for Artshow</i>	(\$500.00)		
<i>Art Show Tech</i>	(\$1,449.20)		
<i>Packing and Shipping Expenses</i>	(\$1,698.23)		
<i>Art Show Reception</i>	(\$2,099.82)		
<i>ASFA Breakfast</i>	(\$488.04)		
<i>SFWA Lunch</i>	(\$775.21)		
Power		(\$2,040.00)	
Logistics		(\$7,055.31)	
<i>KC Storage Rental</i>	(\$864.23)		
<i>MIMO - Van Driver / Hire</i>	(\$1,094.23)		
<i>MIMO - Crew Food and Drink</i>	(\$515.36)		
<i>Tools and various needs to MIMO</i>	(\$121.62)		
<i>Boston Shipment</i>	(\$4,459.87)		
Signage		(\$9,615.15)	
<i>Signage</i>	(\$9,191.22)		

Supplies	(\$423.93)	
Consuite		(\$17,998.50)
Consuite Equipment	(\$753.07)	
Consuite Food & Beverage	(\$15,295.43)	
Bartenders	(\$1,950.00)	
Fan Fair		(\$7,488.17)
Giant Balloon Floats	(\$1,500.00)	
Sportsfield/Stadium	(\$831.28)	
River	(\$2,947.85)	
Photo Ops	(\$209.39)	
Midway Games	(\$1,014.99)	
Cleaning Materials	(\$112.35)	
Other Fan Fair Activities	(\$553.22)	
Fan Hospitality Tasting	(\$245.00)	
Quilting and Craft Supplies	(\$74.09)	
Decorator		(\$102,125.22)
MIMO - Forklifts	(\$5,830.00)	
MIMO - Hall Rigging	(\$8,727.21)	
Furniture, Decorator	(\$69,836.97)	
Big Top Materials/Production	(\$979.60)	
Throne, GoT Exhibit	(\$4,750.00)	
Exhibits all Power in Halls	(\$8,627.50)	
Plaque	(\$454.26)	
Bench	(\$600.00)	
Park	(\$2,319.68)	
Gaming		(\$1,055.43)
Program Division		(\$36,805.13)
Program Ops		(\$1,653.09)
General Supplies	(\$660.62)	
Pink Paper for Updates	(\$992.47)	
Green Room Catering		(\$12,943.69)
Fan Lounge		(\$116.54)
Kids Programming		(\$5,000.00)
Programming Tech		(\$17,040.16)
Writers Workshop		(\$51.65)
Events Division		(\$17,007.00)
Opening Ceremony		(\$831.00)
Dance Expenses		(\$112.59)
Masquerade		(\$1,825.16)

<i>Masquerade Photography</i>	<i>(\$450.00)</i>		
<i>Masquerade Green Room</i>	<i>(\$1,375.16)</i>		
Campbell Event			<i>(\$2,644.18)</i>
<i>Campbell Food</i>	<i>(\$2,494.18)</i>		
<i>Campbell Bartender</i>	<i>(\$150.00)</i>		
Hugo Ceremony			<i>(\$10,494.07)</i>
<i>Hugo Ceremony Admin</i>	<i>(\$612.38)</i>		
<i>Cash Bar</i>	<i>(\$1,552.13)</i>		
<i>Bartenders</i>	<i>(\$300.00)</i>		
<i>Pre-Hugo Reception</i>	<i>(\$8,029.56)</i>		
Retro Hugo			<i>(\$1,100.00)</i>
<i>Swing Dance</i>	<i>(\$950.00)</i>		
<i>Bartender</i>	<i>(\$150.00)</i>		
Services Division			<i>(\$55,234.48)</i>
Quartermaster			<i>(\$4,862.31)</i>
<i>Office Supplies</i>	<i>(\$4,337.08)</i>		
<i>Postage</i>	<i>(\$82.17)</i>		
<i>Photocopying</i>	<i>(\$443.06)</i>		
Ribbons			<i>(\$2,949.04)</i>
Childcare			<i>(\$14,036.03)</i>
<i>Kiddiecorp Net Payment</i>	<i>(\$11,983.00)</i>		
<i>Material</i>	<i>(\$31.15)</i>		
<i>Suite Hire</i>	<i>(\$2,021.88)</i>		
Accessibility			<i>(\$19,643.01)</i>
<i>Mobie Hire</i>	<i>(\$13,007.01)</i>		
<i>CART Services</i>	<i>(\$3,315.00)</i>		
<i>ASL Services</i>	<i>(\$3,321.00)</i>		
Volunteers			<i>(\$12,344.09)</i>
<i>Volunteer Rewards</i>	<i>(\$3,084.00)</i>		
<i>Food Vouchers</i>	<i>(\$8,602.63)</i>		
<i>Voucher Printing</i>	<i>(\$657.46)</i>		
Incident Response Team			<i>(\$1,400.00)</i>
<i>Communications</i>	<i>(\$900.00)</i>		
<i>Response Training</i>	<i>(\$500.00)</i>		
Publications			<i>(\$63,259.13)</i>
Publications			<i>(\$21,704.74)</i>
<i>PR0 - Production</i>	<i>(\$1,403.60)</i>		
<i>PR1 - Production</i>	<i>(\$4,685.25)</i>		
<i>PR1 - Mailing</i>	<i>(\$474.98)</i>		

<i>PR2 - Production</i>	<i>(\$7,419.89)</i>		
<i>PR2 - Mailing</i>	<i>(\$1,005.93)</i>		
<i>PR3 - Production</i>	<i>(\$5,062.90)</i>		
<i>PR3 - Mailing</i>	<i>(\$1,652.19)</i>		
At Con Publications		<i>(\$40,244.39)</i>	
<i>Souvenir Book</i>	<i>(\$22,116.38)</i>		
<i>Hugo Awards Program</i>	<i>(\$1,920.36)</i>		
<i>Pocket Program/Convention Guide</i>	<i>(\$16,104.14)</i>		
<i>Newsletter</i>	<i>(\$103.51)</i>		
Paper		<i>(\$1,310.00)</i>	
Marketing			<i>(\$16,255.68)</i>
Advertising (Outbound)		<i>(\$7,071.07)</i>	
<i>Fan Advertising</i>	<i>(\$2,373.25)</i>		
<i>Semi-Pro / Pro Advertising / Pro Online</i>	<i>(\$2,960.00)</i>		
<i>Social Media</i>	<i>(\$396.17)</i>		
<i>Local Advertising</i>	<i>(\$1,341.65)</i>		
Convention and Open Events		<i>(\$3,454.92)</i>	
<i>Loncon</i>	<i>(\$2,053.60)</i>		
<i>Sasquan</i>	<i>(\$750.14)</i>		
<i>US Regionals & Other</i>	<i>(\$651.18)</i>		
Promotional Materials		<i>(\$5,729.69)</i>	
<i>Flyers/Brochures/Reg Forms</i>	<i>(\$847.50)</i>		
<i>Convention Table Fees</i>	<i>(\$905.00)</i>		
<i>(\$1,694.39)</i>			
<i>Mailing Costs</i>	<i>(\$28.28)</i>		
<i>Table Swag : Give-a-Ways</i>	<i>(\$2,254.52)</i>		
		Total Expenses:	<i>(\$958,235.42)</i>
			\$122,442.97

F.6 NorthAmeriCon '17 (Puerto Rico)

NorthAmeriCon '17 Financial Statement

Cash on Hand \$5,712.35

There are still some expense reimbursements pending as well as collection of some income. The net result of these will still have the convention in the black after which a level of reimbursements will be made to zero out funds.

A completely detailed final report of all finances closing the convention will be submitted to the Business Meeting at Worldcon 76

Convention Name: NorthAmeriCon'17

Mailing address: 1313 W. Abram St.
Arlington, TX 76012

Person certifying report: Randall L. Shepherd

Parent corporation: Latin American Literary Society, a Texas Not-for profit Corporation

Corporate address: Latin American Literary Society
1313 W. Abram St.
Arlington, TX 76012

Officers:

President: Pablo Vazquez

Secretary: Randall L. Shepherd

F.7 Worldcon 75 (Helsinki)

Worldcon 75 Financial Statement to July 17, 2017

Income		
PAF	Millennium Falcon	€21,620.00
	Sasquan	€25,402.32
	MAC 2	€28,731.47
Other Donations		€798.71
Grants	Taike	€5,000.00
	Nordiska Kulturfonden	€3,408.36
Site selection fees		€99,940.80
Memberships	Adult 3055	€207,755.00
	First Worldcon 1672	€153,675.00
	Youth 271	€22,810.00
	Child 126	€7,915.00
	Adult upgrade	€83,800.00
	Youth upgrade	€1,290.00
	Supporting 2704	€47,775.00
Day passes		€2,590.00
Paper publicatio	Ns	€2,770.00
Ads	Progress reports	€700.00
	Souvenir book	€13,030.00
	Programme book	€1,425.00
	Restaurant guide	€900.00
	Hugo booklet	€400.00
	Anthology	€300.00
Exhibitors	Vendors	€7,785.00
	Art show	€1,537.00
	Creators alley	€680.00

Merchandise	T-shirts	€3 558,92
	Other	€1,525.47
TOTAL		€747,123.05
Expenses		
Chair		
	Travel reimbursements	€6,225.36
	Hotel reimbursements	€1,244.83
	Staff weekend costs	€26,332.05
	P.O. Box	€790.88
	Other	€783.14
DevOps	Domain and web hosting	€562.74
	Basecamp and Sendgrid	€786.18
	Sponsoring streaming in MAC2	€1,423.01
	Other	€96.62
Design	Progress Report printing	€8,458.05
	Progress report mailing	€4,156.71
	Other	€264.85
Exhibits	Other	€204.16
Facilities	Venue	€357,200.60
Finance	Auditing	€1,128.40
	Bank fees	€836.08
	Payment system fees	€13,800.64
	Currency exchange losses	€7,790.63
	Other	€397.42
GoH	Travel	€8,192.51
	Hotel	€10,100.00
Hospitality	Hugo Losers Party	€8,866.08
Member Services	Accessible hotel room reservations	€8,395.00
Outreach	Tables and parties at other cons	€3,102.63
	Promo items	€2,990.77
	Ads	€3,222.35
	Merchandise	€5,123.25
Programme	Grenadine	€470.58
Turva	Storage	€987.89
TOTAL		€483,977.41
BALANCE ON JULY 17		€263,145.64

Prepared by: Pasi Vihinen, Finance DDH <pasi.vihinen@worldcon.fi>
Approved by: Crystal Huff <crystal@worldcon.fi> and Jukka Halme <jukka@worldcon.fi>, Convention chairs

Convention: Worldcon 75

Parent Organization: Maa ja ilma ry

Address: Worldcon 75, c/o Maa ja ilma ry, PO Box 665, FI-00101 Helsinki, FINLAND

Contact Email: info@worldcon.fi; Jukka Halme <jukka.halme@worldcon.fi>

Convention Website: <http://www.worldcon.fi/>

Other Contact: hallitus@worldcon.fi

Current Tax Status: Non-profit and pre-certified as VAT-free for Worldcon 75

Officers:

Eemeli Aro, Chairman

Pasi Vihinen, Vice Chairman

Sanna Kellokoski, Treasurer

Vesa Sisättö, Secretary

Saija Kyllönen

F.8 Worldcon 76 (San Jose)

**Financial Report
Worldcon 76
For the period of August 20, 2016 to June 30, 2017
(Life of the Convention)**

INCOME	<i>US Dollars</i>
Memberships	
Adult Attending	\$158,405.00
YA Attending	1,060.00
Child Attending	1,060.00
Supporting memberships	5,330.00
Site Selection Fees	53,280.00
Total Memberships	\$219,135.00
Donations and Grants	
General Donations	\$1,875.59
Reg Fee Payment	1,253.15
Passalong Funds: Sasquan	28,395.00
Total Donations and Grants	\$31,523.74
Interest Income	\$91.43
TOTAL INCOME	\$250,750.17
EXPENSE	
Advertising & Parties	
Ads in Other Program Books	\$883.15
Online Advertising	9.70
Flyers (PR 0)	1,367.33
Table Decorations	635.78
Party Room	762.69
Party Supplies	5,761.37
Tips and Misc Party Expenses	220.00
Sponsorship at Other Convention	900.00

Total Advertising & Parties	\$10,540.02
Convention Expenses	
Hugo Nominee Pins (WC75 & WC76)	\$1,012.36
Misc Convention Expenses	106.09
Total Convention Expenses	\$1,118.45
Treasury Expenses	
RegOnline Fees	\$7,017.42
Credit Card & Paypal Fees	
Reg Credit Card Fees	\$4,166.16
Square Fees	1,007.14
Paypal Fees	751.76
Total Credit Card & Paypal Fees	\$5,925.06
Other Treasury Expenses	
Bank Charges	\$3.66
Misc Treasury Expenses	71.30
Total Other Treasury Expenses	\$74.96
TOTAL EXPENSE	\$24,675.91
NET INCOME	\$226,074.26

Membership Count:

Attending (all types)	1408
Supporting	775
Total Memberships	2183

Convention: Worldcon 76

Parent Organization: SFSFC Inc. (San Francisco Science Fiction Conventions Inc.)

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

Address: PO Box 61363, Sunnyvale, CA 94088-1363 USA

Contact Email: info@worldcon76.org

Convention Website: www.worldcon76.org

Officers and Members:

President: David W. Gallaher	Kevin Roche
Vice President: David W. Clark	Cindy Scott
Secretary: Kevin Standlee	Randy Smith
Treasurer: Lisa Deutsch Harrigan	Andy Trembly
Sandra Childress	Jennifer "Radar" Wylie
Bruce Farr	Tom Whitmore, Director Emeritus
Cheryl Morgan	

G. SITE SELECTION RESULTS

Johan Anglemark, the Site Selection administrator for Worldcon 75, announced the results of the selection for 2019.

First Ballot	Mail In	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Total	Winner
Dublin In 2019	208	305	395	252	1160	WINNER
None of the Above	1	0	1	3	5	
Invalid Ballots	2	1	1	0	3	
Minneapolis In '73	2	1	0	0	3	
No Dams	0	1	0	0	1	
Vandemeer Capybara Home	0	1	0	0	1	
Highmore, SD	0	1	0	0	1	
Boa Con World of Leather	0	2	0	0	2	
Xerps in 2010	0	2	0	0	2	
Harlan Ellison's House	0	0	0	3	3	
San Marino	0	0	0	2	2	
Never Again	0	0	0	2	2	
Coober Pe'dy	0	0	0	1	1	
James's Fun House	0	0	0	1	1	
Anywhere in Asia	0	0	1	0	1	
I*5 I 2025	0	0	1	0	1	
Dublin, CA	2	0	1	0	3	
Sodankylä	0	0	1	0	1	
Montreal in 2019	0	0	1	0	1	
Reykjavik, Iceland	1	0	0	0	1	
The Fabulous Bungalow	1	0	0	0	1	
Donald Trump Toupee	1	0	0	0	1	
Rottneest Island	0	0	0	1	1	
Literally anywhere women have more rights than zygotes	0	0	0	1	1	
Total with Preference	216	313	401	266	1196	
Needed to Win					599	
No Preference	12	4	9	6	31	
Total Valid Ballots	228	317	410	272	1227	

The Chair, on behalf of the Business Meeting, thanked the Site Selection tellers. Without objection, the Chair then instructed that the site selection tellers to have the ballots destroyed.

James Bacon, the bid chair, and now chair of the 2019 Wordcon, announced the name of the convention: *Baile Átha Cliath Dhá Mhíle agua a Naoi Déag Comhdháil*

Finscéalaidocht an Domhan An Seachtó-Seachtú Athinsint Domhanchon Éireannach, which translates to “Dublin 2019, an Irish Worldcon” in Dublin, Ireland. He hoped everyone at the meeting would also attend the Dublin Worldcon. The GOHs will be Professor Dame Jocelyn Bell Burnell, Ginjer Buchanan, Mary and Bill Burns, Diane Duane, Steve Jackson, and Ian McDonald.

Currently, Attending memberships are €160 (for those over age 26); Supporting memberships are €40. There will also be a “first Worldcon” price of €100, which is also the Young Adult (13-25 years) price. The price for children from 6-12 years is €60, and for infants (5 and under) it is €5. There will also be a fund to help people get to Dublin. Progress Report 0 was then handed out.

H. QUESTION TIME

Question time was limited to 5 minutes per convention.

H.1 Worldcon 76 in 2018, San Jose, California

Kevin Roche announced that artist John Picacio and musician/technologist Frank Hayes would be additional guests of honor. Membership rates will be increasing on September 1. The attending membership rate will be \$210; the active duty/first responder rate will be \$105; the young adult rate will be \$105; and the child rate will be \$75. Kids-in-tow will still be free (with the purchase of an attending membership.) However, anyone making a deposit will lock in the rate at the price in effect at the time of the deposit. Hotel contracts with six hotels have been signed with approximately 1,400 rooms in the block. Six hundred are in the Hilton and Marriott, which are attached to the convention center; another 600 are in the Fairmont, which is where parties will be located. Two other hotels are across the street from the convention center, and the sixth hotel is a few blocks away. There are currently approximately 2,400 members, of which 1,700 are full attending members.

H.2 New Zealand in 2020

Andrew Adams represented the New Zealand in 2020 bid. He announced that the convention will be held in Wellington, New Zealand. The bid has two viable sites for the convention, but they are still keeping their options open because there may be a new conference center there, which will be a better site than the two existing ones. The bid team is very enthusiastic but not necessarily very experienced with working on Worldcons and will be looking for assistance from overseas. (Indeed, Dr. Adams, a Brit living in Japan, was representing the bid!)

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Mark Protection Committee Report

REPORT OF MARK PROTECTION COMMITTEE

August 2016 –July 2017

Membership and Structure

The terms for Paul Dormer and Deb Geisler expired at the end of MidAmeriCon II, and we thank them for their service. Randall Shepherd rejoined the MPC as the representative of the 2017 NASFiC, and Joni Dashoff joined the committee as the representative for Worldcon 2018.

Members of the Mark Protection Committee (“MPC”) from August 2016 through July 2017 were as follows, with the expiration of membership listed in parentheses after their name: Stephen Boucher (elected until 2018), John Coxon (elected until 2017), Joni Dashoff (appointed by Worldcon 76 until 2020), Linda Deneroff (elected until 2017), Donald E. Eastlake III (elected until 2018), Bruce Farr (elected until 2018), Glenn Glazer (appointed by Sasquan until 2017⁷), Michael Lee (appointed by Worldcon 75 until 2019), Tim Illingworth (elected until 2019), Dave McCarty (elected until 2017), Mark Olson (appointed by MidAmericon II until 2018), Randall Shepherd (appointed by NASFiC 2017 until 2019), Kevin Standlee (elected until 2019), and Ben Yalow (elected until 2019).

Kevin Standlee was re-elected Chairman; Linda Deneroff, Secretary; and Bruce Farr, Treasurer. Although the term for Scott Dennis expired at the conclusion of the 2015 Worldcon Business Meeting, he remains assistant treasurer by the MPC for the current MPC term. Our Canadian agent is Adrienne Seel.

Worldcon Intellectual Property (“WIP”) is a California public benefit/non-profit corporation (also recognized as a 501c3 tax-exempt charity by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service) controlled by the MPC that holds the MPC’s bank account. The WIP Financial Report is appended at the end of this document. A report from the Hugo Awards Marketing Committee is included as an appendix to this report. The Worldcon Website Working Group was discharged at last year’s first MPC meeting and its tasks assigned to the Hugo Awards Marketing Committee.

⁷ Glenn Glazer resigned at the end of 2015 and Mike Willmoth was appointed in Glenn’s place.

Report

Things slowed down for us a bit this year, but there was still a lot of activity.

During MidAmeriCon II we learned that our EU trademark for HUGO AWARD was registered. We announced it at the MidAmeriCon II business meeting, but we received notice too late to make it into last year's report.

In light of the success of our marks registration Collette Fozard asked on behalf of Worldcon 75 if we needed to modify our boilerplate text. Kevin suggested they use the following modified notice:

“Worldcon,” “Hugo Award,” the Hugo Award Logo, “World Science Fiction Society,” “WSFS,” “World Science Fiction Convention,” and the distinctive design of the Hugo Award Trophy Rocket are service marks of Worldcon Intellectual Property, a California non-profit, tax-exempt charitable corporation, on behalf of the World Science Fiction Society, an unincorporated literary society.

This puts the three registered marks first and names WIP as the legal entity, while continuing to state that WIP is doing so on WSFS's behalf.

Later in August, we were asked exactly to whom the 1951 Retro Hugo award for Destination Moon was awarded. Kevin Standlee pointed out that The Hugo Award is presented to the work, not an individual. We do not know for certain which individual or individuals accepted or received any trophies for the 1951 Retro-Hugo Award.

Joni Dashoff reminded us that we were to create a spreadsheet with all the domain names we have registered, along with their renewal dates. The spreadsheet is attached as Addenda 1 to this report.

The YA Committee had some questions for the MPC, specifically regarding registered the mark for such an award. Would the MPC register the award, and what would happen if we did not register the mark? Would someone from the YA committee need to be appointed to the MPC, and what would be the total cost (e.g., award/logo design and registration costs)? Kevin felt that if the name of the award incorporated an existing WSFS service mark (e.g., “The Worldcon Awards for YA SF/F,”) then the existing service mark that WSFS holds on “Worldcon” would be sufficient, and no new service mark registration would be required. He also delineated the costs of a new service mark registration (\$375 in the USA) plus attorney fees. However, rather than registering the new mark immediately, Kevin felt it would be easier to register the mark a few years down the road, when we could show the US Patent & Trademark Office

that we had been using the name “in commerce” for a while. We would, however, *assert* it as a service mark. (The WSFS service marks were asserted for years before we registered them.) Additionally, the logo and trophy designs would be separate service marks and each would have to be registered separately, with the fee payable each time. There would also be ongoing renewal fees periodically. (All these fees would be the responsibility of the MPC, which is solely concerned with the overall management of WSFS service marks, and thus would include any new awards that WSFS presents. Therefore, there would be no reason to appoint a YA committee member to the MPC unless we (a) permanently created the YA Committee as an entity of WSFS and (b) authorized it to appoint a member to the MPC.) Kevin also warned that if a name is too generic, it’s likely to be rejected by the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office.

We also received a couple of requests to register domain names for the benefit of future Worldcons, e.g., Worldcon 77, Worldcon 78, etc. This raised the question as to whose responsibility is it to register these domains. John Coxon thought we should put it to a vote of the current bid chairs and ask them to register the domains, but Joni Dashoff felt that this was a job for the MPC as protectors of the WSFS identifiers, and that we can turn the mark for a given year over to the winning convention. Bruce Farr agreed that it’s within our purview, but asked how far out we should go since we do not have a large budget. We then received notice from Andrew Adams that, on behalf of the New Zealand in 2020 bid, he had gone ahead and registered “worldcon78.org” and “worldcon2020.org” and that no use would be made of these names except to retain control of their registration until the 2020 Worldcon was officially seated by the Worldcon 76 Site Selection Business Meeting, and that if another group should win the election, then control of those domains would be passed to them in a timely manner. Brian Nisbet also told us that the Dublin 2019 bid has registered “worldcon.ie” for their use should they win the 2017 Worldcon site selection vote.

We received word that the Human Genome Organization was presenting HUGO Awards (HUGO in this case being an acronym of the organization’s name). This group has been around since 1988 and is headquartered in South Korea. Kevin suggested to them that they rename the award the HUGO Prize since one of the things they already present is styled a “prize” and the other two items are named “Chen Awards.” (It’s only the three together that they collectively call HUGO Awards.) We have had no response from them since then.)

We contacted the Highgate Upstairs Theatre (a small North London theatre) when we learned they were giving out “Hugo Awards.” They agreed to change the name of their award.

It was also pointed out to us that producer Michael Rosen appeared to be claiming a Hugo Award win for one of his movies. This was a mistake on the part of an intern in Mr. Rosen's office and has been corrected.

Additionally, there was a small security/hacker conference calling itself NolaCon. Luckily, we did not have to do anything as the MPC is not responsible for protecting individual conventions' names.

A Chinese television company based in Washington, D.C., SEP, was looking for a speaker regarding the science fiction market in China. We gave them a few more appropriate names/organizations to contact.

Jo Van Ekeren offered her services to the MPC. She actively helped collect the information needed to get our EU marks registered, and we look forward to her continued participation in one manner or another.

We continue to receive various enquiries not MPC related. We received one asking how to submit a work for Hugo consideration; this year we received such an enquiry from China. We also received an enquiry from a woman whose aunt and uncle live in what was Alfred Bester's Pennsylvania home. The top floor of the house still contains his reference/research books and other related materials! Before they cleared this space, they wanted to know if any of these items would be of interest to the MPC. We recommended they contact either the Fan History Project or the Eaton Collection, depending on whether the material was fannish or professional.

This spring we received a request from the offices of Future Man, a new Sony television series, for permission to use a mock "dummy" of a Hugo Award as set dressing in the fictional home of a famous Hollywood director in an episode of the series. We responded that we had no objection to their using a mock-up of a Hugo Award, or even an actual Hugo Award trophy, and suggested they contact the Los Angeles Science Fantasy Society, which could probably put them in contact with someone who has an actual Hugo Award trophy.) We asked in return if they could include our mark in the closing credits of the episode and to please let us know when the episode becomes available so that we could publicize it through the Hugo Awards web site. The producers said they had no control over the issue and that they could not add the credit, but that they would send their standard release to confirm permissions.

We also received a question along the same lines from Paul Cornell, the author of the comic, Saucer State, asking if he could draw a Hugo Award (unmentioned) sitting on the desk of a fictional science fiction writer. We did not see any problem with that.

Domain Names

Domain	Owner	Handle to Renew	Renewal Date
Worldcon.org	World Science Fiction Society	KS2182-GANDI	2020-08-02 – 04:00:00
Worldcon78.org Worldcon2020.org	Andrew Adams purchased both on behalf of NZ in 2020		
Worldcon.ie	Dublin in 2019		

U.S. Marks

Mark	Owner	Action	Renewal Dates
Rocket Mark	World Science Fiction Society	Section 8, Section 9 Section 8, Section 15	4/16/18-4/15/19 4/16/22-4/15/23
NASFiC	World Science Fiction Society	Section 8, Section 15	6/30/18-6/29/19
3D Rocket	World Science Fiction Society	Section 8, Section 9 Section 8, Section 15	10/14/19-10/13/20 10/14/23-10/13/24
World Science Fiction Convention	World Science Fiction Society	Section 8, Section 9	6/26/23-6/25/24
Worldcon	World Science Fiction Society	Section 8, Section 9	6/26/23-6/25/24
World Science Fiction Society	World Science Fiction Society	Section 8, Section 9	7/3/23-7/3/24
WSFS	World Science Fiction Society	Section 8, Section 9	7/17/23-7/16/24
Hugo Award	World Science Fiction Society	Section 8, Section 9	7/24/23-7/23/24
Revisit 00417825.7 Potential opposition to CTM App No. 014808471 for Hugo Rocket (Logo) in classes 9, 25, 28 and 41 in the name of RDC Studios Limited - Opposition Deadline: Thursday 11 March 2016 [CW-LEGAL.FID2621780]	We have reserved our rights for five years (through 2021); we should review in 2019.	Review	2019

EU Marks

Worldcon	Worldcon Intellectual Property	Class	
Hugo Award	Worldcon Intellectual Property	Class	
The Hugo Award Logo	Worldcon Intellectual Property	Class	

Mark Protection Committee/WIP Financial Report
July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017
All U.S. Dollars

	Income	Expense Paid by MPC/WIP	Balance Checking Accounts
Cash on hand as of July 1, 2016			\$7,697.04
Pair Networks 7-5-2016 Website		\$78.62	\$7,618.42
Wire Fee 7-15-16 (for June, 2016 wire transfer)		\$46.00	\$7,572.42
Cover It Live 8-11-16 Coverage at Hugo Ceremony		\$149.00	\$7,423.42
Wire British Solicitors 9-6-16 for Trademark work		\$1,038.36	\$6,385.06
Business Systems 9-27-16 Checks		\$42.70	\$6,342.36
Wire Fee 10-17-16		\$46.00	\$6,296.36
Debit Purchase 5-2-17 Pair Networks 1 Yr Web Hosting		65.69	\$6,230.67
Bank Balance June 30, 2017 at US Bank			\$6,230.67

Notes:

) **Note 1:** The amounts paid to the British Solicitors, Clarke Willmott LLC, were paid in British Pounds. Amounts shown are after conversion to US Dollars via wire transfers at U S Bank.

—Bruce Farr

WSFS Hugo Awards Marketing Committee
August 2016 - July 2017

The Hugo Awards Marketing Committee (HAMC) members are Dave McCarty (Chair), Craig Miller, Cheryl Morgan, Mark Olson, and Kevin Standlee. HAMC is established by the WSFS Mark Protection Committee, and its chair and members are appointed by the MPC annually.

The HAMC continues to work with Worldcon committees to support the marketing of the Hugo Awards, to handle inquiries from the press regarding the Awards as needed, and to maintain TheHugoAwards.org, including maintaining the list of past finalists and winners, and archiving the “Section 3.11.4” reports of nomination and voting information issued by Hugo Award administrators. The HAMC also provides the live text-based coverage via CoverItLive of the Hugo Awards Ceremony. (This is not the streaming video coverage; that, when provided, is at the expense of the hosting Worldcon.) The cost of the CoverItLive coverage (around \$150/year) is paid by the MPC, sometimes with grants obtained from elsewhere.

Last year, the HAMC also took on the task of managing the WSFS-owned websites Worldcon.org, NASFiC.org, and WSFS.org. All three sites are now on commercial hosting at Pair.com. We manage these sites, including the list of seated, future, and past Worldcons, and the lists of bids for future conventions to the best of our knowledge.

2016-17 was a relatively quiet year, for which we should probably be grateful, given some of the issues of the previous two years. Traffic on the Hugo Awards web site returned to a new level that is higher than the pre-2015 levels but not at the bandwidth-busting peak. Total page views for the two highest months during the past three years are as follows:

	2015	2016	2017
Finalists (April)	228,184	96,420	92,720
Awards (August)	308,078	121,537	

Bandwidth and disk space usage are well within the allowances for our account.

Appendix B – Hugo Awards Study Committee

HUGO AWARDS STUDY COMMITTEE

At Thursday's WSFS Business meeting, the creation of the proposed Hugo Awards Study committee was supported, and I was asked to chair it. I appreciate the honour and trust implied. – Vincent Docherty

The text of the proposal was:

B.2.1 Short Title: Hugo Awards Study Committee
(*amendment by substitution*)

Moved: to substitute for B.2 the following:

- To create a Hugo Awards Study Committee, appointed by the Chair, to
- (1) Study revisions to Article 3 (Hugo Awards) of the WSFS Constitution, including any such proposals for amending Sections 3.2 and 3.3 as may be referred to it by the Business Meeting or suggested by others;
- (2) Make recommendations, which may include proposing constitutional amendments, to the 2018 Business Meeting; and
- (3) Authorize the Chair of the Committee to appoint other persons to serve on the committee at the Chair's discretion.

Note: The scope of the committee therefore includes various definitions, such as what professional means (section 3.2) and ALL of the current Hugo Categories. The committee scope does not include the administration and tallying of nominations and votes, and it also does NOT include the separate proposals relating to the YA award, which are on the Business Meeting agenda.

The committee chair was asked to report back to Friday's main Business Meeting, following creation of the committee, including any initial recommendations. Key points:

1. Several people volunteered to join the committee. Their names are listed at the bottom of this report, along with the proposers of the Artist Hugo Eligibility and the Novel, Related and BDP Hugo changes, who have also been invited by the committee chair to join. The list will be cross-checked with the WSFS Business Meeting Chair and Secretary.
2. An email kicking-off the committee was sent to this initial group. Given the lack of availability of many members on Thursday, due to Worldcon75 responsibilities, the committee chair's email included the following, which those who replied supported:

- We recommend the three proposals about Novel, Related and BDP be referred to the Hugo Study committee, to report back at the 2018 Worldcon.
3. An in-person meeting of those interested was scheduled just before the Friday, WSFS Business Meeting, but after this report was drafted. Any significant conclusions will be reported verbally.

Next steps:

- After Helsinki we will agree the committee structure, logistics and comms channels, including any additional names, and any sub-committees, along with house-rules and expected behaviours. (I assume the Helsinki/San Jose codes of conduct apply, since this is an appointed group.) Time commitments expected will be flexible depending on interests and availability.
- I expect that our initial discussions and actions should include:
 - Identifying the important principles underlying the Hugos that will guide us, such as the values (the 'why') important to Worldcon fandom, as well as the more practical aspects such as the viability, credibility, scale and ease of understanding of the category definitions.
 - Identifying trends affecting the Hugos now and expected in the future (say, 5-10 years?).
 - Assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the current categories and definitions (what problems we are trying to solve) and consideration of additional categories that are needed.
 - Reaching out to wider fandom and to groups such as SFWA, ASFA and others, for guidance and data.

Based on the above, proposals about the Hugo categories and related definitions will be built and tested, leading to a report with any recommended actions for consideration at the Worldcon 76 WSFS Business Meeting in San Jose.

Committee Chair, Vincent Docherty
(Vincent.Docherty@gmail.com)

Initial Membership:

From Artist Eligibility proposal:

- Nicholas Whyte
- Kathryn Duval
- Michael Lee
- Kate Secor

From proposed Novel, Related, BDP changes:

- Vincent Docherty
- Chris Barkley
- Robert J. Sawyer

Other names received to date :

- Andrew A. Adams
- Bobson
- Joni Brill Dashoff
- Todd Dashoff
- Cliff Dunn
- Colin Harris
- Kevin Hewett
- Joshua Kronengold
- Dave McCarty
- Lisa Padol
- Hanne Paine
- Ann Marie Rudolph
- Kevin Standlee
- Kári Tulinius
- Jo Van Ekeren
- Juhani Vuorio
- Ben Yalow

Appendix C – Analysis of EPH’s Effect on Hugo Voting

HUGO AWARDS VOTING ANALYSIS

Nicholas Whyte provided a detailed hard-copy report on this year’s Hugo administration in order to provide needed information for making our decisions on EPH and EPH+. Those papers can be found on the Worldcon 75 site. The first two reports consist of the traditional material provided to members.

The first report was the traditional analysis of the final ballot voting statistics.

The second report was the nominations tally, which included the number of ballots cast for each of the finalists and the near-finalists at nomination stage, and the final points tally on the round at which they stopped being considered. The top seven were set off in a shaded box in this report because they are the ones that survived through the final count. The top six made the final ballot, and the seventh was the runner-up. The remaining nine were the ones that were eliminated on the previous nine rounds, and the Constitution requires the figures for the last ten rounds of the count.

However, because a new system was used this year, Mr. Whyte provided the following additional reports:

The third report gave the point tally at each of the last ten rounds for each of the top sixteen nominees (not finalists). The number at the top was the ordinal number of the round of counting, and in many cases there were multiple exclusions. In no case was that in the top sixteen rounds. In the online version of this report, the red numbers indicate the two surviving nominees with the lowest point total on each round, and the one with the lower number was excluded.

The fourth report consisted of the analysis of EPH on the final ballot, which was requested at last year’s business meeting. This report went further and also analyzed what the ballots would have looked like under EPH+, the traditional voting system and 5 and 6. In each case, the report also shows what the five finalists would have been.

Mr. Whyte’s conclusion was that EPH made it relatively easier in 2017 for a nominee with a large number of bullet votes to get on the ballot; it made it much more difficult for a slate to get more than one candidate on the ballot.

The final report consisted of a log of the decisions that the Hugo committee (consisting of Mr. Whyte, Catherine Duvall, Collette Fozard) took. This was provided in the interest of transparency so members could see the thinking process behind some of the more controversial decisions, including the appeals of eligibility). While he did not recommend that future Hugo administrators provide this level of detail, he felt that this was a special year and required a vigorous response.